

# PROGRAM REVIEW



March 1, 2010

## CONTENTS

Preamble	3
Interim Program Review Policy	4
Program Prioritization Report	5
Assessment plan	59
2008 & 2009 Assessment Reports	62
Making Excellence Inclusive plan	69
Benchmarking data	79
Department response to the benchmarking data	80
Overview	82

## PREAMBLE

After actively engaging in its 2010 Program Review, the Department of Communication is ready to enhance its role as the university's primary center for the study of human communication, as well as an important center for the development of critical thinking abilities, service and social advocacy opportunities, and a better understanding of diversity, inclusion, and intercultural communication.

As a student-centered department, where scholarship informs teaching and learning, the Department of Communication supports the primary mission of Humboldt State University, including:

We will be a regional center for the arts. We will be renowned for social and environmental responsibility and action. We believe the key to our common future will be the individual citizen who acts in good conscience and engages in informed action. We will commit to increasing our diversity of people and perspectives. We will be exemplary partners with our communities, including tribal nations. We will be stewards of learning to make a positive difference.

As a department that seeks to combine knowledge, understanding, skills, and values, we subscribe to the university's core values:

- Be student-centered.
- Promote diversity of people and perspectives.
- Practice social and environmental responsibility.
- Be a role model for community involvement.

Finally, in changing the program's name from the Department of Speech Communication to the Department of Communication, we signaled to the community that:

1. Communication is a fundamental part of being human;
2. Communication includes public speaking, but also includes nonverbal communication, listening, and critical thinking;
3. Communication is located at the intersection of many disciplines and practices and is ideally situated for trans-disciplinary partnerships;
4. Communication is primarily concerned with the construction of meaning, something that happens between and among people;
5. Communication is performative; it makes the social world;
6. Communication is more than the effective transmission of information;
7. Communication is essential to effective involvement in the workplace.

## Interim Program Review Policy for 2009-2010

Programs scheduled to begin program review in 2009-2010, or whose program reviews have been delayed until 2009-2010, will conduct their reviews as follows:

Content of the 09-10 Program Reviews:

- 1) Program Prioritization Report
- 2) For programs in prioritization categories I & IV: Dean's recommendation, AMP letter, and ICC letter
- 3) Any plan or proposal resulting from prioritization
- 4) Assessment plan
- 5) The last two annual assessment reports (originally submitted September 2008 and September 2009)
- 6) The department's "Making Excellence Inclusive" plan if the department is in one of the first three cohorts of participants.
- 7) The benchmarking data distributed by the deans in summer 2009
- 8) The department's response to the benchmarking data.
- 9) A **brief (2-5 page)** overview that summarizes
  - what the above documents, collectively, indicate about the department
  - any changes not indicated in the above documents (e.g., significant changes to curriculum, increase in number of majors, etc.)
  - Plans for the future direction of the department

Process for the 2009-2010 reviews:

- Review is submitted to the office of the department's college by February 1, 2010
- The dean reviews the reports and works with the department to draft a Memo of Understanding that identifies a common set of expectations, consulting with the Provost as appropriate.
- The Review and its accompanying draft MOU are submitted to the ICC via the Academic Programs office by March 12, 2010.
- The ICC sends the department and the dean any suggestions it has for MOU revisions by April 27, 2010.
- Final MOU and Review go to the Provost and the Senate as information items.

## PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION REPORT

### HSU Academic Program Criteria Academic Program in Communication

---

#### I. The Vision for Humboldt State University (Limit: 2 pages) [15%]

Describe up to 5 curricular or co-curricular features of the program that are consistent with the Vision of HSU, and indicate which aspect(s) of the Vision align with that particular feature. Please provide sufficient information such that an individual unfamiliar with your program will clearly understand the feature's relevance.

#### ENTER COMMENTS HERE

##### 1. Department Mission and Goals

The specific purpose of the Department, as articulated in our Mission Statement, is to serve the university and community by advancing knowledge about human communication, as well as promoting the critical analysis of communication contexts and the judicious application of communication skills. Our intent is to help students become knowledgeable and proficient communicators so they can effectively be involved in improving the human condition and environment, act in good conscience and engage in informed action, as well as to meet other personal goals. In addition, most of our courses also incorporate individual assignments that support Vision Statements 1, 4, 5, and 8.

##### 2. Social Advocacy Minor

This interdisciplinary program is housed in the Department and offers two courses specifically designed to develop the ability of students who wish to act as advocates for issues they care about, including the human condition and the environment, which extends our mission beyond the majors in our department. The minor provides the opportunity for students to learn how various disciplines view advocacy and the ethics of advocating, how to effectively disseminate information about issues, and how social change is accomplished by communication. The Department also offers "Communication and the Environment," as well as the "Speaking and Writing for the Environment" Freshman Interest Group (F.I.G). Through these experiences the Department specifically supports Vision Statements 2, 4, 5 and 8.

##### 3. Curriculum

A. The curriculum in the major is designed both to attract a diverse population of students and to help students understand and communicate with a diverse range of people. Much

of the content of our courses is intended to encourage students to use principles, theories, and skills in the field of Communication to examine their own culture, ethnicity, gender, and relationships. Thus, we achieve diversity in our program in two significant but distinct fashions: one, we serve, retain and graduate students of color, and two, we include diverse perspectives throughout the curriculum

B. The Department is committed to encouraging and promoting diversity in its extensive participation in general education courses. We incorporate diverse perspectives in most of our GE classes, and we offer four courses that fulfill the Diversity and Common Ground requirements (COMM 300, 309b, 315, and 322).

Thus, the curriculum of our major supports Vision Statement 6.

#### **4. Service Learning and Civic Engagement**

Our instructors incorporate service learning and civic engagement opportunities where possible in their courses. These opportunities often focus on work with underprivileged populations, in and out of the immediate area. Many of our courses are designed to require students to spend significant time with others from different backgrounds than themselves in partnership with the community. Courses which regularly include opportunities for civic engagement include COMM 322, COMM 315, and COMM 422. Thus, our department supports Vision Statements 6, 7, and 8.

#### **5. Co-curricular Activities**

The Speech and Debate Team supports students as a means to develop their abilities to engage in effective civic discourse. Coach(es) work directly with students to improve students' communication skills both in preparation for intercollegiate competition and for careers such as law, politics, business, and education. The competitions help students learn to listen effectively, think critically, craft sound arguments, and present those arguments effectively.

The Communication Club is a student-run organization housed in Communication whose purpose is to represent students and to increase public dialogue both on and off campus. The Club has participated in a campus-wide Communication Week in the spring semesters.

Nu-Jacks was a hip hop and diversity club housed in the Department. Funded through grants from the HSU diversity funding committee from Fall 2006 through Fall 2007, this club created programming to encourage appreciation of diversity and cultural difference. During Fall

2006, the Nu-Jacks created nine lectures, concerts, and workshops around diversity and underrepresented populations, with attendance at these events exceeding 500 people.

Therefore, our co-curricular activities support Vision Statements 5, 7, and 8.

## II. Demand (Limit: 1.5 pages per option, not including tables) [20%]

### A. Internal demand for the degree program and courses in the degree program

#### 1. Headcount Data

<b>Major Academic Year (Fall/Spring) Average Headcount Summary</b> Majors_overview_COMM report generated: 16-APR-08									
Major Code	Major Description	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
COMM	Communication	0	0	46	71	62	69	83	88
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>88</b>

<b>Second Majors by Academic Year (exclusive of primary majors)</b> Majors_overview_COMM report generated: 16-APR-08									
Major Code	Major Description	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
COMM	Communication	0	0	1	3	5	7	5	6
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>

<b>Minors enrolled AY Average in Communication</b> minors_enrolled_COMM report generated: 06-MAR-08								
CLASS	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Frosh	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0
Soph	0	0	2	1	2	2	1	1
Jr	0	0	1	2	3	2	2	0
Sr	0	0	2	4	5	7	2	5
Grad	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>Minors enrolled AY Average in Social Advocacy</b> minors_enrolled_SADV report generated: 06-MAR-08								
CLASS	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Frosh	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0
Soph	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0

Jr	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
Sr	0	0	1	1	2	3	1	0
	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>Majors by Sex and Ethnicity</b>									
Majors_overview_COMM report generated: 16-APR-08									
SEX	Ethnicity	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Female	Asian	0	0	3	4	2	1	3	3
	Black	0	0	1	2	2	0	2	2
	Hispanic	0	0	2	3	5	10	4	4
	Native Amer	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
	White	0	0	20	34	25	23	30	26
	Other	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3
	Unknown	0	0	5	6	7	5	6	7
<b>Sum</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>47</b>
Male	Asian	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0
	Black	0	0	2	4	5	6	7	8
	Hispanic	0	0	1	3	3	3	4	4
	Native Amer	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Pacific Is	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
	White	0	0	11	13	12	13	16	18
	Other	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	6
	Unknown	0	0	2	2	2	3	6	7
<b>Sum</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>42</b>

<b>Communication (with options) Degrees Awarded (incl. primary and second majors)</b>								
degrees_awarded_B_COMM report generated: 25-JUN-08								
MAJOR	AY 99/00	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07
Communication	0	0	0	5	26	18	10	25
<b>sum</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>



<b>Communication Degrees Awarded by Sex and Ethnicity (incl. primary and second majors)</b> degrees_awarded_B_COMM report generated: 25-JUN-08									
<b>SEX</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>AY 99/00</b>	<b>AY 00/01</b>	<b>AY 01/02</b>	<b>AY 02/03</b>	<b>AY 03/04</b>	<b>AY 04/05</b>	<b>AY 05/06</b>	<b>AY 06/07</b>
Female	Asian	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
	Hispanic	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
	Native Amer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	White	0	0	0	4	13	10	5	9
	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
<b>Sum</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17</b>
Male	Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	Black	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Hispanic	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
	Native Amer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Pacific Is	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	White	0	0	0	1	7	3	1	3
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Sum</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>

<b>Minors Awarded by Year in Communication</b> minors_awarded_COMM report generated: 25-JUN-08								
<b>MINOR</b>	<b>AY 99/00</b>	<b>AY 00/01</b>	<b>AY 01/02</b>	<b>AY 02/03</b>	<b>AY 03/04</b>	<b>AY 04/05</b>	<b>AY 05/06</b>	<b>AY 06/07</b>
Communication	0	0	1	10	3	6	9	2

<b>Minors Awarded by Year in Social Advocacy</b> minors_awarded_SADV report generated: 25-JUN-08								
<b>MINOR</b>	<b>AY 99/00</b>	<b>AY 00/01</b>	<b>AY 01/02</b>	<b>AY 02/03</b>	<b>AY 03/04</b>	<b>AY 04/05</b>	<b>AY 05/06</b>	<b>AY 06/07</b>
Social Advocacy	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2

## 2. FTES by Course Code

<b>FTES taken in Communication classes by Majors (AY 02/03 - AY 07/08)</b> course_ftes_smry_COMM report generated: 30-JUN-08								
<b>SUBJ</b>	<b>Course level</b>	<b>Student Major</b>	<b>AY 02/03</b>	<b>AY 03/04</b>	<b>AY 04/05</b>	<b>AY 05/06</b>	<b>AY 06/07</b>	<b>AY 07/08</b>
COMM	Lower-div	Undeclared	17.7	16.7	18.5	16.9	12.3	18.2
		Biology	10.0	9.8	10.6	8.6	10.2	11.8
		Communication	4.4	6.0	3.8	7.5	6.1	9.7
		Psychology	5.5	4.9	6.8	7.0	8.4	6.9
		Business Administration	6.0	5.3	4.7	6.1	7.6	6.7
		Art	12.0	9.1	11.1	7.8	5.5	6.3
		Wildlife	3.8	3.5	3.9	4.2	3.8	5.0
	<b>Sub-total</b>		<b>126.7</b>	<b>113.9</b>	<b>128.9</b>	<b>124.6</b>	<b>121.5</b>	<b>134.1</b>

COMM	Upper-div	Communication	16.5	31.7	26.7	32.2	34.6	33.0
		Liberal Studies-Elementary Ed	19.4	16.5	10.9	7.1	6.6	5.5
		Environmental Science	5.1	5.4	4.9	4.5	5.3	4.1
		IS-INTL- International Studies	2.6	.7	2.5	2.7	3.3	3.8
		Liberal Studies	.8	.8	.3	1.5	1.9	2.1
	<b>Sub-total</b>		<b>77.3</b>	<b>84.4</b>	<b>82.0</b>	<b>82.8</b>	<b>85.1</b>	<b>75.8</b>

<b>FTES taken in Communication classes by Majors (AY 02/03 - AY 07/08)</b> course_ftes_smry_COMM report generated: 30-JUN-08								
<b>SUBJ</b>	<b>Course level</b>	<b>Student Major</b>	<b>AY 02/03</b>	<b>AY 03/04</b>	<b>AY 04/05</b>	<b>AY 05/06</b>	<b>AY 06/07</b>	<b>AY 07/08</b>
COMM	All Levels	Communication	20.8	37.7	30.6	39.7	40.7	42.7
		Undeclared	18.4	17.3	19.5	18.3	13.9	18.9
		Biology	10.9	10.4	12.2	10.7	11.6	13.3
		Business Administration	7.3	6.0	5.8	7.2	9.2	8.2
		Liberal Studies-Elementary Ed	23.2	19.5	15.4	9.2	8.9	8.1
		Psychology	8.8	7.9	9.4	9.9	10.8	7.9
		Environmental Science	9.6	8.2	6.9	8.4	7.9	7.7
		Art	14.2	11.0	14.2	9.9	7.1	7.7
		Wildlife	4.5	4.6	4.5	5.1	4.8	5.9

		Journalism	3.5	4.1	4.6	6.8	5.1	5.6
		Kinesiology	3.7	4.0	6.0	4.8	5.5	5.6
		IS-INTL- International Studies	3.7	2.0	3.5	4.2	4.7	5.1
		Environmental Resources Engr	1.7	2.2	3.0	2.4	2.6	5.1
<b>Total</b>			<b>204.0</b>	<b>198.3</b>	<b>210.9</b>	<b>207.4</b>	<b>206.7</b>	<b>210.0</b>

3. Service to other HSU program/options

*Document other HSU programs/options (including, GE) with required coursework from your program*

Course Dept	Course #	Course Name	Units	Requiring Major/Minor
Communication	100	Fundamentals of Speech Communication	3	Nursing
	311	Business & Professional Speaking	3	Journalism
				Natural Resources Planning & Interpretation
	312	Small Group Communication	4	Natural Resources Planning & Interpretation
	322	Intercultural Communication	4	American Sign Language & Special Populations
				Crosscultural language & Academic Development-Certificate
				Dance Studies - Interdisciplinary
				English
				Family Studies - Minor
	324	Nonverbal Communication	4	American Sign Language & Special Populations
	404	Theories of Communication Influence	4	Journalism
	411	Organizational Communication	4	Journalism
				Natural Resources Planning & Interpretation
417	Second Language Acquisition	3	American Sign Language & Special Populations	
			Crosscultural language & Academic Development-Certificate	
422	Children's Communication Development	4	Child Development [Liberal Studies]	
			Natural Resources Planning & Interpretation	
309b	Gender &	3	Education - Minor	

		Communication		
--	--	---------------	--	--

The table above was provided to the department by the Prioritization team. It is important information, but there is more to the story. A search using the Online Catalog Search adds the programs that include our classes as options to meet major requirements. The results of that search are added below:

Course Dept	Course #	Course Name	Units	Requiring Major/Minor
Communication	213	Interpersonal Communication	3	Leadership Studies
	214	Persuasive Speaking	3	Leadership Studies
	309b	Gender & Communication	3	MA in Education
				Leadership Studies
				Women's Studies
	312	Intercultural Communication	4	Child Development (Liberal Studies)
				English/Language Arts Education
				International Studies
				Leadership Studies
				Liberal Studies/Elementary Education
	Teaching English as a Second Language			
	411	Organizational Communication	4	Leadership Studies
	414	Rhetorical Theory	4	Liberal Studies
	417	Second Language Acquisition	3	Child Development (Liberal Studies)
English				
English/Language Arts Education				
Linguistics				
Teaching English as a Second Language				
422	Children's Communication Development	4	Liberal Studies/Elementary Education	
			Linguistics	
426	Adolescent Communication	3	English	
			English/Language Arts Education	

The Director of the co-curricular Speech and Debate team also makes a special effort to serve students from throughout the university. As the table below shows, since AY 2002/03 the

program involved students from twenty-seven different departments other than Communication, representing every college on campus plus undeclared students.

