PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING
Approved 9/2/08 Governing Council

The Program Review process should serve as a mechanism for the assessment of performance that recognizes and acknowledges good performance and academic excellence, improves the quality of instruction and services, updates programs and services, and fosters self-renewal and self-study. Further, it should provide for the identification of weak performance and assist programs in achieving needed improvement. Finally, program review should be seen as a component of campus planning that will not only lead to better utilization of existing resources, but also lead to increased quality of instruction and service. A major function of program review should be to monitor and pursue the congruence between the goals and priorities of the college and the actual practices in the program or service.

~Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Department or Program: Speech Communication
Division: Language Arts

I. **DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM** *(Data resources: "Number of Sections" data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators; CSM Course Catalog; department records)*

> The *2008-2009 College of San Mateo Catalog* describes the program: "The Speech Communication program includes courses in public speaking, small group communication, interpersonal communication, intercultural communication, organizational communication, and oral interpretation of literature. The English requirement may be partially satisfied by 3 units of Speech 100 or Speech 120. Speech 855 is credit-bearing but not degree-applicable, which means that the units count for the purposes of financial aid but not toward the AA/AS degree. [p. 208]" *Fall 2008* and *Spring 2009 Schedule of Classes* reveal the breakdown of courses offered:
>
> Fall 2008 courses [p. 86-87]
> SPCH 100, Public Speaking   10 day sections, 2 evening sections
> SPCH 120, Interpersonal Communication   7 day sections, 3 evening sections
> SPCH 140, Small Group Communication   1 day section
> SPCH 150, Intercultural Communication   1 day section
> SPCH 855, Speech for Non-Native Speakers I   1 day section
> SPCH 690, Special Projects   Independent study
>   TOTAL SECTIONS   25
>
> Spring 2009 courses [p. 88-89]
> SPCH 100, Public Speaking   9 day sections, 3 evening sections
> SPCH 111, Oral Interpretation I   1 day section [combined with SPCH 112]
> SPCH 112, Oral Interpretation II   1 day section [combined with SPCH 111]
> SPCH 120, Interpersonal Communication   6 day sections, 3 evening sections
> SPCH 140, Small Group Communication   1 day section
> SPCH 150, Intercultural Communication   1 day section
> SPCH 855, Speech for Non-Native Speakers I   1 day section
> SPCH 860, Communication in the Workplace   1 day section [1-unit short course]
>   TOTAL SECTIONS   25.33

II. **STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES** *(Data resources: SLO records maintained by the department; CSM SLO Coordinator; SLO Website)*

a. Briefly describe the department's assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. Which courses or programs were assessed? How were they assessed? What are the findings of the assessments?

The department's assessment of Student Learning Outcomes seeks to measure student performance across specific common course assignments.

In Fall 2008, the department's pilot study sought to develop best practices for comprehensive assessment of SLOs; for example, rubrics/grids were developed for assessing "delivery" and "outline" SLOs for Speech 100. A sample of 30% of student speeches was randomly selected to determine degrees of mastery across the different indices of effective delivery and outlining. In Spring 2009, the department used this preliminary information to make progress toward developing SLO templates for each course in the Schedule of Courses; for example, SPCH 100 now identifies six SLOs that are individually subdivided into discrete, demonstrable skills. Relevant SLOs are included on course syllabi as well as on the department website. Students enrolled for each course were randomly chosen and their work assessed by the faculty of record who determined the extent to which discrete skills were demonstrated. Full implementation of departmental assessment of SLOs began in Spring 2009 with distribution of relevant SLO templates to Speech Communication faculty. SLO templates are now being filled out and collected by the department as assignments are completed during the semester.

Findings from Fall 2008 indicate positive scores in SLO assessment that reflect excellence in teaching. For example, of two selected SLOs for Speech 100 assessed across all sections, the average score for the "delivery" SLO is 84%; the average score for the "outline" SLO is 88%; the "critical thinking" SLO that was assessed in four sections out of 12, has an average score of 78%. Two selected SLOs for Speech 120 were assessed in most sections: the average for the "self-concept" SLO is 83%; the "teamwork" SLO is 69%. For Speech 140, the average score of the "group climate" SLO is 93%, and the score for the "decision making" SLO is 84%. For Speech 150, the average score for the "cultural behavior" SLO is 78%, and the score for the "relationship of culture and communication" SLO is 42%. For Speech 860, the average score for the "methods for finding potential employer" SLO is 83%, and the score for the "job interview" SLO is 91%.
Additionally, the faculty member who taught the Speech 150 class reflected on the low score for the SLO "relationship of culture and communication," and reported the root cause of the problem. He believed that the essay question he had written did not relate closely to the SLO, and he would refine the test question in the future.

For Spring 2009, the department has finished assessing Speech 860. It has partially assessed Speech 100, 11/112, 120, 140, and 150, and, as planned, will finish the assessment cycle by assessing all SLOs by the end of Spring 2009. Speech 855 had to be cancelled for Spring 2009 because of budget cuts—not due to low enrollment--and is thus excluded from this assessment round; note that the department was asked, *in Fall 2008*, to earmark one class for cancellation in Spring 2009. This reduced our course offerings. We note that Fall 2008 *"Successful Completion Rates by Section"* data indicate SPCH 855 had *enrolled and retained 25* students that semester, with a success rate of 72.0%.

b. Briefly evaluate the department's assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. If applicable, based on past SLO assessments, 1) what changes will the department consider or implement in future assessment cycles; and 2) what, if any, resources will the department or program require to implement these changes? (Please itemize these resources in section VII of this document.)

The method asks faculty of record to come up with percentages of student achievement for discrete skills that comprise a SLO. The flaws of this method are as follows. First, from a pedagogical standpoint, filling out percentages for discrete categories goes against the grain of holistic evaluation, that department faculty prefer. The SLO templates capture some elements of the student's performance on an assignment, for example--a speech event--but are reductionist in focusing only on specified elements. Second, from a practical standpoint, overall percentages of the discrete skills on the SLO templates are often incommensurate with the grade given by the instructor. After a critique is written and the grade assigned, the SLO grid that is retroactively filled out reveals the contradiction. Even when an evaluation is written in tandem with filling out the grid, the act of filling out the discrete SLO categories becomes intrusive, affecting our best, authentic evaluation of the student. Because SLOs quantify student effort and achievement, the singularity of the individual is denied and our integrity as

teachers is problematized. Third, HBA requirements or "16 hours by arrangement per term" that *complements course work but is not homework*—obliges students to put in one additional hour per week of instructor-supervised work but must not generate additional work for the faculty of record. To avoid violating a work condition, student assignments to fulfill HBA requirements are evaluated by Lab faculty, who are compensated for their effort. Lab faculty evaluate lab assignments, but the faculty of record must fill out percentages of achievement on the SLO template related to SLO #4, *Apply critical thinking skills when evaluating speeches.* To explain further, a student will turn in a typed critique after viewing the recorded speech; that self-assessment is graded by any available lab faculty member. *However*, the faculty of record must then look at that graded critique to determine percentages in the following discrete skills:

Evaluation describes speech event
Evaluation evaluates speech event
Evaluation uses evidence from speech event
Evaluation is cogently developed

It's difficult to retroactively quantify the lab faculty member's evaluation of your student's work. However, this situation could be easily remedied by having the lab faculty fill in this SLO for the faculty of record.

