

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

1. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM:

The 2010-2011 *College of San Mateo Catalog* describes the program as follows: "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 [p. 199]." Speech 855 (Speech for Non-Native Speakers) is credit-bearing but non degree-applicable, so the units count for the purposes of financial aid but not toward the AA/AS degree. Speech 860 (Communication in the Workplace) is a required course for the Dental Assisting Program that also benefits students who wish to improve their work force skills.

2. Based on the elements in your *Core Program and Student Success Indicators* (provided by PRIE for each program) and the goals stated in your most recent Program Review, please identify any key successes and challenges.

Speech Communication continues to have similar retention and success rates:

Retention:	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	85%	85%	88%
Success:	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	71%	71%	74%
Withdraw:			2009-10
			12%
LOAD:	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	470	495	514

Given the demands of students' lives, their preparedness for the courses taught plus the rigor of the courses themselves, the retention and success rates seem reasonable. The 2008-09 Program Review stated, "[C]onsistent with the rest of the College, Speech Communication has student withdrawal levels at around 20% or higher among the traditionally underrepresented students;" however, 2009-10 Successful Course Completion Rates show overall withdrawals as 12%, a marked improvement in the reduction of withdrawals. The department has been working closely in 2009-10 with Head Coach Bret Pollack, and will continue to collaborate to problem solve and offer special seminars and tutorials. It has been a worthwhile relationship, and anecdotal evidence shows increases in attendance, retention, and student success.

Speech Communication's LOAD shows an upward trend, from 470 [2007-08] to 495 [2008-09] to 514 [2009-10]. The trend likely reflects Speech faculty trying to accommodate students who have increasing difficulty finding courses due to budget cuts. As discussed in previous program reviews, the increase in numbers enrolled has drawbacks: "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" requirement 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." [Speech Communication Comprehensive Program Review, 2008-09, p. 6 and Speech Communication Annual Program Review, 2008-09, p. 1].

The Speech Lab, a mandatory component to fulfill HBA requirements for all courses, is usually a valuable resource for Speech students. Students use the lab to videotape presentations, view their speeches, and consult with faculty, to name its primary aims. **BUT** limited human and material resources create **DIFFICULT** problems for students and faculty. Consider the Speech Lab hours of operation for Fall 2011:

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
9:00- 4:00	9:00-5:30	9-4:00	9:00-6:20	9-2:10
<i>Peter: 9-12 Brayan2-4</i>	<i>Peter:1-5:30 Brayan: 10-4</i>	<i>Peter:9-12 Brayan2-4</i>	<i>Peter:1-5:30 Brayan: 10-4</i>	<i>Peter:9-12</i>

The total hours the Speech Lab is open each week is 36.75. The lab, serving 49 sections in academic year 2009-10, has limited hours. Evening classes, in particular, are disadvantaged as well as students carrying a full load of courses who must squeeze in lab activities between classes while attending to work or family responsibilities.

A related problem is staffing. The Speech Lab has no instructional assistant (classified staff) to assist with lab operations. Within the Language Arts Division, we are the only lab without an instructional aide. Also, the Lab is at times staffed exclusively by student assistants, who should work under supervision of a faculty member or an instructional aide. Yet, the department is productive within the division and, further, Spanish courses, with whom we share staffing

resources, should increase our share of FTES (HBA dollars)—an increase not represented in our numbers below.

	FTES/LOAD
READING	77.1 551
ESL	244.2 406
ENGLISH	658 453
SPEECH	195.5 514

Of the Lab's 36.75 hours, faculty are present for 17 hours. Too often, while there, faculty help students with uploading videos, teach camera operation, and perform low-level chores that take time away from answering course-related questions or evaluating student HBA work. Even worse, Lab hours are not reliable for students—especially in the afternoons—because the student aides who keep the lab open cannot sometimes be present. Much of the Lab's equipment-- computers, monitors, digital cameras--is unattended at times. Because of these concerns, Speech faculty reduced HBA-related lab assignments to the bare minimum. A specific example is the two video recording booths in the Lab to accommodate 49 sections of students each academic year. Finally, material resources, namely six-year-old Mac computers and cassette video cameras, are obsolete, non-operational, or malfunctioning. Even four Zino computers, purchased in 2009-10, required frequent service calls to ITS.

Goals from the 2008-09 Annual Program Review identified the following:

- 1) Research feasibility of developing a transfer-level survey course to increase department productivity and/or offer more Speech 120 courses. The justification for the goal would be to help increase [sic] retention. For instance, speech 120 tends to have less attrition than speech 100. If more students can stay in their classes, we will be able to alleviate the budget challenge for students in a small way.
 - 2) Relocate the Speech Lab to a larger space that better accommodates students (Ongoing)
 - 3) Continue to assess SLO's in the department (Ongoing)
 - 4) Look for means to keep the Speech Lab open when funding is minimal (via using volunteers, setting up possible student scholarships, continued advocacy for help, etc.)
3. Are you on track for meeting the goals/targets that your program identified in its most recent Program Review? If not, please explain possible reasons why. If needed, update your goal/targets based on these reasons.