<b>Major</b>	<b>Number of enrollees</b>
Biology	5
Biology (Cellular Molecular)	2
Biology (Ecology)	2
Biology (Marine)	1
Business Administration	2
Chemistry (Biochemistry)	4
Computer Information Systems	1
Computer Science	4
Economics	7
English	5
English Education	6
Environmental Resource Engineering	1
Environmental Science	1
Geography	2
History	11
Interdisciplinary Studies	4
Interdisciplinary Studies: Women's Studies	3
Journalism	3
Journalism: News Editorial	1
Journalism: Public Relations	2
Journalism: Broadcast News	1
Kinesiology (Education)	1
Liberal Studies Elementary Education	8
Native American Studies (Law and Government)	2
Philosophy	2
Political Science	15
Psychology	15
Religious Studies	3
Social Science	1
Social Work	1
Sociology	3
Spanish	1
SSSS	5
Studio Art	2
Theatre	6
Undeclared	10
Wildlife	4
Zoology	3

4. Comment on the internal demand **FOR EACH OPTION** of the Major. Explain any significant changes in internal program demand over past 7 years. Provide any additional relevant information of internal demand.

*Communication*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

A search using the Humboldt Online Catalog Search revealed that, in total, of the 28 regular courses in the 07/08 catalog (excluding special topics, independent studies, and field experience courses), 21 are also associated with a program other than the department of Communication or the Social Advocacy minor, as indicated in the two tables above. Thus, Communication clearly provides coursework needed by a variety of other programs in addition to the classes that are *required* of other programs.

Student demand for Communication department courses has been increasing despite regular budget stresses. As the headcount data indicate the demand for the major has increased dramatically since AY 02/03, doubling from 47 first and second majors in 02/03 to 94 in 07/08.

There is only one option for the major in our program. While students may fulfill various components of the major by choosing among classes, there are no specialization options or tracks. The program traditionally served students who transfer from other colleges, or who change their major while at HSU. However, over the past four years, this has been balanced by larger groups of first-year students entering as declared communication majors. Transfer students come to the Department in two ways: from taking an upper division course such as 309b and getting excited about the program or from having previous knowledge of the discipline and seeking out our program. Of the students originating at HSU, many become a Communication major after taking a GE course, such as COMM 100 or COMM 105.

It is worth noting that, in the past many students were not aware of the field of communication as it is studied at HSU, since dedicated communication courses are not offered in most high schools. We believe these trends are changing as we have seen entering students with more sophistication about communication studies, indicating potential for increased demand.

Demand can be expected to continue to grow in keeping with national trends. The *Princeton Review* recently identified Communication as the eighth most popular college major (Top 10 College Majors). The National Center for Educational Statistics reports that degrees in

Communication and Journalism have grown by 30% since 2003, from a total of 69,828 to 76,936 in 2005-06 (the latest year data is available).

*Communication Minor*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The headcount for the number of minors indicates that few students minor in Communication. These data may be a reflection on the offerings of the Department since we were not able to offer more classes than absolutely needed by our majors and GE obligations. There simply has not been room in major classes to accommodate a substantial number of minors. The data may also reflect the fact that a declared minor is not required by HSU, so students who could have a minor may have simply chosen not to formally declare it.

*Social Advocacy Minor*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

Faculty from across the CAHSS wanted to create an interdisciplinary minor in social advocacy to meet a demand and interests of HSU students, as well as the mission and goals of the university. Participating departments included Communication, Philosophy, Journalism, Social Work, and Sociology. For the first few years the program was housed in the College and classes were identified with the “CAHSS” designation. The elective classes were taught in the above listed departments and the two new courses created for the minor were COMM 315 and CAHSS 480. The latter was a seminar class which included 8-10 presenters from all of the participating departments. The CAHSS 480 class was later housed in Communication and goes under the designation COMM 480. (In Spring 2008, a course request change from was submitted to get this course a permanent number—COMM 416.) COMM 315 has been certified as a DCG course as well.

The following table shows the enrollment for the two core courses in the Social Advocacy minor over time.

<i>Enrollment for COMM 315</i>		<i>Enrollment for COMM. 480 (Soon to be COMM 416) Social Advocacy (advanced level)</i>	
<u>Term</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Term</u>	<u>Students</u>
Fall 2003	20	Spring 2003	12
Fall 2004	25	Spring 2004	5
Fall 2005	31		

Fall 2006	18	Spring 2005	9
Fall 2007	28	Spring 2006	19
		Spring 2007	23
		Spring 2008	23

These two courses directly support the HSU Vision Statement, and are in line with the HSU Graduation Pledge and with the mission of the Department. Students from many majors enroll in these courses.

B. External demand for “graduates” from the program

*Communication*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

Communication is one of the most central skills necessary for modern employment. Yet, Communication majors do not graduate with a readily recognizable label, such as “Nurse” or “Accountant.” Our understanding of relevant national data, as well as our experience with HSU alumni, indicates that Communication majors find careers in a number of fields. Many communication graduates find themselves using their communication, listening, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills in internal organizational communication, customer service, training, marketing, social services, law, education, management, administration, and advocacy.

Because students with communication degrees enter a variety of fields, there is no single statistical presentation of the success of graduates. In the hyper-competitive modern economy, a particular college degree is often less relevant than the skills presented. The case can be made that communication skills are increasingly valued by employers. For example, in a comparison of salary increases in fields of study from 1994-1997, communication/journalism was found to increase a dramatic 28 per cent (US Department of Education, “Baccalaureate”).

Surveys of employers indicate the importance of communication and raise the expectation that the demand for graduates of the major and graduates with the abilities developed by courses in the department will grow over time. A survey of 428 personnel managers found that “the skills most valued in the contemporary job-entry market are communication skills (including oral communication, listening, and written communication” (Curtis). A survey of personnel interviewers at 500 businesses “indicated that communication skills are essential for success, but many applicants lack effective communication skills in job interviews” (Peterson). The National Association of Colleges and Employers surveys over 1000 members annually, and



the results consistently show the importance of communication skills. Executive Director Marilyn Mackes says, “Communication skills have topped the list for eight years” (NACE “Employers Cite”). Figure 1 shows the top twelve results of the latest survey, and in addition to the general “Communication Skills” three more of the top six skills are directly related to our courses: Teamwork skills, Interpersonal Skills, and Problem-Solving skills (NACE “Perfect”).

**Figure 1. Important qualities/skills for a job candidate**

Quality/Skill	Rating
Communication skills	4.6
Strong work ethic	4.6
Teamwork skills	4.5
Initiative	4.4
Interpersonal skills	4.4
Problem-solving skills	4.4
Analytical skills	4.3
Flexibility/adaptability	4.2
Computer skills	4.1
Technical skills	4.1
Detail-oriented	4.0
Organizational skills	4.0

(5-point-scale where 1=not important; 2=not very important; 3=somewhat important; 4=very important; and 5=extremely important)

*Communication Minor*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The external demand for graduates with a communication minor are not known, except to repeat that the skills minors would gain also match what employers say are important. Students taking the minor are less likely to develop their abilities as much, though, because the classes taken for the minor are less extensive than those for the major.

*Social Advocacy Minor*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The external demand for the Social Advocacy Minor should correspond to that for the Communication major because social advocates also learn valuable communication skills. The Social Advocacy minor tends to attract students who are more interested in doing social good than in making money, so they do not tend to be oriented toward traditional careers.

However, there is no reason why social advocates could not be employed in a wide variety of careers.

**III. Program Quality (Limit: 6 pages, not including tables) [30%]**

A. Students

1. For undergraduate programs

<b>Communication (with options) Mean GWPE Scores (incl. primary and second majors)</b> degrees_awarded_B_COMM report generated: 25-JUN-08								
<b>MAJOR</b>	<b>AY 99/00</b>	<b>AY 00/01</b>	<b>AY 01/02</b>	<b>AY 02/03</b>	<b>AY 03/04</b>	<b>AY 04/05</b>	<b>AY 05/06</b>	<b>AY 06/07</b>
Communication				16.4	17.2	17.2	17.0	17.0
Overall				16.4	17.2	17.2	17.0	17.0

Provide evidence indicative of program quality related to student learning (e.g., patterns of student achievements in discipline-specific contexts such as special honors or awards, publications, presentations; passing rates on professional examinations; proportion of students who are admitted to graduate school and/or employed in a disciplinary field; and so on – as appropriate for your discipline).

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The Department has a number of markers of recent success that indicate program excellence. For example, a significant number of student campus leaders have been Communication majors (including two of the AS presidents in the last five years).

The Table (below) on “Student Achievement” presents additional evidence that the Department has a strong record of empowering student learning, achievement, and service.

<b>Number</b>	<b>Activity</b>
1	Bill Emerson National Hunger Fellow
2	Associated Students Presidents
1	HSU Woman of the Year
1	Award for Excellence in an Academic Discipline for the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (plus another nominee)
2	Awards for Outstanding Contribution to an Associated Students Program (plus another nominee)
2	Awards for Outstanding Contribution to a Campus Club, Program or Organization (plus two other nominees)
1	Award for Excellence in Intercollegiate Athletics and Sports Clubs (plus another nominee)
1	Nomination for Outstanding Contribution to residence halls

- 1 Nomination for Al Elpusan Award for Activism
- 1 Nomination for Brian Lorensen Living Group Advisor Award
- 1 Award for Excellence in Community Service by the Indian Teacher and Educational Personnel Program
- 1 CCAA Player of the Year
- 6 members of Omicron Delta Kappa National Leadership Honor Society
- 28 members of Lambda Pi Eta National Communication Honorary

Admission to (and success in) graduate programs is another indicator of program excellence. The Department has seen a steady stream of Communication majors move into graduate programs. More than a dozen of our students from 2005-2007 are currently enrolled in or have completed graduate school (Travis Bartosh, Amanda Stevens, Tia Newby, Bill Kelvin, Carolyn Bys, Josh Hanan, Elana Babiarz, Lisa Hand, Angelina Paoello, Jenny Perez, Marco Rotting, Nita George, Erin Miedema, Ruthie Mahoney, Kayleigh Azevedo, and Julie Jensen). These students are doing well in the study of Communication, Law, Social Work, Environment and Community, and Higher Education Administration or Student Services.

The HSU Speech and Debate Team (formally called the Forensics team) provides other evidence of program excellence, as well as an opportunity for students to gain recognition for HSU. During the time under consideration members of the team have won literally hundreds of awards at a variety of contests. Even more impressive, thirteen students have competed at national championship competitions in seventeen events.

## B. Faculty

1. Provide evidence of teaching effectiveness and commitment to continuous improvement of teaching. Include, for example, engagement in professional development for teaching (including around campus themes on learning outcomes and diversity, and on accessibility training), program approaches to ensure quality, and/or recognitions, honors, and awards for excellence in the classroom as appropriate for your program.

### **ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

Every tenure-track faculty member in the department has a Ph.D. in the field. The faculty regularly participate in local, regional, and national conferences as presenters, respondents, program chairs, and for professional development.

The Department's Personnel Committee regularly reviews students' evaluations of teaching/learning, as well as peer reviews of teaching/learning. During the past five years, the Department's faculty consistently earns high scores in these evaluations (typically well

above 4.0 on a 5.0 scale) The Department's has been recognized for best practices in promoting Diversity. For example, several COMM courses are approved to meet the Diversity and Common Ground component of the GE curriculum. Department of communication faculty have participated in diversity planning events in 2006 and 2007 (organizing student groups, presenting talks). Women and under-represented students have served as Undergraduate Instructional Assistants and Mentors. The Department also is proud of the accomplishments of Dr. Tasha Souza, who serves HSU in Faculty Development and promoting Accessibility.

The faculty regularly encourages students to participate in conferences. For example, Dr. Reitzel and Mr. Amundsen served as mentors for students presenting papers at the recent meeting of the Popular Culture Association. Four students have attended the Western States Communication Association conventions in San Francisco and Seattle through the department's Convention Experience offering.

Department faculty have won a number of awards, confirming the Department's excellence in several fields. Those awards include:

*Library Award* for promoting student research, 2008

*Outstanding Advisor Nominations* (3 faculty)

Outstanding Faculty Member Award by Disabled Student Services

D. Scott Enright Award for Service to the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, April 2005. TESOL has a membership of 13,000-14,000 ESL professionals around the world.

Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service-Learning, 2003. One of 15 finalists out of 140 nominees nationwide for the national award.

Outstanding Faculty Award recipient for working with the Latino Students at Humboldt State University, 2002.

Outstanding Faculty Award recipient for working with students with Disabilities, 2001

*Outstanding Professor of the Year Award* recipient at Humboldt State University, 1999

2. Evidence of faculty engagement in scholarship/creative activities and service. (Express as a percentage of full-time or FERP faculty members **affiliated with the program**. For example, if 9 of 10 faculty affiliated with your program gave a paper at a professional meeting in 04/05, then enter 9/10 = 90%.) This table is to be completed by the department.

<b>Scholarship/Creative Activities/Service</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>07/08</b>
At least one peer-reviewed publication or creative product	57%	57%	57%
At least one funded grant or contract related to scholarship	43%	43%	0
Invited participant or leader of workshops, expert panels, or task forces	43%	57%	71%
At least one presentation (paper, poster, exhibition, etc.) given at a professional society meeting	71%	57%	43%
Professional service activities at a regional or national level	43%	57%	57%
Service on at least one university or college-level committee (at least 1 hour/wk avg.)	57%	71%	71%

3. Provide explanations of the data above and/or descriptions of the patterns of faculty engagement in scholarly and/or creative activities and service as appropriate for your program.

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

In terms of sustained engagement, several examples should be noted. First, the faculty, over many years, have been actively involved in the Western Communication Association, the National Communication Association, TESOL, and regional debate associations.

Second, Communication faculty engages in continuous improvement of teaching and learning. Dr. Souza, Dr. Hahn, Dr. Reitzel, Dr. Schnurer, Dr. Paynton, and Dr. VerLinden, have presented convention papers, created web sites, and published texts or chapters on issues of pedagogy and communication instruction.

Third, Communication faculty have national reputations in their specialties. Dr. Schnurer is co-author of a book on *Debate Across the Curriculum*, and is a recognized expert on public advocacy and advocacy issues, such as animal rights. Dr. Bruner is a regular participant in the Biennial Conferences on Communication and Environment, and has co-authored a well-known chapter in *Landmark Essays in Environmental Rhetoric*.

Dr. Souza, has been at the heart of several university-wide initiatives, intended to maximize learning diversity. She has coordinated workshops to help teachers learn about

Accessibility for documents and syllabi. She has also managed “The Faculty Learning Cohort” where faculty meet regularly for a semester to share techniques used to make courses accessible. Dr. Souza has helped to win grants for funding and provided serious mentoring for dozens of Humboldt faculty in making their course materials accessible.

The Department’s main mission is undergraduate teaching/learning. Communication faculty have been part of a number of collaborative one-unit classes, including “Humanism and Religion” and “Actions to End Sexualized Violence.” In addition, several instructors in the department have enhanced their classes with digital reading assignments, use Moodle and Oncores, and integrate digital media in classes.

Courses are regularly revised, including syllabi and course design, to keep the material fresh and to respond to student comments from evaluations. Instructors incorporate new pedagogical strategies, such as contract grading, to foster student success across a variety of learning styles. Instructors also use contemporary issues and readings in relation to the academic goals of the curriculum. For example, this semester one COMM 100 course is subtitled “Cultural Expression through Food” and includes readings from Michael Pollan (*The Omnivore’s Dilemma* and *In Defense of Food*) and Peter Singer (*Animal Liberation*). Instructors also use different course designs to make the material more interesting to students and more relevant to the HSU vision. For example, in previous semesters some sections of COMM 100 have been structured around a model United Nations format.

The department has used the students’ senior portfolios created in the capstone class to reflect on the Communication major holistically and also to discuss changes for specific courses.

Several Communication instructors have developed dedicated resources to assist students. Dr. VerLinden offers a 100+ page resource packet for COMM 319 and created the *Argumentation and Critical Thinking* web site, which is an extensive tutorial used in COMM 103 and which has been utilized by faculty across the United States. James Floss has embedded his COMM 100 lesson plans in a web page.

The following is a partial list of service that our faculty provide in addition to service on a variety of college and university committees and the Academic Senate:

Dr. Tasha Souza directs the Faculty accessibility institute. It is grant driven and externally funded to provide support for faculty accessibility needs. She

directs semester-long faculty learning cohorts to develop appreciation and skills for diverse learning needs.

Dr. Souza is the Faculty Development Coordinator for campus.

Dr. Hahn advises the Democracy Unlimited student group with cross-community capacity building with the Eureka advocacy group.

Dr Payton serves as the Humboldt State University Ombudsperson.