In light of these reservations, the department would like to develop a better instrument for assessing department SLOs by course. Resource requests in our Program Review submitted Fall 2008 articulated our faculty, classified, and instructional equipment needs. Of these prior requests, the Full Time Faculty Learning Assistance Coordinator and Full Time Instructional Aide for Speech Lab would, in their respective areas of expertise, share our workload for developing effective tools to measure student achievement. As we have not received the outcome of these past requests, we repeat them in section VII below.

c. Below please update the program's SLO Alignment Grid. The column headings identify the GE-SLOs. In the row headings (down the left-most column), input the course numbers (e.g. ENGL 100); add or remove rows as necessary. Then mark the corresponding boxes for each GE-SLO with which each course aligns. The definitions of the GE-SLOs can be found on the CSM SLOAC website: http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmsloac/sl_sloac.htm (click on the "Institutional" link under the "Student Learning Outcomes" heading.) If this Program Review and Planning report refers to a vocational program or a certificate program that aligns with alternative institutional-level SLOs, please replace the GE-SLOs with the appropriate corresponding SLOs.

GE-SLOs → Program Courses ↓	Effective Communication	Quantitative Skills	Critical Thinking	Social Awareness and Diversity	Ethical Responsibility
SPCH 100	X	X	X	X	X
SPCH 111/112	X	0	X	X	X
SPCH 120	X	X	X	X	X
SPCH 140	X	X	X	X	X
SPCH 150	X	X	X	X	X
SPCH 855	X	X	X	X	X
SPCH 860	X	0	X	X	X

III. **DATA EVALUATION** *(Data resources: Core Program and Student Success Indicators from the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness)*

a. Referring to the Enrollment and WSCH data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, what programmatic, course offering or scheduling changes do trends in these areas suggest? Will any major changes being implemented in the program (e.g. changes in prerequisites, hours by arrangement, lab components) require significant adjustments to the Enrollment and WSCH projections?

Evaluation of Fall Terms: There is a slight decline in enrollment from Fall 2005 to Fall 2007 (708 for Fall 2005, 686 for Fall 2006, and 675 for Fall 2007). The number of courses we offered remained more or less the same (26 for Fall 2005, 27 for Fall 2006, and 26 for Fall 2007). Enrollment and load changes in Fall terms were not significant, which led to steady Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH). Note that, in this document [see I above], Fall 2008 shows 25 sections; the reduction in offerings is due to mandated, across-the-board cuts due to budgetary constraints.

Evaluation of Spring Terms: It is important to note that the decline of enrollment from 738 in Spring 2006 to 675 in Spring 2008 was directly caused by the reduced department offerings. There were 30 sections in Spring 2006 but only 28 in Spring 2008. Despite mandated cuts in course offerings, our productivity increased dramatically from 451 in Spring 2006 to 480 in Spring 2008. Our Weekly Student Contact Hours correlate to the number of sections we offer. Note that, in this document [see I above], Spring 2009 shows 25.33 sections; the reduction in offerings is due to mandated, across-the-board cuts due to budgetary constraints.

Note: As discussed with the loss of SPCH 855 from spring 2008 course offerings, a mandated cut that was made one semester prior, the students, department, and college lost a course that demonstrated successful completion rates the semester before [25 students, rate of 72% success]. We believe that looking longitudinally at trends tends to ignore the reality of the loss of a section that was still nearly full at the end of term.

Evaluation of Summer Terms: It is exciting to see increased enrollment despite losing one section from the 2008 summer schedule. [Please see comment above, on the loss of sections. Loss of a summer section harms productivity, for Speech Communication retention rate is 85%, but is 94% in summer, and average success rate is 72%, but 87.3% in summer.] The department enrolled 218 in Summer 2006 with nine sections, but, by Summer 2008, we reached 236 in enrollment with only eight sections. Productivity went up because classes were more fully subscribed than before. WSCH remained steady during the three summer terms. Note that the published Summer 2009 schedule shows eight sections, a reduction from the nine sections that are sometimes offered.

The above trends support adding sections to both Spring and Summer terms. The department's numbers prove its higher-than-average retention and success rates. We strongly suggest, in addition to restoring classes already cut, adding two additional sections per term, or at least for Spring and Summer semesters, to enable the department to serve students, capture WSCH needed by the college, and develop into an outstanding program.

Finally, in addition to course enrollment for fall, spring, and summer, we must consider funds captured by our courses' HBA [Hours by arrangement] designation. Some history is in order. Vice President, Instruction, Shirley Kelly and Dean Susan Estes asked the department to include a HBA requirement for its classes because doing so would bring needed funds to the college and department, complement student course work and homework, and generate no additional work for the faculty of record. Speech Communication faculty struggled to honor HBA requirements because for years its lab could offer only 25 hours of operation for nearly 25 sections of classes. This is not to say that, despite the HBA obligation, all faculty participated by offering lab assignments to complement class work and homework [HBA work is considered supplemental and separate from class work and homework]. Even with expanded hours since January 2009 with the exchange with the Writing Center of a full-time instructional aide for our 48% instructional aide position, lab facilities and equipment cannot accommodate all students; for example, headcount from Fall 2007 indicates that 687 students needed to be served in the Speech Lab *each week* ["CSM Instructional Programs: Productivity Analysis, Fall 2003 vs. Fall 2007," *EMP 2008*, p.114]." Although we can receive no data from the college or district despite multiple requests, it is a given that the department generates WSCH by its HBA requirement for enrolled students [25 classes each semester as well as eight summer offerings].

We therefore suggest, as Speech Communication classes exhibit high retention and success rates in given semesters as well as over time, that the department's offerings be **exempted from mandated cuts**, that **classes already cut be restored**, and that **new, additional sections be added** in order to serve students and capture the WSCH this department has proven it can generate.

b. Referring to the Classroom Teaching FTEF data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, how does the full-time and part-time FTE affect program action steps and outcomes? What programmatic changes do trends in this area suggest?

Total Full Time Equivalent Faculty for the department has ranged from 12.1 to 11.87. FTEF for 2005-06 was 12.1 (62% full time), 12.67 (58% full time), and 11.87 (65% full time); these percentages are based on full time faculty assigned and does not include calculations for adjunct, overload, or reassigned time. We concede the numbers are better than College Totals for "percentage full-time:" 50%, 47%, and 51% for those same years. And while perhaps the prompt above contains a typo in asking about "*full-time and part-time FTE,*" regarding FTES, the numbers, for the above academic years combined, excluding summer, are: 190, 182.6, 185.8. These trends support the department's request for an additional full time, tenure track faculty position. Please see VII for details.

c. Referring to the Productivity data, discuss and evaluate the program's productivity relative to its target number. If applicable, what programmatic changes or other measures will the department consider or implement in order to reach its productivity target? If the productivity target needs to be adjusted, please provide a rationale. (Productivity is WSCH divided by FTE. The College's general target productivity will be recommended by the Budget Planning Committee.)