1) The department has not made progress towards developing a lecture-based survey course. However, one of our faculty has volunteered to develop a lecture-based SPCH 120 course, and we look forward to this addition. The department also agreed that a new course added in Fall 2011 with Measure G monies would be a SPCH 120 course (it has the best enrollment and retention rates). Over the years, Speech Communication has lost nearly 1/3 of its course offerings, so an additional section of Interpersonal Communication is a strategic choice.

2 & 4) The faculty is involved in discussions and decisions to move the Speech Lab to Building 10N. In addition to a spacious new facility, bond dollars are dedicated for the purchase of equipment such as computers, digital cameras for all Speech faculty, and four or five dedicated videotaping booths (also digital) in close proximity to Building 10N's Learning Center. The purchase of new equipment would eliminate problems discussed earlier. Moreover, a full-time Learning Center Coordinator (faculty position), Learning Center student

assistants, and, possibly, Learning Center Instructional Aides (classified positions), would augment the limited hours of the Speech Lab instructors. It has also been mentioned that the Speech Lab will be able to hire a half-time dedicated Speech Lab instructional aide to supplement hours provided by Speech faculty and our student assistants (we hire only Work Study students, paid out of Federal funds, to save the division money).

3) Department faculty receive reminders that each person is responsible for submitting and inputting SLO data for his or her classes. Our SLO data is submitted in the spring of the academic year. This year, we have identified key SLOs to track in each course with multiple offerings, such as SPCH 100 and SPCH 120 (discussed in item 6a below).

4. Have you identified any new goals or projects for the program to focus on during this next year? Please explain (grants, stipends, initiatives, etc.).

One project that has come upon us rather suddenly is the department's name change and, relatedly, the alignment of our curriculum with the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC). As one of the first three disciplines statewide to have developed an approved TMC template, we are moving ahead with our name change, from Speech Communication to Communication Studies (approved by Committee on Instruction, February 10, 2011) and submitting course updates to COI for all courses, which include name and numbering changes aligned with courses identified in the TMC.

Another project is the conversion of one section of SPCH 120 (Interpersonal Communication) to a lecture-based curriculum. A different mode of instructional delivery will offer options to students and a lecture-based course will generate additional WSCH for the department and college. A related project, to be completed in the next few weeks, is submitting a Trustees Program Improvement Grant proposal to begin developing a hybrid or online course for SPCH 100 (Public Speaking). SPCH 100 would then be part of an "online GE package" that would accommodate student needs as well as the needs of the college and district. For our part as faculty, we intend to insure that any curricular changes are pedagogically sound.

Furthermore, the move to Building 10N, the opening of the Speech Lab [Fall 2011], and the purchase of new equipment for classroom and lab use will require every faculty member to adjust his or her personal practice as an instructor. The department will continue to work with consultants and technical specialists to ensure the learning environment complements students' speech coursework.

Finally, we have observed a significant difference in retention and success rates between the regular semester [Fall 2009, 88% and 73% and Spring 2010, 89% and 76%] and summer semester [Summer 2010, 96% and 91%]. We will analyze the variable of *level of academic achievement* as a factor in retention and success, once PRIE provides the data, projected to be April 2011.

5. Are there any critical issues you expect to face in the coming year? How will you address those challenges?

Our department has a good ratio of credit instruction taught by full-time to part-time faculty. Even so, the amount of work outside the classroom—such as writing this program review—is formidable. We do not anticipate any faculty retirements or resignations. Sadly, if a full-time faculty leaves, it is *ideal and yet unlikely* that tenure track position would be replaced. If a part-time faculty leaves service, it would be difficult to replace any of the three faculty the department and college have come to rely on. Either scenario would deeply influence and

likely harm our department's sense of community. We would like to protect our department as we move into an uncertain future [to wit, the Legislative Analyst's Office's and Governor Brown's proposals for the System]. We have sat in meetings prioritizing position requests of one-person departments or departments with no full-time faculty or departments with ratios of credit instruction that are the reverse of ours. We have also received notice of approval of positions requests by College Council and Cabinet--many times justified by regulatory necessity--and have felt distraught. Our program, which has been recognized as a *department* and for its *teaching*, cannot advance without a strong core of permanent faculty.

Budget reductions and loss of sections of our courses (*1/3 of our courses over time*) have forced us to adopt a scheduling strategy that has worked thus far. Namely, after all faculty, full- and part-time, receive their assignment, we ask that full-time faculty take an overload as opposed to hiring additional part-time faculty--who may not be scheduled the following semester. The full-time faculty have also discussed with part-time faculty that, should budget reductions eliminate courses in their 60% load, any summer assignments would be given to "make up" the difference. We understand this to mean two summer courses, not one (financially, not a feasible option).

But the bottom line is that our department cannot afford to lose more courses. Already, there are fewer options for students as well as for our instructional faculty.