Dr. Hahn serves as the Humboldt State University Ombudsperson.

Dr. Souza is a trainer with the Institute for the Study of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ISADOR).

Dr. Schnurer is the Secretary of the Animal Liberation and Public Policy Journal.

Dr. Paynton has served as secretary and Chair of the Health Communication Division of Western States Communication Association.

Dr. Reitzel is affiliated with Upward Bound and IELI (Intensive English Language Institute).

Dr. Reitzel is serving as the Chair of the Music Department.

Dr. VerLinden was the Interdisciplinary Studies-Student Designed major coordinator.

4. Provide evidence for faculty mentoring of students. Include, for example, approaches to advising, directed study or research, and/or clubs or student professional chapters that involve faculty mentorship.

#### **ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The Department of Communication is committed to mentoring students to help develop skills and capacity within the undergraduate population. We have COMM 495 and COMM 499 units available for students who wish to work directly with faculty on projects of the students' choosing, and have integrated those opportunities into the major requirements. In these capacities we have been able to build the infrastructure for students to gain experience as teachers by becoming Undergraduate Instructional Assistants or tutors, and student-guides, and to help students develop necessary and relevant capacities and skills. Several students have taken advantage of internships, including a recent opportunity with *Arcata Mainstreet*.

Communication faculty advise campus clubs including Democracy Unlimited, Always Working for Animal Rights and Equality (AWARE), NORML, Nu-Jacks, academic fraternities, and other community groups.

The Debate Team provides mentoring to students engaging in the competition as well as to a number of student coaches. Students who have recently graduated continue to not only remain in contact with the program, but serve as volunteer judges and coaches.

Several faculty have mentored students participating in communication convention experiences, including the Western State Speech Communication Association, the Popular Culture conference, and the National Communication Association. Some students have co-presented with faculty at our national convention.

Several students have anchored their self-directed studies in communication. Notable are award winner Justin Williams and artist/businessman Artemio Jimminez.

The Department is serious, indeed, about empowering students in the classroom and in Department governance. Students are *voting* members of the Department's Executive Committee and have membership on the department Curriculum Committee. They not only serve as a bridge for University, College, and Department policies, but also are invested partners in learning successful interpersonal and small group communication.

5. Other evidence of quality indicators related to faculty that may not be listed elsewhere, including, for example, faculty diversity within the program.

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The Department of Communication is dedicated to diversity, including a number of high-profile woman leaders. In addition to Dr. Souza, both Dr. Reitzel (Chair, Music Department) and Dr. Hahn (Ombudsperson) provide significant campus service. When we are able to search for tenure-track positions we purposely include language in the descriptions to encourage members of other underrepresented to apply, and take what actions we can to legally seek out underrepresented applicants.

C. Curriculum (differentiate by option, if appropriate)

1. Writing and oral communication learning outcomes  
*Describe how written and oral communication skills are included in your program.*



Oral and written communication skills are fundamental *every* course we teach. Most courses require a series of short papers, and at least one presentation. Many courses require major papers and dedicated class presentations to provide instruction and feedback for students who are developing their skills.

Perhaps more importantly, the Department recognizes the diverse learning styles of students. With offerings in interpersonal communication, rhetoric, public address, group communication, computer mediated communication, intercultural communication, and nonverbal communication we instruct communication skills more broadly and engage students in more ways than in the traditional lecture/note-taking format. Some examples are:

COMM 100 Fundamentals of Speech Communication is specifically designed to help develop students' oral communication skills. The class requires students to craft and rework speeches and to learn by observing speech presented by other students. Every class offers at least two major required speeches, as well as other forms of oral presentations and written assignments. Since 1997 the department's policy regarding COMM 100 explicitly states "All sections must require . . . at least one written analysis of a formal spoken message," so even in a class devoted to public speaking writing is also required.

COMM 110/310 Intercollegiate Speech and Debate: Refined oral communication is the purview of the Speech and Debate team. Students participate not only in competitive argumentation events, but also in interpretive speaking events, platform speeches, speaking with a partner, and other forms of oral presentations. The students who participate in Speech and Debate receive more intensive instruction and many more evaluated speaking opportunities that push them to develop skills beyond the regular classroom instruction.

COMM 319 Communication Research: Our flagship intensive communication research methods course is a good example of the use of embedded and rigorous oral and written communication skills. Students are required to author multiple short papers, and develop a 20+ page research prospectus or completed rhetorical criticism, developing their formal, scholarly writing skills. Students are also required to give oral presentations on research devices, and present their final projects in a manner simulating the presentation of research at a scholarly conference.

COMM 213 Interpersonal Communication: This course emphasizes listening skills and working on interpersonal dialogue including concise and clear quick messaging.

COMM 214: Persuasive Speaking develops students' speaking skills beyond that of COMM 100. It also includes several written assignments meant to demonstrate knowledge and to assist students with their writing.

COMM 322 Intercultural Communication has required 15-hours of intercultural field work such as forming conversational partners with an international students, not only sharing speeches, but also developing interpersonal, small group, and computer-mediated communication.

COMM 495 Intercultural Dialogue has, over five years, paired 18 HSU students with an e-mail partner in Oaxaca, Mexico. Dr. Bruner also was honored to be invited to teach a summer course on "Discourse Analysis" at the Autonomous University Benito Juarez de Oaxaca.

COMM 495 Convention Experience requires students to attend a regional or national communication convention, which gives them a chance to learn more about communication by listening to reports of recently completed research. Their writing is also developed with a required reflection paper about their experiences.

This is only a sample of how we address oral and written communication in our department. Something similar could be said about every class that we offer.

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

2. Assessment

[Data on program progress with assessment tasks will be provided from the Faculty Associate for Assessment]

As of October 10 we have not received data from the Faculty Associate for Assessment (FAA), so we will summarize our efforts ourselves.

Area A Oral Communication: COMM 100 was assessed two years ago using a method approved by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and the report was forwarded to the UCC.

Area A Critical Thinking: COMM 103 was assessed using a method approved by the UCC and the report was forwarded to the UCC. COMM 101 and COMM 102 also meet the Critical Thinking requirement but we were not able to offer them during the time of the last assessment.

Area C: One learning outcome was assessed last year and the report was forwarded to the FAA and the Associate Dean of CAHSS. The second learning outcome is being assessed this semester.

Area D: Due to a misunderstanding of the time line the first learning outcome was not assessed last year. The outcome was embedded in an assignment this semester and the report is being drafted. When the draft is ready to be shared with the department we will discuss it and forward the final report to the FAA and the Associate Dean of CAHSS. The second outcome is ready to be embedded and we will soon decide if it should be assessed this semester or in the spring.

Department Learning Outcomes: The first learning outcome was assessed last spring and the report was forwarded to the FAA. We are currently in the process of finalizing our other learning outcomes and will assess the second one this year.

*Provide 2 examples of how you have used results of assessment of your program's student learning outcomes to adapt, enhance, or affirm your program's curriculum.*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

For several years the department's assessment procedure for the major followed a procedure modified from the "Bakersfield notebook" and approved by the university. Our procedure was to embed learning objectives in assignments or other activities of classes that meet major requirements. Each student then reported their results for each objective and provided other feedback as part of the required Capstone course. Thus, our adapting, enhancing, and affirming of our program's curriculum have come from that, along with individual instructors using their student course evaluations. However, last year we did assess one learning outcome regarding oral communication by assessing the one-to-many speaking abilities of students in the capstone course.

As mentioned earlier, courses have been regularly revised, including syllabus and course design, to keep the material fresh and respond to student comments from evaluations. The faculty also respond to peer feedback from colleagues outside of the Department. For

example, several courses have undergone rigorous external reviews for acceptance as Diversity and Common Ground courses. Communication 319 has received consistent feedback that affirms the value of the significant research project. Communication 315 has responded to student feedback that class-members get to help plan course events. A specific class may provide some of the template of our dedication to course revisions. American Public Discourse (COMM 300) has used students' evaluations of teaching and the re-certification peer review for Diversity and Common Ground to enable the Department to modify the course from (A) a methods in Rhetorical Criticism approach to a (B) communication and popular culture with an emphasis on [student] Identity approach.

At present, the Department is actively engaged in creating and utilizing embedded and other assessments in COMM 100 (Area A Oral Communication), COMM 105 (Area D and major requirement), and COMM 108 (Area C and major option).

Other goals which have emerged from previous assessment and faculty initiatives include: retaining or increasing speaking opportunities in class, attempting to reduce overlap of material with other major classes, and more detailed directions for assignments.

Last spring we assessed our first learning outcome using the new method. The learning outcome is "Students will prepare and present an original, formal, and researched speech." Using a rubric created prior to the speeches the results were that 16 of 37 students "exceeded expectation," 13 students met expectations, and 8 students did not meet expectation. As a result of the assessment we agreed to (1) continue to use the procedure in the capstone class, (2) distribute and use the "Expected Presentational Elements Form" (the rubric) in all our major classes so students will be consistently evaluated using the elements of the rubric, (3) revising the wording of the outcome to read, "Students will effectively demonstrate an original, formal, and researched speech."

The department is using the assessment data from the 2007-2008 WASC process to make curricular revisions. The department has calibrated the data collected in the first major objective and learning outcome, and is engaged in discussion and analysis of the impact of the data on the major.

3. Accreditation (if applicable)

*If the program is accredited, describe the need for this accreditation and its impact on the quality and composition of the curriculum of the program.*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

Not applicable.

## 4. Relevance and innovation

*Provide evidence through examples that demonstrate a curriculum that is relevant, innovative, forward looking, responsive to changing trends, and equips students to function in a diverse, global context.*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

By all accounts and measures, the Communication Department is meeting current and emerging trends in several important areas: Communication in many face-to-face and mediated contexts, Critical Thinking, Listening, Gender and Communication, Social Advocacy, and Intercultural Communication. Below are selected classes with targeted innovations:

COMM 100 Fundamentals of Speech Communication: using role-playing (Schnurer), radio broadcast (Amundsen).

COMM 105 Introduction to Human Communication: mediated communication approached as a broad survey of the discipline (Bruner and Hahn)

COMM 300 American Public Discourse: Inclusion of discourse other than public address, extension to popular culture, and focus on identity and communication (Bruner).

COMM 319 Communication Research: Use of convention-style presentations (VerLinden).

COMM 322 Intercultural Communication: Partnering domestic students in a dialogue with international students, service learning and civic engagement (Hahn).

COMM 416 Social Advocacy Theory and Practice: course established by the department as an advanced seminar in communication and advocacy.

COMM 480 Special Topics in Communication: inclusion of dedicated course into the major requirements and course rotation; established to enable faculty to teach about their research specialties, to allow innovation, and to include material that is not part of our other offerings.

COMM 495 Field Experience: Provides opportunities for student internships, student teaching assistants, and tutoring experience.

5. Interactions between graduate and undergraduate programs (if applicable)  
*If this is a graduate program, what opportunities for undergraduates result (or are lost) by virtue of the graduate program.*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

Not applicable.

6. Program uniqueness  
*If your program provides unique educational opportunities or course content that is found at few or no other CSU institutions, please describe this uniqueness.*

*Communication*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

Numerous graduate programs have provided communication department faculty with favorable feedback on the generalist nature of our program for preparing students to succeed in MA/Ph.D. level work. The unique perspective synthesizing humanities and social sciences gives graduates advantages in future schooling and employment.

With respect to the CSU system, the Department of Communication has led the system in a number of innovative programs. The more than eighty-year old Humboldt State University's Speech and Debate team is one of only six in the CSU. Not only do we offer speech/debate opportunities to students without experience, but we have a long-tradition of successful novice debaters. In 2007-8 Humboldt State has begun competing in World's Debate style, an international debate format highlighting the need for an expansive world view.

As we continue to value not only fundamental skills in public communication, but excellence, we suggest that the speech and debate team be considered as extremely valuable for HSU students and the CSU system. As a result of its success, the Speech and Debate team maintains trust accounts funded by individual donors whose monies are dedicated to support debate activities.

The Department of Communication has led the university in innovative Humboldt-oriented programming. The Department was a leader in early participation and innovative programming for the Freshman Interest Group. The First Year Interest Group "Speaking and Writing for the Environment" connects an English 100 composition class with a communication 100 course. Both courses emphasize the skills of environmental advocacy.

*Communication Minor***ENTER COMMENTS HERE***Social Advocacy Minor***ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

In alignment with the HSU mission statement, the department of communication provides the only Social Advocacy minor in the CSU system. This minor provides critical support for campus activists and students interested in Non-Governmental Organization work. A unique strength of the minor is that it is interdisciplinary in construction and implementation. Students draw from Social Work, Sociology, Journalism and Mass Communication, Women's Studies, Political Science, and Communication.

As the culminating experience in the program, students are engaged in field work, civic engagement, and community organizing which provide opportunities for internships, job training, and employment experience.

This program responded to student desire for curriculum on social advocacy and faculty recognition of the value of a program that helps students become effective, responsible, and ethical advocates for the causes they believe in. The establishment of the Social Advocacy program preceded the University vision statements.

7. Opportunities for undergraduate scholarship/creative activities/service  
*Estimate the percentage of your undergraduate majors that participate in scholarship/creative activities/professionally-related service, and provide some illustrative examples of such activities. Can students receive academic credit for these activities and have them counted toward undergraduate major requirements?*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

Students participate in a variety of discipline-related scholarship and service, and receive external recognition for their achievements. Students may receive credit for these activities and count them toward major requirements. We estimate more than fifteen percent of undergraduate majors participate in such activities. Examples of student scholarship/creative activities include:

- Justin Williams won the 2007 International Environmental Politics essay competition at Keele University (U.K.) for an essay on personal engagement and environmental advocacy.

- Ruthie Maloney developed a presentation on indigenous and local plant life in conjunction with community Native American elders to help preserve indigenous knowledge.
- Erin Mediema won the privilege of hosting and coordinated a western regional student leadership conference for housing and student professionals.
- The following students competed at the 2008 American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament at the University of Texas at Austin: Ryan Guy and Alyssa Lomier in Dramatic Duo (performing “In Security”), Alyssa Lomier in Dramatic Interpretation (performing “Homepage”), Courtnie Thomas in Communication Analysis, (presenting a speech on Misogyny in Hip Hop Lyrics), Andrew Huggins in Dramatic Interpretation (performing “The Dishpit”).
- Ryan Guy, Alyssa Lomier, Jeff Gutierrez, and Courtnie Thomas competed at the 2008 NPDA National Debate Tournament at the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.
- Ryan Guy presented an academic paper: “Blood and Spandex: Marvel Comics’ Civil War is Lost to the Hyperreal.” 2008 Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association Conference, San Francisco, CA. March 21, 2008.
- The following students competed at the 2007 American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament at Minnesota State University, Mankato: Jeff Gutierrez and Alyssa Lomier in Dramatic Duo (performing “Red vs. Blue”), Alyssa Lomier in Program of Oral Interpretation (program theme: “eavesdropping”), April Richardson in Communication Analysis (presenting a speech on Garadsil’s “Tell Someone” Campaign).
- The following students competed at the 2006 American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament at the University of Florida: Jeff Gutierrez and Kathryn Blaisdell in Dramatic Duo (performing “Don’t Look Back”), Kathryn Blaisdell in Program of Oral Interpretation (program theme: faith) and in Prose Interpretation (performing “Fly Away”).
- Nathan Saari participated in a public debate as a part of a HSU Communication Club/Nu Jacks event. The topic: “Resolved: We Should Not Support Sexist Hip-Hop.” (November, 2006.)



- Ryan Guy, Alyssa Lomier, Bryan Faber, and Arian O'Brien participated in a public debate on behalf of the HSU Communication Club. The topic: "Resolved: HSU Should Be Tolerant of Religious Differences." (April, 2007.)

#### D. Affiliations/Equipment/Facilities/Environment

##### 1. Affiliations

*Some academic programs are affiliated with on-campus or off-campus centers, units or institutes that bring important benefits to programs. For any such center/unit/institute, please provide (1) the name of such center/unit/institute, and very brief descriptions of (2) the purpose of the center/unit/institute, (3) the nature of your program's affiliation with the center/unit/institute, and (4) the benefits accruing to your program/major from your affiliation with this center/unit/institute. Units/centers/institutes may be public (HSU, CSU, local, state, federal) or private.*

Not applicable.