The target number for Productivity, Load, or WSCH/FTEF, is 525 WSCH, according to *EMP 2008*, p. 107. However, another document, "CSM Program Review: College Total," reveals that Total College LOAD was as follows over a three year period:

2005-06   502.8
2006-07   491.5
2007-08   512.0

Further, extrapolations of College Total Load are:

2008-09   511.3
2009-10   515.9
2010-11   520.5

The actual and projected numbers above, for College Total Load, are observed to be *below 525*.

Moving on from this point, *EMP 2008* explains, "A faculty member teaching 5 sections of Sociology, each section meeting for three hours per week with an average per section enrollment of 30 students, equals 450 WSCH/FTEF." The number 450 used in the example adheres closely to the overall Load for the Speech Communication Department, 460 ["CSM Instructional Programs: Productivity Analysis, Fall 2008 vs. Fall 2007," *EMP 2008*, p. 113]. Speech Communication courses have historically been capped at 29 students, so to have nearly 30 students at census will always be lower than the college target, 525.

Further, all courses offered by the department conceivably fulfill an "oral communication" requirement--roughly 30 minutes of solo or group speaking during the semester *per student*. With a class of 29 students, an "oral communication" commitment leaves little time for discussing speeches, as well as for lectures, class discussion, and collaborative work. We cannot accomplish course objectives and add more students beyond the historical number of 29. Logistically, our classrooms lack the capacity to seat 35 students, the number required to reach the WSCH target of 525. Unless the class were a straight lecture class—and none of our courses are designed in this manner [see *Official Course Outlines*]—we cannot achieve the target number. Ultimately, the target WSCH of 525 is insupportable from a pedagogical standpoint. The target WSCH Of 525 is insupportable from an ethical standpoint. Even if 35 students were enrolled in a speech course--and please note that 70-72% of CSM students test "below transfer-level" in English; see *Educational Master Plan 2008*, p. 11—high enrollment would likely reveal an inverse relationship with retention and success. Finally, the target WSCH of 525 is insupportable from a work conditions standpoint.

One important realization from *EMP 2008* is that Speech Communication is considered a Large Program ["CSM

Instructional Programs: Productivity Analysis, Fall 2003 vs. Fall 2007," p. 113]. The numbers verify the department's 6% growth in WSCH over a five year period, while the other Large Programs in our division-- English/Literature and English as a Second Language--registered declines: -6.8% and -9.7%, respectively. Further, when productivity is compared with other Language Arts Large Programs, the numbers are:

Speech, 460
English/Literature, 372
ESL, 349

Remaining departments in our division, with growth and productivity shown, are Medium Programs (Reading, - 34.9%, 714; Spanish within Foreign Languages, -26.8%, 410) and Small Programs (Film, -6.4%, 426; Italian, 28.2%, 412; ASL, 47.2%, 493; Chinese, -9.5%, 369; Japanese, -12.6%, 589; French, -1.0%, 370; German, -17.8%, 346; Journalism, -36.8%, 194).

Measures to improve department productivity:

• Research feasibility of developing a transfer-level survey course, Fundamentals of Communication, that articulates with four-year receiving institutions. Similar large lecture courses are offered at universities; one of our faculty members has taught a similar survey course, with an enrollment of 125 students [there were 2 teaching assistants as well]. A survey course would offset a lower enrollment of 29 in courses that blend theory and performance. Such a course would be commensurate with non-performance-based, survey courses in Psychology, which has ten and eleven sections of PSYCH 100, General Psychology or Sociology, which has ten and nine sections of SOCI 100, Introduction to Sociology [*Fall 2008* and *Spring 2009 Schedule of Classes*, respectively]. These programs are productive, as can be observed:

The Fall 2007 LOAD for Psychology, a Large Program, [26 sections, fall 08; 24 sections, spring 09) is 745 [*EMP 2008*, p 115].
The Fall 2007 LOAD for Sociology, a Medium Program, [18 sections, fall 08; 13 sections, spring 09) is 515 [*EMP 2008*, p.117].

• Based on WSCH analysis and considering the department's impact and contributions as a Large Program, exempt its course offerings from mandated, across-the-board cuts. Restore classes already cut.

• Based on being a productive Large Program, request two additional sections be added to the *Schedule of Courses* for fall, spring, and possibly summer terms, commencing in Spring 2010. Request that productive tenure track department faculty relinquish reassigned time for lab work or coordination, or else interview and hire new non-tenure track faculty, to staff additional sections.

• Relocate the Speech Lab to a larger space that better accommodates 687 student visits per week ["CSM Instructional Programs: Productivity Analysis, Fall 2003 vs. Fall 2007," *EMP 2008*, p.114]. Look at square footage, numbers of enrolled students, and resources consumed by each Language Arts lab, and use hard numbers to build an equitable allocation model. For example, "Statistics for Language Arts Labs, Spring 2008" reveals the Speech Communication Department enrolled 590 students,* recorded 2513 lab visits, was open 20 hours and 30 minutes per week, and was given 11 FLCs and 2 Lead Faculty, along with 9 hours of an instructional aide for staffing purposes. Its facility is 650 square feet. Analysis of resources distributed to other labs in the division indicates a larger lab would increase productivity of the Speech Communication program.

* The 590 number was calculated by using information available at census; however, PRIE indicates the number enrolled for Spring 2008 is actually **675** students, a number much higher than indicated.

Detail, *Statistics for Language Arts Labs*

Foreign Language Center
FLC   14.5 FLC
        3 lead faculty
        Instructional Aide (9 hrs/wk)

```
SF      650 sf


Reading/ESL
FLC     16 FLCs
        3 lead faculty
        Instructional Aide (48 hrs/wk)
        Tutors (5 hrs/wk)
SF      1500 sf


Writing/800 Lab
FLC     90 FLCs
        8 lead faculty
        Instructional Aide (94 hrs/wk)
        Tutors (50 hrs/wk)
SF      1800 sf


Speech Lab
FLC     11 FLCs
        2 lead faculty
        Instructional Aide (9 hrs/week)
SF      650 sf


Note that, since January 2009, the FLC and Speech Lab traded a 48% Instructional Aide position for one Full
Time Instructional Aide; as it is a shared position, FLC and Speech Lab each have 20 hrs/week of this position.
```

IV. **STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS** *(Data resources: Educational Master Plan;*
   "Success Rates," "Dimension" data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and
   Planning reports; other department records)

   a. Considering the overall "Success" and "Retention" data from the Dimension section of Core Program
      and Student Success Indicators, briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs
      relative to current, past, and projected program and college student success rates. If applicable,
      identify unmet student needs related to student success and describe programmatic changes or other
      measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success. (*Note that
      item IV b, below, specifically addresses equity, diversity, age, and gender.*)

"Retention" and "Success" data from 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 show the Speech Communication
Department's commitment to, and efficacy in, addressing student needs. At the same time, we acknowledge the
tension that can exist between retention and success (students are enrolled in, and complete, the course) and
integrity of instruction (students must demonstrate mastery of college- and university-level concepts and skills in
the course). According to *EMP 2008*, 70% of CSM students place into pre-transfer English [p. 31]; however, the
"recommended preparation" for all Speech Communication classes is "eligibility for ENGL 100." The numbers of
students who require basic skills and who self-place into our classes is a factor we cannot control. Perhaps related
to the numbers of students requiring remediation who enroll in classes without enforceable prerequisites, overall
course completion rate for the college is 72% [p. 31.]