The question of how to address these critical issues is difficult to answer. Our department has worked together to solve its problems and has a history of effective advocacy over the years. We will address these issues collegially, as they arise, but discussions that are likely to occur in yet another difficult budget year will affect morale and productivity.

6. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs) AND ASSESSMENT FOCUS FOR THIS YEAR:

- a. Academic areas: Identify at least one course SLO on which to focus. Describe the assessment strategies you will use and your method of reflection and documentation for this cycle.

With the submission of 2011 SLO data, we will be able to perform a linear regression analysis based on two years' prior data. Only two of our courses are offered in multiple sections, SPCH 100 (Public Speaking) and SPCH 120 (Interpersonal Communication). SLO #1 has been selected for SPCH 100:

Write speech outline that demonstrates proper organizational components
Linked to GE SLO Effective Communication

Assignment: Informative or persuasive speech

Use A, B, C, D, F; if Y = 4.0, N = 0
Outline's thesis/important ideas are properly expressed
Outline shows mastery of outlining symbols
Outline is logically coherent
Outline includes intros, transitions, conclusions

SLO #2 has been selected for SPCH 120:

Recognize the self-concept process and its multidimensional identity and its role in communication

This SLO could be measured by a self-definition speech or essay

Use A, B, C, D, F; if Y=4.0, N=0

- b. Student services areas: The department has not given this much thought. We do want to understand, from a counseling point of view, whether there is a difference between SPCH 100 (Public Speaking) and SPCH 120 (Interpersonal Communication) for transfer purposes. While we have added additional sections of SPCH 120 due to student need and its historic record of strong enrollment and high retention, the TMC clearly positions SPCH 100—Public Speaking—as the only mandatory course in its curriculum. SPCH 120 --Interpersonal Communication—is simply one among several options in TMC’s List A. It is a reminder of the centrality of public speaking in the speech curriculum.

7. **SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS**

(Data resources: Educational Master Plan, 2008, Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011, College Index, 2009-2010, 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.
N/A		

Classified 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.
This is a standing request. We were told, however, that at		

least a half-time Instructional Aide (.48) would be hired for the new Speech Lab in B10N.		
---	--	--

- 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 instruction (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.
N/A. New equipment will be purchased with dedicated bond money. Discussions are in progress with Media Services and Instructional Technology Services.		

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

8. PROGRAM REVIEW PARTICIPANTS AND SIGNATURES

Date of this *Annual Update for Program Review and Planning* evaluation:

Please list the department's *Annual Update for Program Review and Planning* report team as appropriate:

Primary program contact person: Kate Motoyama
Phone and email address: 574-6676
Full-time faculty: George Kramm, Yaping Li, Pat Paoli
Part-time faculty: Lisa Perry, Karen Reed, Charles Rope
Administrators: Sandra Comerford
Classified staff:
Students:

<i>Primary Program Contact Person's Signature</i> By Kate Motoyama	<i>Date</i> 2/17/11
<i>Full-time Faculty's Signature</i> By Kate Motoyama	<i>Date</i> 2/17/11
<i>Part-time Faculty's Signature</i> (as appropriate)	<i>Date</i>
<i>Administrator's Signature</i> (as appropriate)	<i>Date</i>
<i>Classified Staff Person's Signature</i> (as appropriate)	<i>Date</i>
<i>Student's Signature</i> (as appropriate)	<i>Date</i>
<i>Dean's Signature</i> By Sandra Comerford	<i>Date</i> 2/17/11

**Annual Program Review
RESOURCES FOR SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

This section contains a listing of sources for data and key documents referred to in this *Annual Update* along with other resources. Contact information for relevant people is also included.

Academic Senate

<http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/academicsenate/>

Contact: csmacademicsenate@smccd.edu

Diana Bennett, President, bennettd@smccd.edu, (650) 358-6769

College Catalogs and College Class Schedules are archived online:

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/schedule/archive.asp>

Course Outlines are found at:

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/articulation/outlines.asp>

Committee on Instruction

<http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmcoi>

Contact: Laura Demsetz, Chair, demsetz@smccd.edu, (650) 574-6617.

Program Review Resources (includes forms, data, and completed program reviews for both instructional and student services program review)

Core Program and Student Success Indicators (see links for "Quantitative Data for Instructional Programs")

Distance Education Program Review Data

Glossary of Terms for Program Review

Listing of Programs Receiving Program Review Data from PRIE

Rotation Schedule for Instructional Program Review, 2008-2014

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review.php

Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE)

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/>

Contact: John Sewart, Dean, sewart@smccd.edu, (650) 574-6196

Contact: Milla McConnell-Tuite, Coordinator, mcconnell@smccd.edu, (650)574-6699

At PRIE Website:

College Index, 2009-2010, http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php

Comprehensive Listing of Indicators and Measures, 2009-2010

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php

Division/Department Workplans, Spring 2009 (only)

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php

Educational Master Plan, 2008, <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/emp.php>

Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) website:

<http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/sloac/>

Contact: Frederick Gaines, Interim SLO Coordinator, gainesf@smccd.edu, (650)574-6183