##### 2. Facilities and resources

*Provide a brief listing of your most important facilities, equipment and information/library resources, and describe the degree to which the current facilities, equipment and information/library resources affect program quality.*

#### **ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The Department of Communication is a fairly light user of facilities and resources. Our facility use is primarily classroom space for the classes we teach. Theatre Arts 11 and 110 provide indispensable value to communication students and faculty. These rooms are specially equipped smart classrooms dedicated to the instruction of public speaking so we can teach students to use computer mediated presentation material effectively and so we can record student speeches that they can view and use to improve. Those rooms are also heavily used by our curricular and co-curricular events, such as Speech and Debate practice, speech tutoring, and for special communication events such as hip hop ciphers. The ability to use those rooms is indispensable for providing quality instruction for oral communication competency. The recording equipment in the rooms will soon have to be replaced, as they are now VHS tape recorders. Most students have access to DVD players, and fewer use VHS as time passes.

Our other facility use is our office space, primarily located in House 54. Although the house is old and "temporary," so does not get repaired and upgraded as it should, it still provides a space that is appropriate for our needs. Our students and visitors repeatedly comment on the fact that they feel comfortable in the house.

Our resource use is mainly for faculty salaries (necessary to provide instruction), operating expenses (mostly paper and similar supplies which are necessary to provide instruction), normal technology expenses (such as faculty and office computers, printer, and photocopier which are all necessary to provide instruction and for other duties), faculty travel expenses for conventions (necessary to remain current in the field and, thus, provide high quality instruction), and travel expenses for the Speech and Debate coach (necessary to provide instruction for a high quality student activity).

3. Unique local and regional environment

*Describe how the program takes advantage of the unique local or regional social, cultural and/or natural environment available to students and faculty at HSU. (Do not include items listed under D1.)*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The Department of Communication has strong connections to the regional environment to strengthen its program and experiences for students. Selected examples are listed below.

1. Dr. Schnurer has facilitated community discussions on Hip Hop at the Morris Graves museum.
2. Dr. Reitzel has coordinated presentations for the Humboldt County Historical Society, "History Day," and Storytelling Festivals.
3. Dr. Souza's students have taught diversity workshops in local schools, such as Sunny Brae Middle School.
4. Dr. Schnurer has coordinated the Religion and Humanism seminar which brought scientists together with local clergy and communities of faith.
5. Dr. Bruner's small group classes have partnered with local community groups including cancer charities and a local food bank.
6. Dr. Bruner has organized student discussion panels that were run on KEET-TV. Topics include: post-9/11 USA and the impact Sex and the City has had on changing gender roles.
7. James Floss writes, directs, and acts in community theatre, including performances with the North Coast Repertory Theatre.
8. Dr. Hahn's social advocacy classes have bridged programs with the Humboldt Community food bank.

9. Dr. Schnurer's Speaking and Writing for the Environment is a team taught seminar project taught in collaboration with English 100, intended to connect first year students with advocacy skills (oral and written). The class relies on the local environment including a field trip to the Arcata educational farm (CSA), field work in the community forest, and evaluation of the urban architecture/cultural mode of Arcata.
10. Dr. Paynton's Organizational Communication students have conducted organizational assessment and consulting for local businesses.
11. Dr. Paynton advises the Humboldt State Surf club.
12. Dr. Reitzel has conducted various programs with the Hoopa community and with local Hmong peoples.
13. Dr. Reitzel is serving as the chair of the Music Department.

#### IV. Costs, Revenues, and Efficiencies (Limit: 2 pages, not including tables) [20%]

NOTE: There are two versions of this section and we're no longer sure which is supposed to be included, so we're including the other version at the end of this report, but did not duplicate information that is in this section.

##### A. Data -Costs and Efficiencies

###### 1. Expenditures

Fiscal Year	Dept	FTES	Personnel	OE	Total	C/FTES
1999/00	COMM	197.1	\$ 595,865	\$ 28,552	\$ 624,418	\$ 3,169
2000/01	COMM	195.1	\$ 706,707	\$ 16,579	\$ 723,286	\$ 3,708
2001/02	COMM	185.8	\$ 614,488	\$ 18,904	\$ 633,392	\$ 3,408
2002/03	COMM	203.8	\$ 693,412	\$ 21,558	\$ 714,970	\$ 3,508
2003/04	COMM	198.4	\$ 668,580	\$ 18,807	\$ 687,387	\$ 3,464
2004/2005	COMM	210.9	\$ 872,360	\$ 19,767	\$ 892,128	\$ 4,230
2005/2006	COMM	207.4	\$ 934,943	\$ 28,746	\$ 963,689	\$ 4,647
2006/2007	COMM	206.7	\$ 971,054	\$	\$	\$ 4,785

				17,942	988,996	
--	--	--	--	--------	---------	--

2. SFR and FTEF

Academic Year Averages	Subject	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
SFR	COMM	20.93	20.98	21.41	22.06	20.48	21.92
FTEF	COMM	9.75	9.47	9.85	9.40	10.10	9.58

3. Staff FTE

**Staff FTE**

	1/31/2004		1/31/2005		1/31/2006		1/31/2007		1/31/2008	
COMMUNICATION	Count	Sum	Count	Sum	Count	Sum	Count	Sum	Count	Sum
R07	1	1.00	1	0.20	1	1.00	1	1.00	1	1.00
Total	1	1.00	1	0.20	1	1.00	1	1.00	1	1.00

	1/31/2004		1/31/2005		1/31/2006		1/31/2007		1/31/2008	
COMMUNICATION	Count	Sum	Count	Sum	Count	Sum	Count	Sum	Count	Sum
R07	2	1.20	2	2.00	2	2.00	2	1.80	2	1.50
Total	2	1.20	2	2.00	2	2.00	2	1.80	2	1.50

4. Time to degree

<b>Terms/units completed for Freshmen to obtain BA/BS Degree Communication including options/concentraions</b>					
degrees_awarded_B_COMM report generated: 25-JUN-08					
MAJOR	DEG	Total Degrees Granted	Average terms enrolled	Avg term Units	Avg Total Units
Communication	BA	30	9.3	15.0	138.4
		<b>30</b>			

<b>Terms/units completed for Transfers to obtain BA/BS Degree Communication including options/concentraions</b>					
degrees_awarded_B_COMM report generated: 25-JUN-08					
		Total Degrees	Average terms	Avg term	Avg Total Xfer

MAJOR	DEG	Granted	enrolled	Units	Units	Units
Communication	BA	46	5.1	15.0	74.1	62.6
		<b>46</b>				

## B. Data - Revenues

Revenue	05/06	06/07	07/08
<b>DEPARTMENTS COMPLETE THIS SECTION</b>			
Fundraising/donations			
Extended Education	4,444	2,072	2,696
Student fees			
Instructionally Related Activities (IRA)	23,491	23,491	24,711
Instructionally-related grants			
Grants and contracts to P.I.s			
Other revenues			

C. Provide additional explanation for the data in the tables under questions A and B above, as appropriate.

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

A.1 We note that all of the increased expenditures since 1999/00 have been in personnel. That must come from salary increases since the FTEF data show a decrease since AY 02/03. Indeed, although there is a fluctuation of OE the general trend is downward, and in AY 06/07 it was the second lowest of the eight year period.

The nature of the classes we offer makes it difficult to lower the Cost/FTES. Most of our classes require oral presentations, which larger class sizes would either reduce or eliminate. Indeed, the class we offer the most is COMM 100, and each student in the class accounts for approximately one full class-day for his/her speeches. So more students either means fewer speaking opportunities or less instruction. Another class with heavy demand is COMM 309b, which is a CWT class. Since CWT classes are mandated to include major assignments using oral communication skills that course faces the same problem as the COMM 100 course.

Our cost per full-time equivalent student (FTES) is extremely low compared to many other majors across all three colleges, in part due to our higher than campus average SFR.

A.2. Despite Humboldt State's average SFR (Student Faculty Ratio) of between 16 and 18, our department has maintained a SFR around 21 to 22 for the last six years recorded. Our student faculty ratio is in alignment with other CSU communication departments.

A.3 The Staff FTE was actually reduced to .75 in Fall 2007 as our ASC was required to become the ASC for both the departments of Communication and Journalism and Mass Communication. JMCs staff person was reduced to half-time so both departments combined now have 1.5 positions instead of 2.0. In addition, both staff people are now housed in the JMC offices, which has further reduced our effective staff.

A.4 The time to degree for both Freshmen and Transfer students is good. For freshmen it is slightly more than one semester past four years, and for transfers it is slightly more than one semester past two years. This reflects our efforts to offer a program and course rotation that allows students to graduate in a timely manner. Although eight semesters for freshmen and four semesters for transfers would be ideal there are several factors out of our control, including: delays due to changing majors, delays due to reducing enrollment due to personal circumstances, delays due to inability to enroll in full courses (major or GE), etc.

- D. [For accredited programs only] Detail the costs of accreditation of your program that would not be incurred if your program were not accredited. Include costs related to faculty and staff, curriculum, facilities, and any other relevant direct costs.

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

- E. Budget cut impacts

*Indicate how your program has been affected by recent (compare AY 2002/03 with 2007/08) budget cuts that have directly affected your departmental resources (faculty, staff, operating expense) and course offerings (class size, reduced offerings).*

- 1. Changes (use - for reductions and + for increases) in Staffing or \$\$ Support

	<u>Staffing</u> (Express in terms of FTEF or FTE staff positions)			Operating Expenses (\$\$)
	Full-time faculty	Part-time faculty	Staff	OE
Change			-.25	-.10
% Change			-25%	-10%

- 2. Changes in Class Size or Frequency of Offering - number of classes (% affected)

<b>Distinct Courses Enrolled in Communication by Level (AY 00/01 - AY 07/08)</b> class_offerings_COMM report generated: 27-JUN-08								
Course Level	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Lower-div	0	8	8	7	7	7	6	6

Upper-div	0	12	13	13	12	12	11	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>

**COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING TABLE TO HIGHLIGHT CHANGES IN CLASS SIZE OR FREQUENCY OF OFFERINGS**

	LDGE courses		UDGE courses		Majors courses	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Increased class size	3	60	1	50	4	33
Reduced frequency of offerings	4	80	1	50	--	--

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The data in these forms may be deceptive because we had to make the assumptions for how to calculate the percentages and because the comparison between 2002/03 and 2007/08 doesn't reflect gains in offerings during the intervening years that were then lost. So, for instance, the reduced frequency of LDGE offerings was calculated based on the number of courses with reduced sections, not the total number of sections of LDGE.

The frequency of major courses remained steady over time mainly because we were operating a Minimum Essential Schedule during the entire time considered in the table for "Class size or Frequency of Offerings."

3. Changes in options

*Note any changes over the past 5 years in the number or organization of options with in the major. List options as of 2002/03 and 2007/08 AYs.*

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

We have changed the major contract in 2006-7 to be responsive to the needs of current students and to react to curricular and budget and personnel changes. The name of the department has changed from Speech Communication to Communication indicating a broadening and deepening of our perspective on inquiry.

We created the Social Advocacy minor.

We added the area of practical skills to major

We added a COMM 315 Social Advocacy class.

We proposed renaming the second Social Advocacy course “Social Advocacy Theory and Practice,” and proposed it be numbered as COMM 416 (instead of COMM 480).

We suspended instruction of some 400-level classes.

We combined the content of COMM 311 and COMM 411 into 411.

We adapted the major requirements and course rotation to offer regular seminars under the COMM 480 number, as seminars connecting to faculty research initiatives and to areas of the discipline that aren’t addressed in our other offerings.

We suspended instruction of COMM 400: Communication and the Human Condition.

Our offerings of Critical Thinking Area-A courses 101, 102, and 103 have been almost eliminated administratively.

Our offerings of Critical Ways and Thinking course Communication/Women’s Studies 309B Gender and Communication has been significantly reduced despite very heavy demand.

We proposed that COMM/WS 309b be used to meet UDGE requirements only in Areas C and D.

Summer School offerings have been cut to a shadow of their previous strength.

#### 4. Comments on above tables

*Please provide any additional explanation that you think would be useful for assessment of how your academic program has been affected by recent budget cuts and how you have attempted to improve efficiency, reduce costs, or increase revenue.*

#### **ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

While considering our program it is worthwhile to compare the collaborative skill-building work in many communication classes to the sciences, where direct engagement with a professor, hands-on "lab work," and serious small group discussion is required. A comparison of Fall 2008 sampling of enrollments in the sciences indicates that our Communication class sizes (which typically enroll 25 or more students) are not "small" for the type of subject matter in which we are engaged when compared to Physical Chemistry (7), Biochemistry (11), Environmental Problem Solving (20), Forestry Measurements (22), and Applied Forest Ecology (13).



The pressure to fill classes based on absolute need has forced the Department to delay curricular changes that might be driven by interests in excellence, student preferences, or diversity.

COMM 309B, a heavily sought course, has consistently increased in enrollment to a direct detriment of the quality of education.

COMM 322 Intercultural Communication has gone from 25 students to 31.

COMM 105 Introduction to Communication has gone from 25 to 37 students.

More students have been unable to get into our classes (even declared majors) and the increasing number of majors has been met with decreasing resources to support communication instruction.

The impact on student-teacher climate has been hurt. The reduction of face-time and dedicated instruction from faculty makes undergraduates more bitter and increases tension during overcrowded class discussion days. The overload also leaves some students unreachable, floundering without the kind of support we would like to provide as instructional professionals. As class size increases the students most at-risk have less opportunity for individual attention.

Smaller classes are central to the Communication discipline. The engagement and practice of communicating requires access to one-another. Large numbers of participants make it more difficult to interact, to give everyone a turn, to discuss some controversial topics, and to develop communication skills needed to succeed after graduation.

The larger numbers of students has reduced quality feedback to students. Fewer people do more work, and the outcome is that some students are do not get the attention they need to succeed. Because of time-pressure, faculty are unable to remedy basic skill failures and thus endemic problems get passed on.

The high pressure on teaching has undercut time and energy to publish, to write grants, and to undertake service.

To help address these issues, the Department continues to advocate with the Dean and others that excellence in undergraduate teaching/learning should be HSU's top priority, and that smaller class size is an essential requirement. The Department has reluctantly increased class size during this period of budget stress in direct response to administration requests.

#### F. Additional Data – Course Level and Service

##### 1. Course level

<b>FTES in Communication by Course Level (AY 00/01 - AY 07/08)</b> class_offerings_COMM report generated: 27-JUN-08								
<b>Course Level</b>	<b>AY 00/01</b>	<b>AY 01/02</b>	<b>AY 02/03</b>	<b>AY 03/04</b>	<b>AY 04/05</b>	<b>AY 05/06</b>	<b>AY 06/07</b>	<b>AY 07/08</b>
Lower-div	.0	111.3	126.7	114.2	128.9	124.6	121.5	134.1
Upper-div	.0	74.7	77.3	84.4	82.0	82.8	85.2	75.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>.0</b>	<b>186.1</b>	<b>204.0</b>	<b>198.6</b>	<b>210.9</b>	<b>207.4</b>	<b>206.7</b>	<b>210.0</b>

**2. Service Courses**

The following shows sections which are considered service for either General Education, CWT (Communication and Ways of Thinking), DCG (Diversity and Common Ground), Institutions Requirements, and/or prerequisites to some other discipline (Subject area).

<b>Service Course Sections Enrolled in Communication (AY 00/01 - AY 07/08)</b> class_offerings_COMM report generated: 27-JUN-08								
<b>Course Level</b>	<b>AY 00/01</b>	<b>AY 01/02</b>	<b>AY 02/03</b>	<b>AY 03/04</b>	<b>AY 04/05</b>	<b>AY 05/06</b>	<b>AY 06/07</b>	<b>AY 07/08</b>
Lower-div	0	21	24	20	24	26	24	25
Upper-div	0	5	5	6	7	6	7	7

**3. Comments**

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

**V. Potential (Please complete this section for each option. Limit: 2 pages per option) [15%]**

**A. Program capacity with existing resources:**

1. What is your program's maximum capacity with current resources? Use two metrics to define "capacity": The number of graduates per year, and the number of FTES generated by courses that are unique to this option, per year.

(Completed by the department)	Graduates per year	FTES in the major option per year
Existing	35	97
Maximum capacity with existing resources	~25	~100

Please note that the number of graduates each year varies, and that 35 graduates in one year is unusual given the number of majors we have.

2. If your program is at maximum capacity, proceed to question 2. If you have capacity to grow with existing resources, what steps have been taken to increase enrollment? What have been the effects of these steps, and what results are still anticipated?

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

As indicated earlier, the department's efforts to increase enrollment have resulted in doubling size of majors to the point that we are now at or close to full capacity. Our external efforts have included sending brochures and contacting applicants indicating an interest in Communication. Most of our efforts have been internal by addressing students who take our classes.