Against this context and over a three year period for the Speech Communication Department:

• Average retention rate

Speech Communication: 85%
Speech Communication summer courses: 94%
Language Arts Division: 79.3%

• Average success rate

Speech Communication: 72%
Speech Communication summer courses: 87.3%
Language Arts Division: 63%

Projected retention and success rates for the Speech Communication Department for the next three years are as follows: for 2008-09, retention is 84% and success is 69%; for 2009-10, retention is 83% and success is 68%; and for 2010-11, retention is 82% and success is 66%. The projection is based on prior data from the 2005-2008, using simple linear regression trend analysis. Our department intends to maintain or improve rates of student retention and success to forestall future declines. However, average retention and success rates of Speech Communication courses indicate the department's practices are defensible and reasonable. Student success and retention must be understood against the context of academic quality and rigor of the course. The demands of students' lives must be understood against their ability to put effort toward mastery of course concepts and skills.

b. Briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs specifically relative to equity, diversity, age, and gender. If applicable, identify unmet student needs and describe programmatic changes or other measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success with specific regard to equity, diversity, age, and gender.

College of San Mateo's *Educational Master Plan 2008* [p. 40] reports that Ethnicity in San Mateo County breaks down in the following manner:

White, 46.7%
Asian, 25%
Hispanic, 23%
African American, 3.3%
Native American, 0.5%

EMP 2008 [p. 67] provides rates of successful course completion by ethnicity for *all* CSM courses:

Asian, 75.2%
White, 74.8%
African American, 62.5%
Pacific Islander, 64.5%
Filipino, Hispanic, Native American, 65%-66.6%

EMP 2008 states "The data inciate [sic] that most African American and Hispanic students place in the lowest level of mathematics and English courses. . . . African American and Pacific Islander students have the lowest course completions among ethnic groups at the College. [p. 20]" Disability is not referenced in *EMP*'s discussion.

However, *EMP 2008* speaks of our community's "various waves of innovation" and how "community colleges in the region has [sic] responded to each wave with new program offerings [*EMP 2008*, p. 20]." *EMP 2008* goes on to predict growth in Allied Health occupations. Consequently, the department refined its SPCH 860 course, Communication in the Workplace, in response to steady and guaranteed enrollment from CSM's dental assisting program. The department will propose a change to the course description to inform prospective students that SPCH 860 is geared towards the needs of this defined population.

Turning specifically to department numbers, IVb asks: *"Briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs specifically relative to equity, diversity, age, and gender."* In general, the Speech Communication Department observes variation along demographic variables in course retention and success. Below are course success rates, disaggregated by ethnicity (we assume this is what "diversity" means in the prompt), age, and gender:

Success rate by ethnicity

Asian students and "unrecorded," 79%

White students, 76%
Filipino students and "other," 71%
Hispanic students, 63%
African American students, 56%
Pacific Islanders, 53%
Native Americans, 50%

Success rate by age

19 and younger, 68%
20-24, 70%
25-29, 79%
30-34, 82%
35-39, 79%
40 and above, 75%

Success rate by gender

Women, 75%
Men, 67%

Success rates by ethnicity are systematically higher than the Language Arts Division and college as a whole.

As for retention in Speech Communication courses, however, we note higher rates of withdrawals in the following ethnic groups that tend to reflect trends at the level of the college:

African American, 44%
Native American, 50%
Pacific Islander, 48%

Our faculty designed the AFAM Project—linked courses and counseling—intended to increase retention and success of African American students and those interested in an African American emphasis, but this initiative was discontinued by the college. Our faculty submitted a similar program [State Chancellor's *Funds for Student Success*] that included instruction and counseling components for Pacific Islander students; while ranked highly by reviewers, it was put on a list of projects that the State CO would fund *if* funds were available. Both projects would be considered "innovative programs and services that address emerging community needs as identified in the Educational Master Plan and through other data and information sources, "1.1, Objectives for Goal 1: Programs and Services, *2008-20013 CSM Strategic Plan* [p.11]. While these Speech Communication initiatives "address the diverse learning needs of our students and implement innovative programs that address the needs of underrepresented and non-traditional students, "3.1, "Objectives for Goal 3: Diversity, *Strategic Plan*, [p. 21]," faculty require support in order to research, write, and submit competitive proposals; funding is required; and programs must be institutionalized by the college.

When IVb, above, mentions "equity," we understand that to mean that *all* students--regardless of ethnicity, age, and gender--have an equal chance of succeeding in, and completing, our courses. "Equity" as a term has been replaced by the more general designation, "student success," but the department is committed to the principles of both. Although the *Schedule of Courses* specifies recommended preparation prior to, or concurrent with, enrolling in Speech Communication classes, students will self-place regardless of academic preparedness or constraints in their work and personal schedules. Clearly, the department must take principled steps to improve student success in its courses regardless of student circumstance. We make the following commitment:

Commitment 1.

Department faculty must contact students or make use of Early Alert system when students have extended absences or exhibit difficulty in class. If appropriate, work with students' counselors, coaches, or programs such as DSPS and EOPS. This commitment pertains particularly to student populations whose success rate is

inequitable compared with those of other students.

Many department faculty already practice this commitment. We have discovered that contact information, such as phone numbers, is obsolete, necessitating mailing information to a home address. Further, student email addresses provided by the college sometimes do not work, and students do not check email as frequently as we expect. We have requested that contact information be updated via WEBSMART *each time* students register for courses. Students respond to phone calls and texts as opposed to email, so faculty should be diligent in communicating with students using these media.

Commitment 2.

Tenure track faculty must engage in marketing the department, particularly if we are granted two additional sections of potentially productive classes [see IIIc above, "Measures to Improve Productivity"], and target *non-traditional students.*

To support this emphasis, data from *EMP 2008* show that students from high performing high schools are declining in enrollment while students from continuation high schools are increasing. Despite these vagaries, we can assert with confidence that the fastest growing portion of our county's service area is 45 to 64 years of age ["Lifelong Learning," p. 18]. The mean age of CSM students is 29 [p. 48]. Targeting working and retired adults would be consonant with what *EMP 2008* identifies as an "opportunity." Curriculum could be tailored to support this age group. Further, since the age category of "40 and above" demonstrates high rate of success [75%] in our courses, this cohort could be predicted to have high retention rates, which would increase WSCH for the department. Thus, the department is in full support of Objective 2.2 in the *2008-20013 CSM Strategic Plan,* "Develop, implement, and institutionalize strategies to recruit prospective non-traditional students through enhanced relationships with K-12 schools, adult schools, local employers, and community agencies [p.17]."