B. Opportunities for future growth or substantial curricular changes

1. What opportunity does the program have for future expansion? Provide evidence for your response.

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The Department of Communication is well suited for future growth. As stated earlier, Communication is the eighth most popular major nationally and the number of Communication majors has been growing nationally for several years. Also, as HSU enrolls more and more freshmen many of those students who are undeclared will likely become Communication majors. Thus, Humboldt State University could greatly increase student enrollment as the communication major grows while it continues to serve other programs and required G.E. courses. (NOTE: even without growth of the major if HSU continues to enroll larger Freshmen classes then there will need to be growth in the GE classes to allow students to graduate in a timely manner.)

Curricular changes provide the department the opportunity to meet student need. Removing the CWT physical science substitution from 309B Gender and Communication, which we've proposed, would free up faculty to teach essential major course offerings, thus expediting successful student graduation.

Most of our classes are heavily sought after, and a few are consistently overenrolled beyond the stated capacity. We could very easily fill additional sections. For example:

**COMM 309B** In Spring 2008 there were three hundred students who received course closed notices, 172 of those students asked to be notified if a seat became available, and of those, 162 students were unable to be seated.

**COMM 103** In Spring 2008, Critical Thinking, had 38 students seeking seats unable to get into the class. 17 students requested notification in the case that seats became available, and 13 went unseated.

**COMM 100** Despite larger class size, and offering 20 sections of Fundamentals of Speech Communication, 224 students were unable to enroll in Spring 2008. Of those, eighty requested SANE notification, and forty were not seated in classrooms.

For fall of 2008, *every course taught in Communication* was so heavily sought after that each class had students unable to enroll.

Many students want to participate in the Communication discipline. Noting that many of our majors come to join us after experiencing a lower-division GE communication class, it is our supposition that the true demand for our major has not yet been accurately measured. Should all students be able to get basic Communication classes (COMM 100, 102, 103, 105, 108), we suspect that our majors would rise, and our demand for upper-division classes would increase correspondingly.

Being held in the financial grip of “minimum essential programs” for more than a decade has left a skeletal frame of Communication courses. Major students often find that only a single class will fulfill their requirement, and since many of those classes are offered only once a year they have to delay enrolling until they are seniors, which then prevents other students from enrolling when they should. We are also increasingly using substitution of courses to help students to graduate on time.

One opportunity to help market Humboldt State is to describe the *engagement* between actual professors and motivated students in small classes. The Communication Department’s curriculum and faculty emphasize precisely this type of engagement.

2. Describe the curricular changes and/or staffing increases required to accomplish such an expansion?

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

The frequency of class offerings is a key component. Initially we would need to make sure we offer courses that fulfill major requirements each semester instead of each year, which would require an additional 10 WTU per year. If enrollment in the major continues to increase we would then need to offer the major requirements three times each year. The initial increase

could probably be met by reassigning permanent faculty to major and UJGE courses and using temporary faculty for LDGE courses. The second increase would probably require hiring another tenure track position, which also has the possibility of addressing faculty diversity concerns and allow us to expand our course offerings.

Class size is one of the key components. As noted above, the National Communication Association recommends an average class size of 18 for introductory public speaking courses. More frequent offerings of both GE and major courses also will help achieve the goal.

### C. Impact of augmented resources

*Suppose that your program were ranked in a category that recommended augmentation of resources. What would be the impact of augmented resources? (Answer for a 10% augmentation and a 20% augmentation.)*

#### **ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

According to the expenditure table and the SFR and FTEF table in section IV.A. of the report, augmentations would be in the following amounts, from the 07/08 level:

10% augmentation = .958 FTEF or \$98,899.60

20% augmentation = 1.916 FTEF or \$197,799.20

Determining what a 10% or 20% augmentation would mean depends on a series of assumptions about how it should be calculated. Should we look to the total costs of expenditures? To the total FTEF? Some combination? Would the augmentation be for tenure-track faculty (12 WTUs plus collateral duties each semester) or for temporary faculty (15 WTUs each semester at lower salary)? If the augmentation results in offering classes that we don't offer now would the enrollment in those classes have to meet the capacity of the class, or can the augmentation result in smaller classes that could give the students a better educational experience?

As a result, we cannot exactly say what we would do with 10% augmentation verses 20% without more information. We can, however, indicate the directions we can envision going at this time.

### **10% Augmentation**

In the event of augmented resources, the department of Communication will blossom. If our program received a 10% increase, we would use the increased resources to maximize student educational excellence in some combination of the following ways:

- Use funding to return the full-time ASC to our department. For the past year we have shared 1.5 ASC/ASA positions with the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication. Although both staff members have made heroic efforts the reduction in staffing makes it difficult to meet the needs of both departments. The Department of Communication finds the arrangement particularly difficult since both staff members are housed in the JMC office, leaving us with no one in our office to meet students, provide public contact, or give advice to students. Our assessment procedures over the years consistently indicate that students believe one of the strengths of our department is the help they received from our ASC and we believe it would strengthen our department to have the right person back in our office.
- Change our course rotation so that a course that meets a requirement in each category of our major is offered every semester, so students can better plan schedules that will allow them to graduate in a timely manner. We now use close to the same course rotation that we had when the number of majors was half of what it is now, which means that students often have to postpone taking a course when they should because there is no room available. We estimate that this change would require adding one additional section of each of the following courses each year: COMM 319: Communication Research (4 units), COMM 411: Organizational Communication (4 units), COMM 490: Capstone (2 units). That is a total of 10 units per year, fewer than  $\frac{1}{2}$  the WTUs for a tenure track faculty member.
- Re-establish the Assistant Director for the Speech and Debate team to the level of 07/08, which would require 6 WTUs per year.
- Work collaboratively with other programs to develop and regularly offer classes that would add to other programs, or offer more sections of some of our current courses to add to other programs. If we were to add two, three-unit classes each semester it would be a total of 12 WTUs a year. A preliminary list of possible courses includes:
  - Environmental Communication (which would connect with the HSU vision statement)
  - Health Communication
  - Educational Communication
  - Leadership Communication

Debate Across the Curriculum

Communication and Popular Culture

Intercultural Communication

Gender and Communication

Organizational Communication

Business Communication

- We would try to meet student need for COMM 309b Gender and Communication to provide access to upper level non-major students who seek this class.
- A ten percent increase would allow the Social Advocacy minor to grow and increase inter-disciplinary relationships, community ties, and fulfill HSU's vision as "the campus of choice for individuals who seek above all else to improve the human condition and our environment."

### **20% Augmentation**

- We would increase the number of sections of Critical Thinking classes we offer to help meet the campus needs.
- Reduce the size of GE courses, particularly COMM 100, to the extent made possible by the augmentation. Since COMM 100 requires student performances fewer students would allow both more performances by the students and more instruction for all the students. If we assume that, without augmentation, we would offer 50 sections a year with an initial enrollment of 27 per section, reducing enrollment by five students per section would require an additional 9 sections a year. At 3 WTUs per section that would be an additional 27 WTUs a year.
- In other courses where speeches and performances are given as a matter of course content, we would reduce class sizes to allow instructors to successfully guide students through class assignments, provide feedback, and encourage oral communication skills in both major and service classes.
- We would be interested in supporting the campus vision of successful communication by coordinating a speaking center akin to the campus writing center. This initiative would allow the campus to foster successful communication across the curriculum.
- We could facilitate students to submit and travel to conferences.

- We could provide an academic “home” for such programs as Leadership Studies and Sign-Language if needed.

The course changes listed above would call for an increase of approximately 55 WTUs, or 2.3 tenure-track positions, or 1.8 temporary positions, or some combination of both. The other changes would require costs that are unknown to us at this time. To do all of them would probably require even more augmentation.

#### D. Impact of reduced resources

*Suppose that your program were ranked in a category that recommended reduction of resources. What would be the impact of reduced resources? (Answer for a 10% reduction and a 20% reduction.)*

### **ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

#### **10% Reduction**

The department of communication has been pro-active in finding ways to reduce major class offerings while still facilitating timely progress toward graduation. We have cut the course offerings by rotating required major courses every other semester or every other year. Any further cuts would guarantee that majors could not graduate in four years. At the same time that we have reduced major course offerings, we have doubled the number of communication majors and our course offerings have become increasingly necessary for other campus majors and programs.

There are many different ways to calculate what a 10% reduction means. The simplest, and the one we will use in this report, is to tally the total number of class units (excluding independent study type units) and divide by 10. We will also use the units for 08/09 as our baseline, because the total number of units the department offers does change from year to year.

We know from past experience that a 10% reduction means more than a 10% reduction of course offerings. The reductions would need to come first from the temporary faculty, who have lower salaries than permanent faculty. So, a 10% reduction based on costs will inevitably result in cuts greater than those indicated below. However, without knowing the salary information and other assumptions this is the best we can do.

In AY 08/09 the Department of Communication is scheduled to offer a total of 234 units, so a 10% cut would mean a reduction of 24 units. Since we currently offer fewer than the



minimum number of sections of major courses necessary for our students to graduate in four years the cuts would be targeted toward GE and service courses.

<b>POSSIBLE 10% REDUCTION</b>			
<b>Course Eliminated</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Semester</b>	<b>Sections Remaining</b>
COMM 322	4	Fall	1 in fall
COMM 422	4	Fall	0
COMM 309b	3	Fall	1
COMM 108	3	Fall	1 in spring
COMM 322	4	Spring	1 in spring
COMM 422	4	Spring	0
COMM 309b	3	Spring	1

#### PROGRAMS AFFECTED

(Note: The “Programs Affected” are based on a combination of “Other HSU Programs/Options” table provided by the Prioritization team and the results of the Online Catalog Search Results.)

Reducing COMM 108 offerings would affect LD Area C GE and the COMM major and minor.

Reducing COMM 309b offerings would affect CWT, DCG, Women’s Studies, Education–Minor, MA in Education, Social Advocacy-Minor, and the COMM major and minor.

Reducing COMM 322 would affect DCG, the COMM major and minor, and the following programs: American Sign Language & Special Populations, Child Development (Liberal Studies), Crosscultural Language & Academic Development Certificate, Dance Studies-Interdisciplinary, English, English/Language Arts Education, Family Studies Minor, International Studies, Leadership Studies, Liberal Studies/Elementary Education, Peace & Conflict Studies, Teaching English as a Second Language, NRPI.

Reducing 422 would affect Child Development (Liberal Studies), Liberal Studies/Elementary Education, Linguistics, NRPI, and the COMM major and minor.

Of course, any reduction would make it impossible to offer additional courses that could help other departments improve their majors’ ability to communicate.

#### **20% Reduction**

<b>Additional 10% Reduction</b>			
<b>Course Eliminated</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Semester</b>	<b>Sections Remaining</b>
COMM 426	4	Spring	0
COMM 108	3	Spring	0
COMM 309b	3	Fall	1 in spring
COMM 100	6	2 in fall	21 in fall
COMM 100	3	1 in spring	20 in spring
COMM 322	4	Spring	1 in fall or spring

#### PROGRAMS AFFECTED

Eliminating COMM 426 offerings would affect English, English/Language Arts Education, and COMM major and minor.

Reducing the number of sections of COMM 100 would either make it difficult for students to meet the requirement of completing Area A: Oral Communication by the end of their Sophomore year or require increasing the size of the class which diminishes each student's opportunity develop their abilities.

A twenty-percent cut would be catastrophic. Funding cuts would dramatically decrease the department's capacity to meet CSU mandates for instruction in oral competency, hurt HSU likelihood of receiving WASC reaccreditation, undercut interdisciplinary initiatives, decrease diversity initiatives, shatter community-campus partnerships, and decrease our ability to successfully teach to "improve the human condition and the environment" (vision statement 1).

Because there is no regional graduate program in communication, access to skilled staff who can teach our major classes is quite limited. In the case that a major cut meant a reduction in Fundamentals of Speech Communication faculty, we would be unlikely to be able to rebuild our capacity to teach the basic courses. Short-term financial cuts would hinder the ability to re-grow the program in the future. Evidence of this can be found in the 'temporary suspension' more than two decades ago of the Communication M.A. program.

#### E. Impact of program elimination

*Suppose that your program were recommended to be discontinued. What would be the impact of program elimination?*

#### **ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

Communication program elimination once was proposed at the University of Washington and quickly abandoned. Student response, and fearing the devastation of their national reputation, the university quickly reversed itself, but suffered enormous embarrassment.

Program elimination of the communication major would result in the exodus of tenured/probationary faculty, resulting in HSU's failure to meet CSU mandated oral competency requirements. Other harmful, direct effects would be an inability to staff Oral Communication, Critical Thinking, Intercultural Communication, Gender and Communication, Debate and advanced special topics courses due to an inadequate lecturer pool caused by the remote location of HSU. Since the Department of Communication is the center for oral communication, listening, and critical discourse, the quality of education would be reduced, and the lives of students, graduates, community members, and alumni would be negatively influenced.

Skills in oral communication, listening, critical thinking, and intercultural interaction are crucial for success in many other disciplines and endeavors. Techniques of communication taught in communication classes leads to better discussion and presentations in classes in other departments (including Senior Seminars in the sciences), as well as to more effective communication in business, not-for-profit organizations, student government, and student-activists speaking with confidence and clarity.

More than the loss of oral communication skills – the elimination of COMM would leave a number of other programs scrambling to cover our wide-ranging contributions. Communication classes are used as First Year Interest Groups (F.I.G.), cross-listed with Women's Studies, Ethnic Studies, and other degree programs.

The loss of the Debate Team would mean a dramatic decrease in reputation for the University, especially in light of its eighty-year history. It would also gut student campus culture.

**VI. Additional Information (Limit: 1 page) [up to 5 extra credit points may be assigned to the overall score]**

*Provide crucial information that is not provided under the previous categories.*

---

**ENTER COMMENTS HERE**

1. The Communication Department is focused on excellence in *undergraduate* teaching/learning. The Communication Department accomplishes a great deal with limited resources. The full extent of the Department's contributions sometimes is hidden. For example, trans-gender students have a safe place to discuss gender and communication, and to learn and to grow, in COMM 309b.
2. The *Communication* Department is not the *Speech* Department. To fully appreciate what the name change means, one has to see beyond COMM 100 and Public Speaking. Communication today is a rich blend of Interpersonal Communication, Small Group Communication, Computer and Mediated Communication, Listening, Nonverbal Communication, Intercultural Communication, Debate, Organizational Communication, Mediation, Critical Thinking, Social Advocacy, Argumentation, Gender and Communication, Communication and the Environment, Health Communication, and many other contexts and fields.
3. The Communication Department believes in the value of our courses to *all* students, not just our majors. That is why we are committed to participation in General Education and why we are interested in providing service to other departments.
4. The Communication Department will continue to include the ideals of a student centered campus. Doing so helps to attract and retain students and provides a better learning climate.

---

**Works Cited**

- Allen, Mike, Sandra Berkowitz, Steve Hunt and Allan Louden “A Meta-analysis of the Impact of Forensics and Communication Education on Critical Thinking.” *Communication Education* 48 (1999): 18-30.
- Curtis, D. B. (1988, November). *A Survey of Business Preferences for College Grads* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED297407)
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. “Employers Cite Communication Skills, Honesty/Integrity as Key for Job Candidates” March 15, 2007. Retrieved October 8, 2007. <<http://www.nacweb.org/press/display.asp?year=2007&prid=254>>
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. “‘Perfect’ Job Candidate Pairs Communication Skills With Strong Work Ethic.” December 05, 2007. Retrieved October 8, 2007. <<http://www.nacweb.org/press/display.asp?year=2007&prid=270>>
- Peterson, Marshalita Sims. “Personnel Interviewers' Perceptions of the Importance and Adequacy of Applicants' Communication Skills.” *Communication Education* 46 (1997): 287-291.
- “Top 10 College Majors” MSNencarta. Retrieved October 7, 2008.  
<[http://encarta.msn.com/college\\_article\\_top10collegemajors/top\\_10\\_college\\_majors.htm](http://encarta.msn.com/college_article_top10collegemajors/top_10_college_majors.htm)>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1992-93 “Baccalaureate Longitudinal Study, Second Follow-up(B&B:1993-1997),” found in National Communication Association. “Comparison of Undergraduate Salaries to other Majors and Fields of Study (1994-1997).” Retrieved October 10, 2008.  
<<http://www.natcom.org/nca/Template2.asp?bid=407>>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. “Degrees in communication, journalism, and related programs and in communications technologies conferred by degree-granting institutions, by level of degree and sex of student: 1970-71 through 2005-06.” Retrieved October 7, 2008.  
<[http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07\\_291.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_291.asp)>

---

**APPENDIX***HSU Vision Statement*

1. Humboldt State University will be the campus of choice for individuals who seek above all else to improve the human condition and our environment.
2. We will be the premier center for the interdisciplinary study of the environment and its natural resources.
3. We will be a regional center for the arts.
4. We will be renowned for social and environmental responsibility and action.
5. We believe the key to our common future will be the individual citizen who acts in good conscience and engages in informed action.
6. We will commit to increasing our diversity of people and perspectives.
7. We will be exemplary partners with our communities, including tribal nations.
8. We will be stewards of learning to make a positive difference.