The department is not turning away from its commitment to the traditional student cohort. A line from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges position paper, *"Student Equity: Proposals for Action,"* reads: "Since colleges now turn away significant numbers of students, are we turning away students whose goals are in fact more urgent while students with less pressing needs are admitted because neither admissions nor registration priorities nor funding formulas were written with this situation in mind." When compared with college and district efforts to court high school students through concurrent enrollment, the needs of working adult seem more urgent, as they retrain and reposition themselves against the exigencies of California's economic downturn.

V. **REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT SUCCESS** *(Data Resources: Educational Master Plan; "Dimension: Retention and Success" data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports; department records)*

a. Using the matrix provided below and reflecting on the program relative to students' needs, briefly analyze the program's strengths and weaknesses and identify opportunities for and possible threats to the program (SWOT). Consider both external and internal factors. For example, if applicable, consider changes in our community and beyond (demographic, educational, social, economic, workforce, and, perhaps, global trends); look at the demand for the program; review program links to other campus and District programs and services; look at similar programs at other area colleges; and investigate auxiliary funding.

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
Strengths	• Tenure track faculty meet or exceed minimum qualifications and have degrees from different graduate programs • Tenure track and non-tenure track faculty	• Students who intend to transfer, who are fulfilling IGETC requirements, who are retraining for employment, who are completing certain degree or certificate

	possess course specializations *and* can teach all courses in the program • Tenure track and non-tenure track faculty have collegial relationships • Department has dedicated space and resources for an operating Speech Lab • Department has consistently been granted internal and external funding for its initiatives • Department is committed to student success while maintaining quality in its course offerings	programs, or who seek personal enrichment take Speech Communication courses • Department awarded Outstanding Teaching Program Award, Western States, WSCA • Faculty awarded Master Teaching Award, Western States, WSCA • Faculty awarded Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' Diversity Award • Faculty awarded Faculty Association for California Community Colleges' Full-Time Faculty of the Year Award
Weaknesses	• Course cap traditionally set at 29; the number of students is high if the instructor honors the rule of 30 minutes speaking/per student for an Oral Communication course. • Faculty (all faculty) encouraged to add more students beyond cap to "make up" for those lost to attrition; however, Speech Communication courses have above-average retention rates. • Courses' "recommended preparation" is eligibility for ENGL 100; however, students self-place and 70-72% of students test into "below transfer-level" in English; see *Educational Master Plan 2008*, p. 11 • Differentiation in course objectives and expectations, as well as rates of student success, among Speech Communication classes • Lack of resources (full time tenure track faculty, full time staff, instructional equipment, see *Summary of Resources*, Section VII) for fully functioning Speech Lab that meets students' needs and fulfills HBA requirements; too few faculty hours in the Lab to assist or evaluate students and their work • Inequitable allocation model for space and resources (based on productivity) among labs	• Lack of participation/presence in regional (WSCA) and national (NCA, ICA) conferences due to severely curtailed professional development opportunities [no funds for travel] • Proximity to two colleges (Foothill, DeAnza) on quarter system with vibrant Communication Studies programs as well as to one two-year public college [CCSF] to the north; see *Educational Master Plan 2008*, p. 28
Opportunities	• Include Speech Communication courses as a Competency Requirement [other competency requirements are Math/Quantitative Reasoning and English] for CSM's Associate in Arts/Science Degree Requirements • Strengthen critical thinking component in SPCH 100, Public Speaking • College commitment to exploring "alternate delivery methods" and embracing "changing technologies" [*Educational Master Plan 2008*, p. 13; *2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan*, 1.2, in *EMP 2008*, p.	• CSU system. Since the majority of CSM students transfer to the CSU system, work to include SPCH 100 as an A3 Critical Thinking course [other A3 courses are ENGL 110, 135, 165, PHIL 103, and SOSC 111] for CSU GE requirements

	171], might result in an online or hybrid course, probably Interpersonal Communication • Research and possibly develop transferable course, Fundamentals of Communication, as an alternative to larger lecture courses offered by Psychology and Sociology	
Threats	• Loss of student enrollment to colleges within (Skyline, Cañada) and outside the district (Foothill, DeAnza, CCSF, Ohlone, Mission), in "Existing College of San Mateo Programs with 3-10 Competitors within 30 Miles," *Educational Master Plan 2008*, p. 146; in a 60-mile radius, there are 12 two-year college competitors, all within the CA Community College system [*EMP 2008*, p. 148] • Zero growth in number of full time, tenure track faculty in the department • Potential loss of full time, tenure-track positions in the department • Department is being pressured by college and district administration to develop an online course as part of a "comprehensive distance education associate degree program" ["Recommendations for Instruction: Action Steps for Instruction, Objective 2, Action Steps," *EMP 2008*, 125]. *EMP 2008* shows the successful completion rate differential of 19.1% and 23.2% between traditional coursework and online coursework, characterizing this as "of concern [p.103]." Even more pronounced is the disparity of completion rates, Fall 2007: Traditional courses, 70.6% Online courses, 47.4%	• State Chancellor's Office. Liability for illegal use of HBA monies; we have requested data numerous times on the funds generated by our department's participation in HBA • WASC. Burnout due to compliance activities generated by mandate

b. If applicable, discuss how new positions, other resources, and equipment granted in previous years have contributed towards reaching program action steps and towards overall programmatic health (you might also reflect on data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators). If new positions have been requested but not granted, discuss how this has impacted overall programmatic health (you might also reflect on data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators).

Speech Communication has not requested a full time, tenure track position for nearly 15 years, since the last hire in 1995. Presently, the department consists of four full time, tenure track faculty and three part time, non-tenure track faculty. Our Fall 2008 Program Review requested one full time, tenure track position for a new, dedicated Learning Assistance Coordinator position in the Speech Lab. The department recognizes our ratio of credit instruction [tenure track versus non-tenure track faculty] is good compared to other departments, but we require the new position to meet HBA obligations in the Speech Lab; a non-unique argument for this tenure track position is that department faculty feel overextended by compliance activities we are asked to undertake and that the workload for completing non-instructional duties is not shared by all faculty. Further, as a Large Program with high productivity, we would like to capitalize on our assets by generating more WSCH and developing a signature program at the college. Growth in the number of course offerings might bring productivity, but greater distinction for the department can only come about by securing needed personnel [see VII below,

"Summary of resources needed to reach action steps." As mentioned in IVb, above, the department designed and implemented the African American Student Recruitment and Retention Program, now discontinued by the college, and submitted a competitive proposal for a similar program designed for Pacific Islanders and those interested in studying Polynesian culture, but it is increasingly difficult to divide up the time of a small core of faculty among competing responsibilities and obligations.

The department's instructional equipment requests are minimal compared with those of other departments (English, Reading) in the Language Arts Division; our philosophy is based on moderation--to request only what seems to have a reasonable possibility of being funded.