**IV. Investments, Revenues, and Efficiencies (Response Limit: 2 pages of narrative, not including tables) [20%]**

C. Program Investments

1. Program Investment – Degree Requirements

*Enter the total number of required course units (as listed in the catalog) for this academic program, and then the number of required course units for this academic program that are from the primary course code associated with your program. Provide a total for each option if appropriate.*

Student Units

Total required Program SCUs	45	Required Program SCUs in the primary Course Code	45
-----------------------------	----	--	----

Weighted Teaching Units (WTU's)

*Total the number of WTUs required to teach 1 section of each of the required courses in the program. If there are lists of restricted electives (e.g., take 1 of the following 3 courses), then choose a representative course from the list. For required S-factor courses, estimate the typical number of WTU's assigned to a faculty member who teaches the course. Again, differentiate by option if appropriate.*

Total Required Program WTUs	45	Required Program WTUs in the primary Course Code	45
-----------------------------	----	--	----

2. Program investment – by Minimum Weighted Teaching Units required to offer coursework so students can make reasonable progress toward their degree.

*Complete the table below using the definitions that follow. Include additional columns as needed for additional options.*

Total WTU in Course Code	WTU for GE and service to other academic Programs	WTU for Major Option 1	WTU for Major Option 2	WTU for Major Option 3
547	439	108		

--	--	--	--	--

*Total WTU in Course Code: Sum up the total number of WTU that were used to teach courses in the primary course code associated with your academic program over the past two academic years. Exclude remedial courses.*

*Service to GE and other Academic Programs: Enter the total number of WTU that were used over the past 2 years to meet service demands imposed by students outside the major. (In other word, if 8 sections of Egyptology 301 have been offered over the past 2 years, but if 2 sections over the past 2 years would have been sufficient for the Egyptology majors, then count 6 sections of Egyptology, and the associated WTU, in this category.)*

*WTU for Major Option (s): Sum up the non-service WTU for the set of courses in the course code associated with your program that you would need to offer over a two year period to accommodate progress toward degree for your program students.*

*Notes: 1) In programs with multiple options, courses common to the multiple options should be included in all options. Hence the entries to the right of the "Total" entry will not sum to the total. 2) Do not pro-rate WTU's by the percentage of students in a particular section of a course that are majors. Include the course in the count if it must be offered during a 2-year period for students to make progress toward their degree. The 4-year major plan for Freshmen may be useful.*

3. Program Investments – by staff allocations.

*Estimate the percent of departmental expenditures for staff positions that can be attributed to this academic program. Provide an explanation, as appropriate.*

	Major Program
Percents of Staff FTEF	100%

4. Program Investments – Other annual costs.

*Provide dollar estimates for other program costs by the following categories. Annualize periodic costs (equipment purchases or facilities upgrades) as necessary. Include an explanation, if appropriate. Do not include costs for commonly used items (smart classrooms, faculty workstations, etc.).*

Category	Estimated Cost
Equipment (including maintenance)	800
	3000



Instructional Supplies	
Temporary Help (graders, lab assistants, GA's, etc.)	0

5. Program Investments – accreditation [if applicable]

*If this program is accredited, describe how this accreditation effects program costs.*

D. Gross Revenues

<b>Revenue</b>	05/06	06/07	07/08
<b>DEPARTMENTS COMPLETE THIS SECTION</b>			
Fundraising/donations			
Extended Education	4,444	2,072	2,696
Student fees			
Instructionally Related Activities (IRA)	23,491	23,491	24,711
Instructionally-related grants			
Grants and contracts to P.I.s			
Other revenues			

*Provide an explanation for how these revenues support the academic program.*

E. Efficiency

1. Efficiency – By SFR for course code

The SFR table for your discipline will be included here from the information found at <http://www.humboldt.edu/cgi-bin/cgiwrap/anstud/filter.pl?relevant=scureports.out>

<b>SFR SUMMARY</b>	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
<b>AHSS</b>	20.36	22.05	21.94	20.61	21.19	22.91
<b>CNRS</b>	15.66	16.90	17.17	16.04	16.82	18.28
<b>CPS</b>	15.12	16.29	15.68	15.22	20.80	25.33
<b>UNIVERSITY TOTALS</b>	17.28	18.65	18.57	17.52	19.32	21.43

*Explain any substantial changes in SFR. Also explain why this SFR differs from the college and/or university SFR. What efforts have been made over the past few years by the program to improve this measure of efficiency? Use the data under part IV.E. as appropriate.*

2. Efficiency – Other views.

The Prioritization Task Force will examine the data given under section IV.A and B in terms of the overall production (e.g. number of majors, number of graduates) in the program. Please comment if appropriate.

F. Budget cut impacts

*Indicate how your program has been affected by recent (since 2002-2003) budget cuts that have directly affected resources for your program (faculty, staff, operating expense) and course offerings (class size, reduced course offerings or options for the major.) Refer to the data included under section IV. E. or in the departmental report as appropriate.*

G. Additional Data

The Course Offerings Profile under the Course Subject Area for your academic program will be included here. (See <http://www.humboldt.edu/~anstud/progdata/pindex.shtml>)

## ASSESSMENT PLAN

### Department of Communication

*Mission Statement: Our general purpose follows that of our national organization: "To promote the study, criticism, research, teaching and application of the artistic, humanistic, and scientific principles of communication." (National Communication Association Strategic Plan, 1996)*

*Our specific purpose is to serve the university and community by advancing knowledge about human communication as well as promoting the critical analysis of communication contexts and the judicious application of communication skills.*

<b>GOALS</b>	<b>OUTCOMES</b>
To develop proficiency of the individual in communication.	<p>Students will effectively demonstrate an original, formal, and researched speech.</p> <p>Students will demonstrate competence in reflective analysis of persuasive discourse.</p> <p>Students will demonstrate basic competency in written communication.</p>
To foster diversity of perspectives that promotes dialogue as a vehicle to address social strife.	Students will demonstrate an understanding of diversity in relationship to communication.
To develop an appreciation and understanding of artistic, humanistic, and scientific perspectives on communication opportunities.	Students will demonstrate fundamental understanding of how knowledge is generated in the Communication discipline.

### Course Program Outcomes Alignment

(the presence of an “X” denotes that the outcome is addressed in the course, and the absence of an “X” denotes that it is not)

Course	Outcome 1 Oral communication	Outcome 2 Persuasive discourse	Outcome 3 Written communication	Outcome 4 Diversity in communication	Outcome 5 Knowledge generation
100	X	X	X	X	
101	X	X	X		
102	X	X	X		
103	X	X	X		
105	X		X	X	X
108	X		X	X	
110/310	X	X	X	X	X
213	X		X	X	
214	X	X	X	X	
300	X	X	X	X	
309b	X		X	X	
312	X		X	X	
315	X	X	X	X	X
319	X		X		X
322	X		X	X	
324	X		X	X	
404	X	X	X	X	X
414	X	X	X	X	X
415	X	X	X	X	X
416	X	X	X	X	X
422	X		X	X	
426	X		X	X	
480*					
490	X		X	X	
495*					

\* As these courses (COMM 480 and 495) are rotating topics the presence or absence of Outcomes will vary depending on the topic selection for a given semester.

### Assessment Planning

*2007-2008:*

Create Outcome 1 (Oral Communication) and develop imbedded assignment. Assessed in COMM 490 (Hahn) and assessed by Bruner, Floss, Hahn, Young.

*2008-2009:*

Finalize outcomes 2-5, map Course Program Outcome Alignment and develop Assessment Timeline for planning purposes. Develop rubric for Outcome 5 (Knowledge Generation) to be implemented in COMM 319 (VerLinden) and assessed by Bruner, Hahn, Paynton, Schnurer, and VerLinden.

*2009-2010:*

Develop rubric for Outcome 3 (Written Communication) which will be implemented in COMM 312 (Bruner) and assessed by Bruner and \_\_\_\_\_.

Develop rubric for Outcome 2 (Persuasive Discourse) to be implemented in COMM 414 (Hahn) and assessed by Hahn and \_\_\_\_\_.

*2010-2011:*

Develop rubric for Outcome 4 (Diversity) which will be implemented in COMM 309b (Schnurer) and assessed by Schnuer and \_\_\_\_\_.

*2011-2012:*

Assess Outcome 1 using revised Outcome (changes were made after assessing this Outcome in 2008). Since the rubric has been distributed to all majors in upper division classes we will also be able to track changes/improvements since 2008. This will be implemented in COMM 490 (Instructor unknown) and assessed by \_\_\_\_\_.

## ANNUAL ASSESSMENT PROGRESS REPORT

Year: 2008 Program: Communication

**Please describe your assessment activities for this academic year.**

**1. List the outcomes assessed during this cycle.**

Outcome 1: Students will prepare and present an original, formal, and researched speech.

**2. Provide a brief description of how each outcome was assessed including the process and participants.**

Outcome 1 was measured Spring 2008 in Communication 490, "The Capstone Experience," through the evaluation by four faculty members of the students' final presentation. These presentations were given April 29, May 1, May 6 and May 8 in class. Each student was independently assessed by two faculty members using the "Expected Presentational Elements" form (see Attached).

Assessment Rubric: Presentations were evaluated as "Exceeds expectations," "Meets expectations," or "Does not meet expectations" defined as follows:

Presentations that contain 85-100% (21-24) of the expected elements will "exceed expectations,"

Those which contain 70-84% (17-20) of expected elements will "meet expectations,"

Anything below 69% (16 and below) "does not meet expectations."

The participating faculty members were Michael Bruner, Laura Hahn, Scott Paynton, and Greg Young. All students enrolled in Comm. 490 that gave their final presentation were among the student participants. There were a total of 21 students giving presentations and 19 presentations. Students that presented together were assessed together as a single presentation. A total of 37 "Expected Presentational Elements" forms were collected by the instructor of Comm. 490, Laura Hahn.

**3. Describe the major findings from this assessment cycle.**

Of the 37 completed assessment forms the scores are:

16 "*exceed expectations*"

13 "*meets expectations*"

8 "*does not meet expectations*"

**4. Explain what action you are going to take based on the assessment results and why.**

- We all agree that assessing Outcome 1 in COMM 490 makes the most sense to get the desired feedback, thus we will continue to do. This will be reflected in the Multi-year Assessment Plan on which we are currently working.

- Based on the feedback we received from the first round of assessment for Outcome 1 and our decision to keep it in COMM 490 we will distribute the “Expected Presentational Elements Form” in all of our major classes. This will alert the students to the assessment criteria and keep these criteria in the forefront of the curriculum.

**5. Reflect on the assessment process itself. What if any changes do you want to make?**

- After running through the assessment for the first time we realized that the wording of the Outcome needs to be revised as we are unable to assess a student’s preparation for a presentation. So, the revised Outcome 1 will be: Students will effectively demonstrate an original, formal, and researched speech.
- We are currently in the process of solidifying all of our Outcomes and will have this task completed very soon.

**Send one copy of this report to the Office of Undergraduate Studies.  
Put a copy of this report in your Assessment Binder.**

*WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?.....*

**STEP ONE:** We need to come up with 4-6 more outcomes—ones that correspond with goals 2 and 3 and other things we care about. According to the directions, “The department/program’s mission and goals will determine the learning outcomes that it expects of its students.” As a reminder, these are:

**Mission:** Our general purpose follows that of The National Communication Association: “To promote the study, criticism, research, teaching and application of the artistic, humanistic, and scientific principles of communication.” (National Communication Association Strategic Plan, 1996)

Our specific purpose is to serve the university and community by advancing knowledge about human communication through the critical analysis of communication contexts and the judicious application of communication skills.

**Goals (these are adapted from our Values Statement):**

1) To develop proficiency of the individual in communication. Our notion of student-centered instruction includes personalizing theory to student concerns, encouraging application and performance of concepts, and cultivating individual student potentials.

*Outcome 1: Students will prepare and present an original, formal, and researched speech.*

2) To foster diversity of perspectives that promotes dialogue as a vehicle to address social strife. We are dedicated to not only teaching students the skills to acknowledge and participate in that diversity, but to modeling those skills in the process of self-governance within the department and in the spirit of co-creation we bring to the classroom.

3) To develop an appreciation and understanding of artistic, humanistic, and scientific perspectives on communication processes. We welcome opportunities to work across disciplines which must acknowledge communication as one of their concerns, our focus is clearly on the process of human communication itself, and our goal is to understand it in all of its complexity.

*Some ideas for outcomes which we have discussed previously include measuring critical thinking skills, engagement with diversity, and written communication skills.*

**STEP TWO:** Once we have the outcomes solidified, we need to identify where each outcome is addressed in the curriculum. In what course(s) are students introduced to the concept or skill? In which course(s) do they practice, apply and develop the concept or skill? In which course(s) are the students’ mastery of the concept or skill measured.

*We have done some of this based on the “HSU Student Learning Outcomes” document.*

**STEP THREE:** Come up with a multi-year assessment plan which is a timeline with tentative indication of who will be involved in the assessment activity and where the assessment data will come from.



## ASSESSMENT PROGRESS REPORT

Year: 2008-09\*

Program: Comm. (Research Skills)

\*Data was collected in Fall 2008 and analyzed Spring 2009

### 1. List the outcomes assessed during the most recent cycle

Objective: Students will demonstrate fundamental understanding of how knowledge is generated in the Communication discipline. (Outcome 5)

### 2. Provide a brief description of how each outcome was assessed including the process and participants.

Final papers were collected from all students in Comm. 319 (Research Methods) during Fall 2008, taught by VerLinden. A total of 12 papers were collected (some papers were written by multiple authors.) In the Spring of 2009 papers were assessed by Bruner, Hahn, Paynton and Schnurer according to the rubric created for that particular outcome (see attached). Papers were read independently by 2 reviewers. To measure students' proficiency in research skills the rubric focused on three particular elements—does the paper contain an argument, does the paper contain a literature review, and does the paper contain a description of the specific method used or proposed? Proficiency was measured in two parts: 1) is the element present? and 2) what is the level of quality? For part one, reviewers answered “Yes” or “No” and for part two, reviewers rated each of these areas as “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” or “does not meet expectations.”

### 3. Describe major findings from the assessment cycle.

Does the paper contain a description of the specific *method* used/proposed?

YES=26      NO=0

<b>Does not meet expectations</b> 3	<b>Meets</b> 19	<b>Exceeds</b> 3
<b>Meet/Does not meet*</b> 1		

Does the paper contain a *literature review*? YES=26

NO=0

<b>Does not meet expectations</b> 1	<b>Meets</b> 18	<b>Exceeds</b> 3
<b>Meet/Does not meet*</b> 4		

Does the paper contain an *argument* justifying the study? YES=20 NO=6

<b>Does not meet expectations</b> 11	<b>Meets</b> 12	<b>Exceeds</b> 1
<b>Meet/Does not meet*</b> 2		

\*While “meet/does not meet” was not a category in the original scoring rubric, it emerged when reviews did not agree on a scoring of a paper. In cases of strong disparity of rankings, a third review assessed the paper.

**4. Explain what actions are planned/were taken based on the assessment results and why.**

- We created a detailed report which summarizes how each of the two reviewers rated the papers along all three dimensions (argument, literature review, and method). This summary (see attached) will be given to the instructor of the course so that Dr. VerLinden may make any necessary modifications. As most of the students were found to “meet” and “exceed expectations” in all categories, the instructor also obtains valuable feedback about what is working well in the class.
- As the majority of students who “did not meet expectations” had difficulty with creating an *argument* for the study, the department discussed and decided that all of us who teach major classes will spend more time on skill development in that area.

**5. Reflect on the assessment process itself. What changes do you want to make?**

Given that we have chosen to assess papers from Comm 319 as part of the Resolution to Improve Undergraduate Student Writing next year, we may alter the rubric/scoring criteria in the next review cycle for Outcome 5.