VI. **Action Steps and Outcomes** *(Data resources: Educational Master Plan, GE- or Certificate SLOs; course SLOs; department records; Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports; Division work plan)*

      a. Identify the program's action steps. Action steps should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate <u>some sort of measurable action</u> and should connect to the Educational Master Plan, the Division work plan, and GE- or certificate SLOs.

Issue #1.

Faculty have invested countless hours in developing, measuring, tabulating, refining, and writing up the results of GE SLOs and course SLOs; however, the students enrolled in Speech Communication classes—for whom we have done this work—can neither state course SLOs, articulate the value of course SLOs, nor explain the relation of GE SLOs to course SLOs

Action step #1:

Develop a pre- and post-test for student self-assessment of mastery of SLOs. **By Fall 2009**, administer pre-test to all course sections at the beginning of the semester and follow-up by testing sections at the end of the semester. Enable students to view measurable differences between pre- and post-test results. Compare Speech Communication students' perception of GE SLOs with those collected in the "Community College Survey of Student Engagement," described in *EMP* 2008, p. 165.

Issue #2.

Faculty are dissatisfied with the reliability of the current method of assessing SLOs. As explained in IIb, "Student Learning Outcomes," above, the SLO templates are reductionist. Filling out the SLO template to collect data on individual student performance feels forced, whether completed *while* assessing the student or *after* the student has been assessed.

Action Step #2. Research best practices in SLO assessment using members of the Community College Interest Group, Western States Communication Association. **By Fall 2009**, complete research and develop new SLO assessment instrument. **By Spring 2010**, administer revised SLO assessment in all sections.

      b. Briefly explain, specifically, how the program's action steps relate to the Educational Master Plan.

EMP 2008 identifies in "Suggested Action Steps for Instruction:"

#25, "Complete the development of SLOs for all courses and certificates (target Fall 2008);"
#26, "Expand the assessment cycle so that all departments are assessing SLOs for courses and certificates;" #28, "Modify the curriculum and methods of instruction based on evidence presented by the assessment of SLOs" which seems identical with

#31, "Modify the curriculum based on evidence-based research and outcome measures."	

      c.   Identify and explain the program's outcomes, the measurable "mileposts" which will allow you to determine when the action steps are reached.

Please see VIa, "Action Steps and Outcomes," above.

VII. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS *(Data resources: Educational Master Plan, GE-SLOs, SLOs; department records; Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports)*

      a.   In the matrices below, itemize the resources needed to reach program action steps and describe the expected outcomes for program improvement.* Specifically, describe the potential outcomes of receiving these resources and the programmatic impact if the requested resources cannot be granted.

          *Note: Whenever possible, requests should stem from assessment of SLOs and the resulting program changes or plans. Ideally, SLOs are assessed, the assessments lead to planning, and the resources requested link directly to those plans.

Full-Time Faculty Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
The Department submitted the request for full-time faculty positions (below) in its Program Review (submitted Fall 2008); the unit has not received a response, although the deans needed to prioritize faculty position requests ["CSM Institutional Planning Calendar," *2008-20013 CSM Strategic Plan*, p.4]. Further, "mak[ing] a recommendation to College Council regarding the number of new faculty positions and other new classified . . . positions" is part of the annual budget planning cycle [Educational Master Plan 2008, p. 161]," so we consider the request pending. Full Time Faculty Learning Assistance Coordinator for Speech Lab (100%) The Learning Assistance Coordinator must meet the minimum qualifications or equivalencies and be authorized to	Discussed in Fall 2008 program review (below); we are awaiting a response. If granted: A Learning Assistance Coordinator with appropriate minimum qualifications is available, in physical proximity and range or communication to provide instruction and ensure the safety of students during the lab hours by arrangement. The Instructional Aide may assist the Learning Assistance Coordinator in working with students, but the qualified faculty member must be available, in physical proximity and in range of communication with the students. The Learning Assistance Coordinator needs to provide the supervision and control necessary for the protection of the health and safety of students (Title 5 Section 58056 (a)(2) and may not have any other assigned duty	Discussed in Fall 2008 program review (below); we are awaiting a response. Currently, to serve nearly 25 sections of students, the Speech Lab is open 25 hours each week, mostly during times classes are held [Monday-Thursday, 9-1:30; Friday, 10-12; Monday evening 5:30-6:20; Wednesday evening 5:30-6:20]. Hours are curtailed due to limited resources, which represent an impediment to student success and student equity. Faculty provide supervision for about 12 hours; a 48% Instructional Aide works half of his hours for the Speech Lab, or about 9 hours each week. The position would essentially enable us to meet our outcomes.

teach in the Speech Communication department.	during this instructional activity. [*HBA Regulations Update*, Elias Regaldo] If not granted: The program is out of compliance with state regulations on HBA. The Speech Lab has been allowed to marginally operate (while the District has received apportionment generated by HBA), given the number of sections and numbers of students the lab *should* serve each week.	

Full-Time Staff Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
The Department submitted the request for Full-Time Staff Positions (below) in its Program Review (submitted Fall 2008); the unit has not received a response, although the deans needed to prioritize classified position requests ["CSM Institutional Planning Calendar," *2008-20013 CSM Strategic Plan*, p.4]. Further, "mak[ing] a recommendation to College Council regarding the number of new faculty positions and other new classified . . . positions" is part of the annual budget planning cycle [*Educational Master Plan 2008*, p. 161]." **Update:** The Speech Lab and Foreign Language Center gave up a shared 48% instructional aide position and received a 100% staff position (January 2009). Note that this is a shared position between two labs, so the position request for a *Full Time* Instructional Aide is still pending. Full Time Instructional Aide for Speech Lab (100%)	Discussed in Fall 2008 Program Review (below); we are awaiting a response. If granted: Nearly 25 sections of students enrolled in Speech Communication courses will be able to fulfill their hour by arrangement (HBA) requirement of one hour over the course of 16 weeks (16 hrs). Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Section 55002(a)(2)(c), HBA entails that "students . . . be required to study independently outside of class time (homework)." The department, division, college, and district will be able to comply with its obligation to provide services to students fulfilling weekly HBA requirements. If not granted: Student success and student equity will be adversely impacted. The department, division, college, and district will be out of compliance with HBA requirements for which the college receives apportionment.	Discussed in Fall 2008 Program Review (below); we are awaiting a response. The Learning Assistance Coordinator would require some assistance, so we are submitting a request for a full time Instructional Aide for both logistical reasons (keeping the lab open) and by virtue of receiving simple parity of treatment with other labs. **New discussion not in Fall 2008 Program Review:** Fall 2007, for example, shows that the Speech Lab needed to serve 687 students each week who use college resources—ideally, faculty-supervised work and not independent work—to complete weekly HBA requirements for which the college receives apportionment.

b. For instructional resources including equipment and materials, please list the exact items you want to acquire and the total costs, including tax, shipping, and handling. Include items used for <u>instruction</u> (such as computers, furniture for labs and centers) and all materials designed for use by students and instructors as a learning resource (such as lab equipment, books, CDs, technology-based materials, educational software, tests, non-printed materials). Add rows to the tables as necessary. If you have questions as to the specificity required, please consult with your division dean. Please list by priority.

Resources Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
The Department submitted the request for resources (below) in its Program Review submitted Fall 2008; the unit has not received a response, although the deans needed to prioritize instructional equipment requests ["CSM Institutional Planning Calendar," *2008-20013 CSM Strategic Plan*, p.4]. Further, as with instructional and staff position requests, the annual budget planning cycle includes "operating budget development" and "current fiscal year monitoring [Educational Master Plan 2008, p. 161]," but the department has received no updates, and considers the request pending. **Update:** A department faculty member donated $1,000 to purchase camcorders to enable more students to videorecord speech rehearsals. We were able to purchase 3 units and will use remaining funds for supplies for the Speech Lab. **Update:** On March 13, 2009, the department received an email from our dean stating that we could spend roughly $1300 for equipment specified below. **Item:** Sanyo Xacti VPC-CG 9MP Flash Memory Camcorder with 5x Optical Zoom (New) **Number:** 5 **Vendor:** Amazon.com **Unit price:** $246.36 **Total Cost: $1231.80** **Item:** 4GB Extreme III SDHC (New) **Number:** 5	Discussed in Fall 2008 Program Review; we are awaiting a response. If granted: The Speech Lab would make substantial progress in serving 25 sections of students each week within the constraints of its space, which include two video recording booths. Presently, some instructors require students to videorecord a rehearsal session either individually or with a classmate; they then write a critique of the practice session or other their peer's rehearsal. Some instructors elect NOT to require rehearsal in the lab prior to the speech because of the limited hours of operation of the lab and the lack of resources. Both research and reason indicate that a recorded rehearsal, in an appropriate learning environment, would result in vital feedback to the student. The Flip Camera would complement the two fixed cameras in the booths in the lab, allowing greater flexible use of equipment outside of the Speech Lab. More instructors would require student video rehearsal and feedback PRIOR TO their slated performance in class. The equipment request is in tandem with the requests for a full-time Learning Assistance Coordinator (faculty position) and full-time Instructional Aide position, as both would enable the Speech Lab to	Discussed in Fall 2008 Program Review; we are awaiting a response. The Flip Camera compensates for the lack of adequate lab space to serve nearly 25 sections of students. Currently, there are 2 camera booths for recording and playback of student practice speeches. In addition, the booths are used regularly by ASL students and occasionally by other foreign language students. Students must use the booths during the Speech Lab's hours of operation (25 hrs/week). Presently, the video recording booths have cameras that use mini-DV/VHS technology. Flip Cameras would enable students to check out the camera for 15 minute periods for recording purposes. They would return to the Lab for viewing and/or to email the recording to their personal computer for playback. Flip Cameras would revolutionize the work of the Speech Lab. The Flip Camera records speeches in digital format with no need for blank DVDs or tapes. The recording can be played back on a computer by USB port or a television via RCA connector. Recorded speeches would be played back mostly through a computer for review with our students. After the speeches are viewed, lab faculty or staff would send the recording to the student by e-mail

Vendor: Amazon.com **Unit Price:** $24.00 **Total Cost: $144.00** **Item:** SanDisk SDHC Memory Card Bonus MicroMate Reader 4.0 GB (SDSDBR-4096-A10 (New) **Number:** 5 **Vendor:** Amazon.com **Unit price:** $39.95 **Total Cost: $199.75** **Complete Order: $1575.55**	remain open to serve students enrolled in Speech Communication Courses. Both individuals for these new positions would assist us in keeping the lab open and in assisting students in checking out the equipment. If not granted: The Speech Lab is unable to assist our students with committing to mandatory video rehearsals prior to their scheduled speech event. The lack of equipment and a controlled rehearsal and playback situation in the lab creates the impression in students that they could settle for what passes for practice in their own minds. The college, through its Speech Lab, has never had adequate facilities to support optimal learning in its Speech Communication classes.	and erase the recording from the camera. Future uses for the Flip Camera could include uploading center orientation speeches, talking tip sheets, staff training, classroom speech recording, and five to ten minute instructional clips.

* Status = New, Upgrade, Replacement, Maintenance or Repair.

VIII. **Course Outlines** *(Data Resources: department records; Committee On Instruction website; Office of the Vice President of Instruction; Division Dean)*

      a. By course number (e.g. CHEM 210), please list all department or program courses included in the most recent college catalog, the date of the current Course Outline for each course, and the due date of each course's next update.

Course Number	Last Updated	Six-year Update Due
SPCH 100	9/1/08	Fall 2014
SPCH 111	10/12/06	Fall 2012
SPCH 112	10/17/06	Fall 2012
SPCH 120	5/3/04	Spring 2010
SPCH 140	3/2/04	Spring 2010
SPCH 150	3/2/04	Spring 2010
SPCH 855	2004	Spring 2010
SPCH 860	10/9/08	Fall 2014

IX. **Advisory and Consultation Team (ACT)**

      a. Please list non-program faculty who have participated on the program's Advisory and Consultation Team. Their charge is to review the Program Review and Planning report before its submission and to provide a brief written report with comments, commendations, and suggestions to the Program Review team. Provided that they come from outside the program's department, ACT members may be solicited from faculty at CSM, our two sister colleges, other community colleges, colleges or universities, and professionals in relevant fields. The ACT report should be attached to this document upon submission.

Prof. M. Lee Buxton, Bellevue College
Dr. Frederick Corey, Arizona State University

College of San Mateo: Program Review and Planning 2009
General:

Overall quality of the review very high: clarity of direct responses to queries exceptional and supporting data accurately interpreted in support of proposals and evaluating strengths, weaknesses of the over all program as well as projections for future success of the program especially in terms of the Speech Communication Department's impact to the college's ability to meet student needs as a whole. In simple terms- in this time of austerity in our community colleges putting funds into this program will generate more value for the dollars spent.

Specific issues of note:

- Critical to establish a speech communication competency requirement: for transfer into four year programs and for existing 2 year programs to be inline with comparable speech communication programs in other colleges. (This would be especially pertinent with worker retraining.)
- The speech lab needs to come up to standards apparent in writing and reading labs- in staffing, equipment and space- to insure student access and success for set outcomes. Data supports a full-time position plus aides.
- Additionally: the speech lab is a powerful support for retention rates in student populations that are at risk.
- There is an opportunity in creating a lecture base introductory survey course (again-standard in most communication programs) that could be at a higher cap, plus- could be offered as a hybrid online option.
- Section VI a. must be addressed: pre- testing and post testing has been successful on other campuses and connecting to Western States Communication Association, Community College Interest groups insures continuity and saves the program the expense of "reinventing the wheel."
- Concerns: cutting courses that have high student enrollment and retention.