**Put a copy of this report in your assessment binder.**

**Send one copy of this report to the Office of Undergraduate Studies.**

Assessment of Outcome 5 (Knowledge Generation)

Reviewed By \_\_\_\_\_

Paper # \_\_\_\_\_

Does this paper contain a description of the specific **method** used/proposed? Yes NoBased on the following elements, this method description  
*exceeds expectations meets expectations does not meet expectations*

- Specific steps outlined
- Timeline outlined
- Interview questions/instrument included
- Literature supporting method
- Specific identification of method beyond “qualitative” “quantitative”
- Justification for specific method and components of that method to be used
- General description of method leading to specific use of method for study

Does this paper contain a **literature review**? Yes NoBased on the following elements, this literature review  
*exceeds expectations meets expectations does not meet expectations*

- An appropriate number of sources
- A variety of sources
- Use of primary sources
- Sources from our field
- Limited number of popular press sources
- Current sources, as well as recognition of past “seminal” pieces
- Literature that covers topic, research method, context/history of topic
- Literature review that is not linear (one paragraph per source), but weaves literature based on topic/themes/justifications/etc.
- Literature that is able to relate peripheral sources to specific topic

Does the paper contain an **argument** justifying the study? Yes NoBased on the following elements, this argument  
*exceeds expectations meets expectations does not meet expectations:*

- Clear statement of thesis
- Logical reasoning in presentation of argument
- Literature backing up argument
- Answers question “why” using previous research, or lack thereof
- Clear research questions(s)
- Clear Preview of topic, paper, methodology, etc.
- Differentiation from past research
- More than one rationale for argument/study

## Appendix A: Scoring Summary

<b>PAPER#</b>	<b>EXCEEDS</b>	<b>MEETS</b>	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b>
1		4	2
2	1	3	2
3		4	2
4	2	4	
5	2	3	1
6		5	1
7		4	2
8		6	
9	1	4	1
10	2	4	
11		5	1
12		3	3

## **MAKING EXCELLENCE INCLUSIVE PLAN**

### **Department of Communication Best Practices for Inclusive Academic Excellence Humboldt State University Submitted to WASC Theme 2 Action Team**

The Department of Communication at Humboldt State University is committed to promoting and achieving the goals of Inclusive Academic Excellence. Humboldt State University has long-struggled to establish a diverse population of administrators, faculty, students, and staff, and has undertaken the objective of WASC reaccreditation the goal of increasing diversity in significant and meaningful ways. HSU has a long history of not being able to achieve representative diversity of traditionally under-represented groups. To this end, this report documents the Department of Communication's best practices for facilitating and achieving diversity in both the student population and faculty. As part of this report, we acknowledge our current areas of weakness and provide methods for achieving greater success. Consistent with the goals of the WASC Theme 2 Action Team, the Department of Communication does not seek to oversimplify the complexities of issues surrounding diversity by solely focusing on increasing student and faculty numbers. Instead, this report highlights our approaches for achieving diversity in Access, Retention, Academic Achievement, and Institutional Receptivity.

Under-represented populations (including the category of "other") represent 28.6% of the total student population attending HSU, while under-represented students make up 30.3% of the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences student body. In 2001, under-presented populations accounted for 19.5% of total Communication majors. The most recent 2006 data indicates that under-represented populations represent 34% of the total majors in our program. Clearly, diversity is increasing in our program, yet the faculty of the Department of Communication are committed to continue working on this aspect of our program.

The distribution of gender at HSU indicates that 55.4% of the student body is female, while 44.6% is male. Females make up the majority of majors in the Department of Communication. In 2006, 80% of our graduates were female. Currently, the Department has 49 females and 37 males in the major.

Using the categories of Access, Retention, Academic Achievement, and Institutional Receptivity, this report highlights actions the Department of Communication engages in to promote diversity. We also highlight practices will believe will produce even greater outcomes of diversity on campus and within our program.

#### **ACCESS:**

The Department is committed to encouraging and promoting diversity in its extensive participation in general education. General education introduces students to a broad range of perspectives and thinking, encouraging students to bring their own representative backgrounds into the discussion. Because students are required to take COMM 100: Fundamentals of Speech Communication, opportunities are intentionally created in these classes for students to discuss and articulate their unique cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Likewise, we offer an array of critical thinking courses, social science general education courses, Diversity and Common Ground Courses, and Communication and Ways of Thinking courses. One of our Area C

general education courses, COMM 108: Oral Interpretation, encourages students to read and perform prose, often from a diverse range of authors.

The Department of Communication offers several upper-division education options in the general education areas of Diversity and Common Ground and Communication and Ways of Thinking. These courses also fulfill major requirements and are required of a significant number of programs due to their exclusive focus on issues of diversity. COMM 309b: Gender and Communication and COMM 322: Intercultural Communication are two examples of courses whose content focuses exclusively on issues of diversity. Both courses focus on communication issues directly related to traditionally under-represented populations. We offer multiple sections of these courses each semester and summer, exposing a large number of majors and non-majors to complex, exciting and difficult issues surrounding diversity. COMM 300: American Public Discourse has recently been re-certified as a Diversity and Common Ground course. The course, specifically, looks at: "the 'production' and 'consumption' of popular culture in the United States, including how cultural differences/similarities and identities are constructed, perpetuated, challenged, and transformed in and through public discourse. Students study many media and a variety of discourses from many cultural heritages. Students also learn to deconstruct the relationships between culture and symbolic power, with particular emphasis on issues of race, gender, class, sexual orientation, and informational, technological, and economic inequalities."

The Department of Communication has a strong tradition of studying and honoring oral traditions. Students from under-represented groups are affirmed when their traditions are affirmed. For example, African-American students may notice in the curriculum "The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant," as well as texts from Fredrick Douglass, Sojourner Truth, Malcolm X, and Martin Luther King, Jr. Native American students may notice texts from Tecumseh, Pushmataha, Duwamish, Leonard Peltier, and Vine Deloria, Jr.

The curriculum in the major of Communication is designed to draw a diverse population of students. Much of the content of these courses is intended to encourage students to use principles, theories, and skills in the field of Communication to examine their culture, ethnicity, gender, and relationships. Given this approach, we believe that students are drawn to the major largely because it fosters applicability in the individual lives of our students.

The curriculum of the Department of Communication *honors* diversity in its assignments, content, and open discussion with faculty and students. Examples include:

- Many COMM 100 classes offer opportunities for students to address, "How communication with people from other cultures or other co-cultures have affected my life."
- Most Communication courses emphasize the importance of understanding the people with whom one communicates (audience analysis) making the connection to diversity central to the curriculum in the Discipline.
- One of the assignments in Nonverbal Communication is to report on a published research study of the nonverbal communication of a non-Euro-American culture. Another assignment is to present a workshop about Nonverbal Communication across cultures.
- COMM 426 has students involved in a service-learning project in which students design and facilitate workshops on diversity topics (such as sexual diversity, disability

awareness, power & privilege, intercultural communication, etc.) to eighth-graders at a local school.

- In COMM 100 instructors often use Native American literature to teach critical reading.
- In Communication Theory, students are exposed to theorists from underrepresented populations, including Native American and Indian communication theorists.
- COMM 480 is a class that exposes communication students to the appeals to equality of oppressed people around the globe.

Core to our curriculum is the notion of “identity.” Communication from a critical or social constructionist perspective recognizes that communication is central to identity formation and negotiation. Thus, we deal with issues of positionality in class content; a concept that examines further issues of identity such as social class, ability, religious orientation, sexuality, etc.

The structure of our curriculum provides students with a diverse range of options for careers after graduation. We are not only providing students with job skills, but also life skills that allow them to be successful. Over the past three years, we have seen our majors grow by 65%, and as stated above, much of this growth is in the population of under-represented groups. We believe that the range of career options available to our students has been a major recruiting tool. Our graduates are able to tell those they know that their backgrounds are welcomed and encouraged in our curriculum.

In terms of access, the faculty of the Department have been actively involved in FIG and EOP programs of students early in their academic careers. We have also worked closely with the Multi-Cultural Center, the Women’s Center, and the Queer Student Union. As a result of this commitment, we draw students from under-represented populations after they see the potential of the major in their lives through the applicability of course and program content in these programs.

### **RETENTION:**

Central to our successes in retention is the fact that our Discipline values accepting others and paying attention to everyone as much as possible.

Once students arrive, it is important to pursue every opportunity to retain them. The Department of Communication works hard at ensuring that students stay and graduate in a timely manner. The primary task in retaining students, and one that is often repeated in exit exercises, is the personal attention and advising that faculty give to majors. Faculty work hard to make themselves available, not only as academic advisors, but also as mentors and friends.

Within a structured major, we provide significant flexibility in terms of courses that can complete the major. Thus, students are encouraged when they are able to build a curriculum of content areas that work to help build, maintain, and foster diversity.

Given the focus on personal attention, students have significant opportunities to interact with classmates from diverse backgrounds, both in and out of the classroom. Many classes require

group projects, group presentations, and group exercises within the class. Many of the assignments within our courses allow students to work on what they are most interested in studying, rather than specific topics chosen by the instructors. Students, as a result of the focus on oral presentations, are also exposed to the diverse backgrounds and perspectives of their classmates in a structured and safe environment. Similarly, the student Communication Club sponsors programs and activities in which students come together and interact with one another, learning about each other's backgrounds.

Instructors use a variety of pedagogical strategies to encourage students to interact about diverse viewpoints. Strategies include discussion based teaching, group projects, oral presentations, listening opportunities, field experiences, internships, service-learning opportunities, and civic engagement. The variety of pedagogical strategies not only allows students to speak of, and listen to, diverse perspectives, but also helps students of different learning styles achieve success.

The Intercollegiate Speech and Debate team is an excellent tool for retaining students. Students in this program get to discuss and debate diverse topics in formal competitions, in the classroom, and interpersonally. Travel to tournaments also exposes students to diverse populations outside of HSU. These experiences are brought back by students and continue to influence the progression of diversity at HSU.

Service learning and civic engagement opportunities have a profound impact on the retention of students. These opportunities often focus on work with underprivileged populations, in and out of the immediate area. Many of our courses are designed to require students to spend significant time with others from different backgrounds than themselves. These experiences, tied to the curriculum, allow students to learn how to communicate with diverse populations in ethical, practical, and beneficial ways.

The department of communication also houses the Nu-Jacks, a hip hop and diversity club. Funded through grants from the HSU diversity funding committee, this club creates programming to encourage appreciation of diversity and cultural difference. During Fall 2006, the Nu-Jacks created nine lectures, concerts, and workshops around diversity and underrepresented populations, with attendance at these events exceeding 500 people.

### **ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT:**

The cumulative GPA exceeding 2.75 of under-represented groups at HSU between 2001-2005 includes: Latino/a 74.1%, Asian 74%, Pacific Islander 83.4%. The GPA of under-represented groups in the Department of Communication during this same period that exceeds 2.75 includes: Latino/a 75%, Asian 75%, Pacific Islander 100%. Interestingly, no data was given for the Communication Department regarding the GPA of African-American students during this same period. Nevertheless, both HSU and Department numbers indicate that programmatic efforts are helping students achieve academic success.

The Department of Communication is committed to helping students achieve academic success and ultimately, a timely graduation. To this end, we have engaged in a number of activities to ensure this.

As stated, faculty in the Department of Communication are committed to excellence in advising. Thus, advisors meet regularly with students in order to track their academic progress and



success. Upon signs of trouble, faculty work with students to ensure correction and redirection in facilitative ways.

Faculty syllabi are an important tool for setting clear course objectives and expectations. Faculty in the Department of Communication do an excellent job of providing students with clear syllabi to help facilitate planning and success for individual courses.

The Department provides a major contract form and matrix detailing when courses will be offered to help students clearly plan their path to graduation. Students utilize these tools, in conjunction with help from major advisors, to facilitate timely graduation with a major in Communication.

We work to ensure that our curriculum is applicable in order for students to make connections between concepts and real-world applications. To this end, opportunities for field experiences and applied course work ensure students are able to apply content of the major curriculum to real world experiences.

### **INSTITUTIONAL RECEPTIVITY:**

Diversity of faculty is the greatest weakness of the Department of Communication in our attempt to create inclusive academic excellence. The following is a breakdown of the composition of the Communication faculty.

- Total Probationary/Tenured Faculty: 7
  - Males: 4
  - Females: 3
  - White: 7
  
- Total Lecturer Faculty: 5
  - Males: 3
  - Females: 2
  - White: 5

The department has hired five probationary/tenure-track faculty since Fall 1998. All faculty hired are white. Two faculty are female and three are male. Despite the current composition of faculty, the Department of Communication aggressively advertised for diversity of candidates for our last hire. Also, the Department has submitted a new position request that specifically seeks a candidate who studies communication from a “non-European” perspective. Nevertheless, we have struggled with achieving diversity at the faculty level.

Faculty in the Department of Communication are committed to the ideals and goals of both fostering, but more importantly, achieving diversity in our program and on our campus. Not only will we continue to reach these goals by building successful students from diverse backgrounds, but develop all aspects of the Department by focusing on the development of greater diversity in the faculty.

## **Department of Communication Responses to WASC Theme II Data Analysis and Development of a Three-Year Plan**

### **Observation/Issue Identified by Department:**

- Although the percentage of our majors who are SOC is relatively high for HSU, it does not reflect the composition of the population of California.

### **Question(s) to be answered in relation to above issue:**

- What can we do to make our major attractive to all students, including students of color?

### **Development of the Action Plan for 2008 – 2009**

#### **What practices can be implemented to address the situation?**

- Practice #1: Each semester, conduct a meeting of all tenured and tenure-track faculty, to which all our lecturers and students are invited, to share the following:
  - A. An example that we use in class that has been presented in a way that doesn't acknowledge diversity and how to make it diverse.
  - B. Other practices that we use in our classes to relate to underrepresented students and perspectives.
  - C. Collect those descriptions and keep them filed or post them on our web site so everyone has access to them.

#### **How can effectiveness of an implemented practice be measured (one example)?**

- Collect the records from the meetings and make them accessible to faculty.
- Track any changes in percentages from the university's disaggregated data.

### **3 Year Timeline**

- December 2008: Submit Action Plan to WASC II Team.
- Spring 2009: Remind faculty to begin collecting the examples and practices from their spring semester classes.
- Fall 2009: Hold the first meeting. At a separate follow-up meeting discuss what happened and if there are any improvements to be made.
- Spring 2010: Hold the second meeting and follow-up meeting.
- Fall 2010: Hold the second meeting and follow-up meeting.
- Spring 2011: Hold the second meeting and follow-up meeting.
- Fall 20101: Hold the second meeting and follow-up meeting.

## **Department of Communication Responses to WASC Theme II Data Analysis and Development of a Three-Year Plan**

### **Observation/Issue Identified by Department:**

- Although the percentage of our majors who are SOC is relatively high for HSU, it does not reflect the composition of the population of California.

### **Question(s) to be answered in relation to above issue:**

- What can we do to make all our majors feel welcome, especially students of color?

### **Development of the Action Plan for 2008 – 2009**

#### **What practices can be implemented to address the situation?**

- Practice #2: We will look for and purchase posters, magazines, and journals that address diverse perspectives. The posters will be mounted in House 54, especially in the Squad Room, and the periodicals will be put in a magazine rack in the Squad Room for faculty and students to read. We will regularly remind students of the availability of the Squad Room for them to meet and use between classes.

#### **How can effectiveness of an implemented practice be measured (one example)?**

- Keep a record of what material will be purchased.
- Track any changes in percentages from the university's disaggregated data.

### **3 Year Timeline**

- December 2008: Submit Action Plan to WASC II Team.
- Spring 2009: Purchase posters and periodicals. Hang the magazine rack in the Squad room. Invite students to use the Squad Room.
- Fall 2009: Update periodicals and posters if necessary. Invite students to use the Squad Room.
- Spring 2010: Update periodicals and posters if necessary. Invite students to use the Squad Room.
- Fall 2010: Update periodicals and posters if necessary. Invite students to use the Squad Room.
- Spring 2011: Update periodicals and posters if necessary. Invite students to use the Squad Room.
- Fall 20101: Update periodicals and posters if necessary. Invite students to use the Squad Room.

In addition to the plans above we had other ideas that can be implemented in addition to formal planning. We agreed they would be good to do, not just for WASC or for underrepresented students, but as “Best Practices” for teaching and for the department in general. Many of them are also things that we do already, some are things we can only do with increased resources or by changing the curriculum.

They are listed below, in no particular order.

### **TREAT ALL STUDENTS WELL**

Consciously use verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors when teaching.

Be sure to provide explicit encouragements along with constructive criticism.

Talk to students about the activities they do when greeting them.

### **CLASS ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

When possible, choose texts that seriously address diverse perspectives.

Teach reflexivity and critical thinking about issues of language and justice and marginalization, etc.

Bring up exceptions to white cultures standards where possible. (Most of the research findings in classes are based on middle-class, white subjects and that can be acknowledged)

Continue to provide “small” classes in which students can establish relationships and be engaged.