M. Lee Buxton
Bellevue College

Advisory Review

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessments

The overall design of the student learning outcomes is superior. Effective delivery, the ability to organize ideas through outlining, critical thinking, self-concept, teamwork, decision making, cultural behavior, and methods for finding future employers are foundational to student success. The assessment method, based on my understanding, could be improved in ways that benefit the students, faculty, and institution. Asking the faculty of record to assess the successful completion of the outcomes conflicts with traditional forms of "grading" or student evaluation. A more effective approach might be a "disinterested" strategy whereby a random sample of students are selected, the names of the students and the teachers are removed from the samples, and the performance is measured by potential employers, colleagues from sister institutions, or successful graduates of the college. The task need not be overwhelming; quick measures can be developed and the sample could be 15% of the students. With faculty buy-in, the feedback would be useful in refining the curriculum.

From an institutional perspective, particularly in a subject such as speech communication, it would be useful to compare pre-tests with post-tests. To extend the discussion of pre- and post-tests in the suggestion section of the report, on an outcome such as oral delivery, CSM students might be evaluated on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is the worst score and 5 the best. Average movement from, for example, 2 to 4, would indicate significant improvement and therefore a worthy investment. What would be most interesting would be to compare the results with nearby elite institutions. If, for example, students at exclusive public universities took the same test and received a 4 on the pre-test and a 4 on the post-test, the State would have data that would help decide where

public funds should be invested.

Most impressive, though, is the willingness of the faculty in the department to participate in the student learning outcome process. Clearly, the faculty are willing to ask not, "Did the student take the class?" but instead, "Is the student competent in the core areas?" This puts CSM ahead of many colleges and universities.

Productivity

Faculty productivity is a complex and controversial topic. In the School of Letters and Sciences at Arizona State University, we hold in balance instructional productivity with quantitative data on student success. English composition classes are capped at 22, as even 23 makes a difference in student success. Performance-based classes such as public speaking and first-year Spanish are capped at 24. We recently moved mathematics from a capacity of 19 to 40 when we discovered that 40 students being taught be a highly qualified math educator fare better than 19 students in a room with an instructor not trained in math education. Survey courses in beginning sociology, communication, and psychology can be taught in large sections of 200 if the professor is dynamic and supplemental instruction is available. In sum, we have found that productivity must be content determined. If the department needs to increase productivity, the idea of a survey course should be pursued so that the performance-based and writing-intensive courses can remain size appropriate.

Student Retention

It appears retention is measured by course completion, and that the students are more likely to complete the summer courses than regular fall/spring classes. I notice as well that a "weakness" is the proximity to two colleges who still use the quarter system. One idea you may want to consider is a "dynamic dating" approach to scheduling. If the traditional semester is 16 weeks, the semester could be divided into two eight-week sessions, with the intensity of each course doubled to meet contact hours and outside class requirements. This strategy can be particularly useful if one course is a prerequisite for another; the students can take the pre-requisite in the first eight weeks and the subsequent class, pending successful completion of the first class, during the second eight weeks. The students would need to be registered for the entire semester on the "headcount" day. This dynamic dating approach can be very student friendly and help expedite the completion of the associate degree, and it provides far more flexibility than a quarter system.

Personnel and Operations

The economy is in crisis, and institutions are having to make very difficult decisions about resources. My inclination is to focus on the core curriculum. It appears CSM is taking the same approach. Low enrollment, special interest courses in remote departments need to be discontinued so that the college is able to teach core areas such as composition, mathematics, biology, history, psychology, and communication.

Faculty hires are among the most important at the college. The faculty shape the curriculum, advance content and instructional strategies, and mentor students as future leaders. A committed faculty can help a college rise above economic turmoil, institutional challenges, and bring intellectual viability to a college.

As faculty, we must be asked to manage our own affairs. Staff support must be scrutinized carefully. Staff hires should be in support of the institution's integrity (e.g., accountants) and student success. The "Learning Assistance Coordinator" should be re-titled "Student Success Coordinator, and the description should clarify that the person should be committed to improving student performance, and if the increased performance is not manifest in one year, the position should be re-framed or eliminated. This evidence-based approach to hiring staff can be used to free additional resources for faculty hires.

Operations expenditures should also focus on the college's integrity and intellectual viability. In this regard, technology can be an excellent investment. State-of-the-art computers, audio-visual equipment, and document cameras can be used as instructional enhancements in face-to-face, hybrid, and online contexts. Three important

caveats on technology: 1) the technology should increase access to the college's resources so that previously excluded populations of students are able to be included in the educational programs; 2) the technology should increase the quality of the educational experience in measurable ways; and 3) the teaching of technology itself should be embedded in the curriculum because students, contrary to popular belief, have little more than an operational understanding of the gadgets they happen to own, and they need to develop a critical understanding of the roles of technology in the larger social context.

Summary

The program review of the Speech Communication Department is among the best I have ever read. The student learning outcomes are superior, and now the assessment process needs to be refined. Faculty productivity needs to hold in balance the success strategies for each course in question, and dynamic dating might be one strategy used to increase retention rates as a measure of student success. During these difficult times, faculty hire need to be strategic and in the best interest of the core curriculum, and staff and operations expenses should be based on measurable improvements in access, quality, and student success.

I have taught in the Hugh Downs School of Communication at ASU since 1986, and I understand the challenges involved in the everyday practice of teaching. In my current administrative role, I have a broader understanding of an institution's opportunities and challenges. The present program review represents a determined, intelligent optimism that will move this nation forward during these difficult times.

Frederick C. Corey, Ph.D.
Dean, University College
Director, School of Letters and Sciences
Arizona State University

b. Briefly describe the program's response to and intended incorporation of the ACT report recommendations.

Traditional SWOT analysis examines strengths and weaknesses as internal factors within an organization [the Speech Communication Department]; opportunities and threats as factors external to the organization [the Speech Communication Department].

Strengths [within department]
• Productive faculty, measured in terms of retention, success, and LOAD

Weaknesses [within department]
• Need for effective redesign of SLOs
• Need to develop standard pre- and post-tests for each course offering
• Lack of adequate faculty and staff positions
• Need to work to include Speech Communication course as Area C, Competency Requirement, for Associate in Arts/Science Degree Requirements [as opposed to Area E, General Education]

Opportunities [outside of department]
• Capture FTES through programming options not formerly considered, such as large lecture class or "dynamic dating," which require research of the following areas: successful past practice, articulation with four-year institutions, contractual issues

Threats [outside of department]
• College distribution of resources (number of courses, positions, funding) that is neither based on evidence nor measures of productivity, such as LOAD; see reviewers' comments on funding of labs and equipment, course cuts,

funded staff and faculty positions

Upon its completion, please email this Program Review and Planning report to the Vice President of Instruction, the appropriate division dean, and the CSM Academic Senate President.

Date of evaluation:

Please list the department's Program Review and Planning report team:

Primary program contact person:	Kate Motoyama
Phone and email address:	574-6676, motoyama@smccd.edu
Full-time faculty:	Yaping Li, George Kramm
Part-time faculty:	
Administrators:	
Classified staff:	John Saenz
Students:	

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

signed by Kate Motoyama, March 23, 2009

Faculty's signatures   *Date*

_____

Dean's signature   *Date*