Design lessons to engage students (i.e. not strictly lecture format).

Incorporate assignments in class that allow or require students to address diverse perspectives.

Keep issues of social justice among the forefront of our curriculum.

Allow students to do assignments in ways that connect to their interests, when possible.

Make sure syllabi are clear.

Make sure assignments are clear to allow student success.

Focus on ATI accessibility

Continue to incorporate service learning when possible. Expand it if possible. (**Requires more resources.**)

**PERSONNEL (all have resources implications)**

Reinstate the presence of the ASC in the building to help students. Meanwhile, send the students to the other building to meet the ASC. (And have the ASC explicitly tell them they are welcome.) **(R)**

Reinstate the presence of the ASC in the building to greet and deal with potential students. **(R)**

Hire at least one faculty member with diversity in mind. **(R)**

**ADVISING**

Do academic advising with respect and being real.

Do group advising meetings with students giving advice to peers.

Do good, face-to-face advising (not just giving away reg codes)

Contact students in advance to encourage them to come for advising

Make ourselves more available during advising time

**OUT OF CLASS INITIATIVES**

Get the word out about what our department is about.

Increase tutoring

Revive the Communication Club

Continue to do something similar to Nu-Jack

**OTHER IDEAS WITH RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

Increase faculty time devoted to Speech and Debate so we could incorporate an Urban Debate League model in Forensics. **(R)**

Develop a rural debate league. **(R)**

Invite the Oklahoma rural debate tour to campus. **(R)**

Reinstate/Increase support for classes that appeal to under-represented groups (such as 300, 309b and 322) so they can be offered more often and serve more students **(R)**

“Adopt” the American Sign Language program and other marginalized programs. **(R)**

Add “Intro to the Major” class as a requirement to help all students succeed **(R)**

June 2009

Communication Benchmarking Data

	Student-Faculty Ratio				Credential	Number of Majors	Number of Graduates
	Overall	LD	Upper Div.	Graduate			
Bakersfield						NA	NA
Sonoma						NA	NA
Chico						335	76
SLO	21.5	23.7	14			230	55
San Bernardino						NA	NA
East Bay	21.9	25.6	x			25*	17*
HSU	24.7	26.6	23.32			82	18

\*listed as Speech Communication (minor w/in Communicaiton?)

Bakersfield graduate data is 06/07 and major count data is Fall 07.

	Average Class Size			
	Overall	LD	Upper Div.	Graduate
Bakersfield				
Sonoma				
Chico				
SLO	24.3	24.7	22.5	
San Bernardino				
East Bay	27	31.9	x	
HSU	24.5	23.7	26.7	

	Staff Support			Required Units		
	ASC/ASA	Tech	SSP	In Major Hegis Code	Other Non-GE Req. Courses	Other GE Req. Courses
Bakersfield				NA		
Sonoma				48		51
Chico	1			45		
SLO	1.0/1.0			45		
San Bernardino				49		
East Bay						
HSU	.5/.25			45		

## RESPONSE TO BENCHMARK DATA

The data indicate that the Department of Communication maintains a Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) that is equal to or greater than other comparable CSU campuses. Our overall SFR is almost 13% higher than the next comparable school, which indicates that an overall reduction would be reasonable.

Our overall class size compares favorably to San Luis Obispo, but is smaller than East Bay. Since we do not know the methodology behind the data we cannot know why East Bay shows larger classes but lower SFR. That may be due to voluntary overloads that enroll one or two students, which would lower our average class size.

The data also indicate that our efforts to be efficient in course offerings for the major and General Education have been successful. Those efforts include using the existing structure of the major and General Education in revisions to the major so we do not increase the number of course offerings. As a result, almost all the classes we offer are either fully enrolled or close to it. We do not feel we can reasonably become more efficient without sacrificing quality of instruction.

We also compare the data to the National Communication Association's assessment guidelines. Those guidelines indicate that performance courses (COMM 100, 108, 110/310, and 214) should have a maximum SFR of 25 and writing intensive classes (such as COMM 319 on this campus) should have a maximum SFR of 15:1 (<http://www.natcom.org/NCA/files/ccLibraryFiles/FILENAME/000000001789/Edited%20Program%20Review%20Guidelines.pdf>). Other upper division classes should aim for an SFR of 15 to 20:1 to help meet the university's SLO of effective oral and written communication so faculty can work with students to help them improve their writing and speaking skills. Class size needs to be reduced in: COMM 309b, 322, 319, and all 400s which all have an SFR of 23:1 to 35:1.

The course rotation schedule also needs to change to offer upper division classes more often to reduce class size, to give students better chance to get the courses they need to graduate, and to provide for better instructional opportunities. We are at the point of needing to over-enroll classes in order for students to graduate.

In part, the need for smaller classes offered more often is a result of the shift to assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. When the educational model was instruction centered an instructor could lecture to a large number of students and it was the students' responsibility to learn. Now the model is that it is the instructor's responsibility to ensure the students learn, which calls for more developmental and evaluative activities and assignments.

Smaller class sizes are also called for in the drive for student engagement. As communication scholars we know that as the size of a group grows the percentage of people who participate falls. In a classroom that often means that the same few students do all the talking and the other students do not. Some of those students listen to others while some use their time in ways unrelated to the class. In smaller classes all students can have opportunities to participate.



Growth in the major cannot happen without increased offerings because the classes required for the major are only offered often enough to generate full enrollment at 25 students or more. Thus, there is no room for additional students without sacrificing educational goals and university Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

## OVERVIEW

The preceding documents collectively indicate that the department is operating efficiently. This department is relatively inexpensive and could reasonably be expected to be one of the departments that are allowed to grow in the future, but that is dependent upon increased course offerings, which will be explained below.

The first two department assessment reports indicate that our teaching is satisfactory but could be improved. As a result we are taking steps to improve our majors' abilities to present speeches and make well-reasoned arguments. In addition, we consider assessment as a work-in-progress, meaning that we will need to revise the Student Learning Outcomes and how we assess them as we become better acquainted with the process and as the guidelines from the Integrated Curriculum Committee and the Assessment Coordinator are clarified.

Since the last program review we have adjusted the major curriculum to better align with the HSU mission and vision. In addition, some classes have been renamed and some classes that were not part of the major have been added to the choices of major requirements. Neither change has affected the frequency of course offerings nor added to the number of courses we offer each year.

The number of majors has increased dramatically since the previous program review. In 2001-2 the average number for each semester was 46.5. The most recent data, for 2008-9, indicates the headcount was 82, with three additional second majors.

There are several things we believe we are doing well and want to continue. Inclusiveness is integrated throughout our curriculum, and especially in the Gender and Communication and Intercultural Communication classes. Our courses are designed to promote student engagement. We are fully participating in the assessment process and adapting courses based on the results. We have embraced the HSU SLO concerning writing and speaking. We emphasize the importance of our course content for career success as well as for personal enrichment. The Speech and Debate program provides opportunities for both our majors and students from other majors to develop their critical thinking and oral communication skills.

The department has many potential plans for the future. For our discussion we considered what we could do to make the program the best for HSU, so the plans do not take into account state or system budget problems. In many cases the plans are intertwined so implementing some are dependent on implementing others. The following are what we would do if we could in the five categories of Curriculum Development, Growth, Integration of Communication studies throughout the University, Scholarship & Professional Development, and Resource Support.

### **Maintaining Excellence: Curricular Development**

- Enrich instruction in Area A Oral Communication courses by sharing our best practices with each other on a regular basis.
- Increase the offerings of COMM 108: Oral Interpretation.

COMM 108 is both a LD GE Area C course and a course that partly fulfills a requirement for the major. As such it has always filled to capacity. Unfortunately, the number of sections we have been allowed to offer have dwindled from multiple sections each semester to only one this academic year. That is both discouraging to the instructors and difficult for students trying to take the courses they need to graduate.

- Reinvalidate service learning.

Prior to the last program review the department and individual instructors incorporated service learning components in several classes and we increased the units for those courses to four units to account for the service learning component. That continued until this academic year when we were told that faculty could earn WTUs only for the number of hours that they meet with the entire class. That effectively eliminated credit for faculty who put in the time and effort to do service learning, which is more intensive than regular classes. The result is that those classes now meet as full classes for four hours a week with no service learning component.

That is unfortunate because service learning is one way to meet the visions of being exemplary partners with the community and stewards of learning to make a difference. When the issue of meeting for four hours to earn four WTUs was discussed at the Academic Senate the senate was told that a policy specific to service learning would be forthcoming. It has not been presented by this writing, so we cannot say what the outcome will be.

### **Maintaining Excellence: Integration of Communication Studies throughout the University**

- Invigorate the Speech and Debate program.

Although the Speech and Debate program is a source of pride for the department and the university it has often been the first target for budget cuts. We barely had the Assistant Director's position reinstated when it was eliminated again. The Assistant Director's position, which would be filled by a lecturer, costs the university 6 WTU's per year. The person who would be in the position would get 3 WTU's a semester for Speech & Debate and 12 WTUs for Area A GE or other classes.

The Assistant Director's position is crucial to making the Speech and Debate program more valuable to the university. With that position it is possible to recruit more students to the program (because there is staff to work with them), incorporate more on-campus events (because there is someone to supervise them), and provide the students with more experience (because there is someone to work with them and accompany them to tournaments). A healthy Speech and Debate program with adequate staff could be a strong recruiting element to bring students to HSU.

It is important to recognize that, although the program is housed in the Department of Communication, most of the students involved are not Communication majors. Thus, the program helps the university achieve the learning outcome of effective oral and written communication.

- Continue to ensure that the elements of the program are aligned with the mission and vision of the campus.

The Social Advocacy minor and the courses associated with it address the HSU vision of social and environmental responsibility and action, the development of individual citizens who act in good conscience and engage in informed action, learning to make a positive difference, civic engagement, and being exemplary partners with our communities.

The Intercultural Communication and Gender and Communication classes also address the commitment to increasing diversity of people and perspectives.

Other courses, including GE courses, incorporate elements of the vision statement. We will continue to re-examine our courses to see how we can include content and assignments to fit the HSU vision.

- Become identified as a source of enrichment for critical thinking in General Education and beyond.

Critical thinking has been part of the Communication discipline from its inception, and we believe we have much more to offer than we have been able to do for some time. We would like to increase the offerings of GE Area A Critical Thinking classes and decrease their class size so it is more possible to engage the students and help them to become better Critical Thinkers. We would also consider the possibility of offering Advanced Critical Thinking courses for the campus community.

- Continue to enact our commitment to serve the whole university.

The Department of Communication has a long history of taking on all-university assignments such as the Faculty Development Coordinator, Interdisciplinary Studies Student Designed Coordinator, Interim Associate Dean of CAHSS, Chairs for other departments, Ombudspersons, and faculty governance positions. The nature of our discipline and, therefore, the nature of our faculty create a natural fit with many aspects of shared governance and to help other departments when called upon.

- Enhance the name recognition of the department

Most of our majors come to the department after they have taken Communication courses, either at HSU or at a previous institution, which is a national trend. We want to enhance the name recognition of the department to attract more students who come to HSU to become Communication majors. In part this will be addressed by adding material to our department web site that is specifically for prospective students, but that can only go so far. Since most California high schools do not offer communication classes we also need to discuss the identity of the department and communicate that to High School teachers and counselors. Many of the California Community Colleges do have speech teachers so we would want to contact them. In the past our recruitment efforts have been frustrated because we have no access to names and addresses of high school and community colleges, let alone the names of counselors or faculty.

### **Maintaining Excellence: Scholarship & Professional Development**

- Continue to develop faculty scholarship.

Our faculty have been active scholars and we intend to continue to be. The Retention, Tenure and Promotion process for Drs. Schnurer, Paynton, and Hahn as well

as the Post Tenure Reviews for Drs. Reitzel, VerLinden and Bruner indicate that our faculty have been productive. We have recently become more active in collaborative scholarship with each other to add to that base. Our intention is to: Encourage co-authorship, research teams, and trans-disciplinary scholarship, especially in areas consistent with the mission and vision of HSU including the scholarship of teaching and learning, encourage scholarship by undergraduate students with faculty mentors, and increase the visibility of faculty scholarship.

- Provide opportunities for the professional development of lecturers.

Our lecturers are members of our department Executive Committee and often volunteer to be on committees or take on *ad hoc* assignments. Some have expressed that they enjoy such involvement and do it because they want to. We are sensitive to the fact that lecturers have no collateral duties and that we need to avoid giving the impression that such activities are expected or required of them, but we also want to give them the opportunity to be more involved with the department and the university if that is what they want.

### **New Directions for Excellence: Future Growth and Expansion**

- Add another tenure-track faculty member.

The department is in need of a generalist who can help teach various upper division classes, both to have enough offerings to grow the major and to fill in for faculty who accept assignments that take them out of the department. In addition, adding tenure track faculty is the only hope for diversifying our faculty.

- Investigate the feasibility of a graduate program.

Students have regularly expressed interest in a Master's program in Communication at HSU but we have not had the resources to develop one. We need to discuss the kind of classes we could offer, how to fund a Master's program, and how to give the students teaching experience without harming our long-term lecturers to see if such a program is feasible.

- Continue to make connections with other departments to offer courses that would enhance their programs, and that they would recommend their majors take.

The nature of our discipline is such that students from any discipline could benefit from taking Communication courses. Since we have been limited to a minimum Essential Schedule for fifteen years or more we have been unable to develop course that could be attractive but are not required for our majors to graduate.

Some classes that have been offered or could be developed include: Environment and Communication, Health Communication, Business and Professional Communication, Communication and Technology, Communication Ethics, Rhetorical Criticism, Performance Studies, Communication and Leadership, Training and Consulting Skills, and Conflict Management. In addition, we could contact other departments to see if there are Communication classes that we could design to meet the needs of their majors.

- Explore the possibility of including Communication courses in the Environment & Community M.A. option.

Currently, our department does not participate in the Environment & Community M.A. but there are some natural connections with our discipline and the expertise of specific faculty. Involvement in the M.A. program could enrich both our offerings and that program.

### Resource Support

- Work to have the former Math lab in Telonicher House reassigned to the department and make it the department office.

Presently Telonicher House Room 1 is used by ITC to store and repair computers, so it is not available to us to use. That means that the department office continues to be on the main floor, which is up a flight of stairs, making it inaccessible to anyone using a wheelchair. Making this change would require finding another location to store computer parts and work on them, as well as find resources to refurbish the space.

- Get a new copier, preferably a color copier.

A copier that does not constantly need service, either from the ASC or a service contractor, is vital to department operations and classes. The copier assigned to this department during the last refresh outlived its service life and became very unreliable. It was replaced by a hand-me-down copier from another department and now it also is becoming unreliable.

- Return to full staffing, which means 1.0 ASC.

The lack of a full-time Academic Support Coordinator in Telonicher House has substantially hurt the credibility of the department. The enrollment in the department has suffered because of the absence of a central staff available to answer questions from prospective students and new majors, or to share recruitment materials. Current students have also complained about the lack of on-site staff. In a poll of senior communication capstone students, more than half of the class recounted problems with the often-closed departmental office. More than three students explained that they have had difficulty getting forms signed, many others described 'wandering around' in an effort to find the A.S.C.. Several students also pointed out that the departmental mailboxes are inside the often-locked office, which impedes their ability to drop off assignments.

We understand the impetus for sharing the ASC with the department of Journalism and Mass Communication, but that arrangement has not worked well for us. The ASC and the ASA do their jobs well, so it is not their fault. However, since they are housed in a different building it means the Communication office is only staffed by a work study student (who does not know the department) about two hours a day or less. When potential majors and other visitors drop in they are met with an empty space, which creates a poor impression of the department and the university.

In the previous iteration of our assessment procedures students were asked to write essays describing what they thought the strengths of the department are. One of the consistent themes was how helpful they found the ASC. Since we began sharing the ASC with JMC she reports that she rarely has contact with Communication majors or

potential majors. If we are to grow the major we need an ASC in the same building that potential students go to for information.

We do realize that potential students should follow instructions on signs and the web site, but the reality is they go to our building and search for someone to talk to. Since HSU is marketed as an institution with a personal touch it would be best if potential and current students could more easily contact a person to answer their questions.

- Provide wireless internet connection to Telonicher House.

Telonicher House has a conference room that is used for faculty meetings and for the Speech and Debate program preparation. We encourage students to use the room at other times to study, hold their own meetings, or just converse with each other. A room for Communication majors to use is important for building community.

The room is much less attractive as a place for students now because they cannot get an internet connection for their laptops. Although the Chancellor's office provided funding to upgrade the wireless capability of the campus, according to Josh Callahan that funding is only for permanent, state owned and operated buildings.