



## PROGRAM REVIEW OF LABS AND CENTERS Pilot Review – Phase I

*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

Name of Lab or Center: **Speech Lab**  
Division: Language Arts

I. **GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE LAB\*** (*Data resources: CSM Course Catalog; Course Outline of Record; department records*)

\*Note: The term "lab" will be used to refer to centers as well as labs in this document.

a. Briefly describe the general purpose of the lab.

The Speech Lab provides support to students enrolled in all speech communication courses.

- Students videotape speeches, job interviews, or any other type of oral presentations *prior* to delivering speeches in class.
- Students view videotaped speeches *after being recorded in class*.
- Students write and submit analyses *after viewing* presentations videorecorded in class.
- Students complete a variety of lab modules that complement course material.
- Students research material for their presentations, using the internet or lab library materials.
- Students draft and print their outlines, essays, or responses to lab modules.
- Students schedule meetings with their partner or groups, including video rehearsals.
- Students work with speech faculty one-on-one, when lab faculty are available.
- Students are able to take a make-up exam under supervision.

b. List the courses that are linked to this lab.

Speech 100, Public Speaking  
Speech 120, Interpersonal Communication  
Speech 140, Small Group Communication  
Speech 150, Intercultural communication  
Speech 111/112, Oral Interpretation of Literature I & II  
Speech 855, Speech for Non-Native Speakers  
Speech 680, Communication in the Work Place

**II. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES** (Data resources: SLOs listed on Course Outline of Record; records maintained by the department; CSM SLO/Assessment Coordinator; SLO Website – <http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/sloac/>; “Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey”; other lab surveys.)

a. Briefly describe the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the lab.

After using the Speech Lab, the student will have been able to:

1. Rehearse and deliver effective dyadic, small group, or one-to-many oral presentations
2. View and evaluate recordings of dyadic, small group, or one-to-many oral presentations
3. Demonstrate mastery of course concepts through completion of lab modules

b. If an assessment of the lab’s SLOs has been completed, briefly describe this evaluation. Which support services for courses or programs were assessed? How were they assessed? What are the findings of the assessment? Based upon this assessment, what changes to the lab will be considered or implemented in the future?

The above SLOs are newly developed and have not been assessed. We may extrapolate anecdotally from data in the “Student Satisfaction Survey Quantitative Data: Spring 2009;” however, results cannot be disaggregated because the individual SLOs, below, were not included as prompts on the student questionnaire.

SLO #1. After using the Speech Lab, the student will have been able to rehearse and deliver effective dyadic, small group, or one-to-many oral presentations.

SLO #2. After using the Speech Lab, the student will have been able to view and evaluate recordings of dyadic, small group, or one-to-many presentations.

SLO #3. After using the Speech Lab, the student will have been able to demonstrate mastery of course concepts through completion of lab modules.

For the above SLOS, then, two questions from the quantitative data set are pertinent:

Question #11: “To what extent did our work in this lab help your academic performance in courses linked to the lab or supported by the lab?”

Very helpful:	67.2%
Somewhat helpful:	29.9%
Not helpful:	2.9%
Class not linked to lab:	2.1%

Question #12: “Based on your overall experience in the Speech Lab this semester, please indicate the extent to which you have made gains or progress in the following learning objectives identified below. I can:

	Progress	
	Major/Moderate	Minor/None
Express ideas and provide supporting evidence effectively orally	89.2%	10.8%
Comprehend, interpret, and analyze information I read	86.9%	13.1%
Express ideas and provide supporting evidence effectively in writing	85.7%	14.3%
Comprehend, interpret, and analyze information I hear	86.7%	13.3%

Question #11 reveals that 97.1% of respondents felt the lab was either very or somewhat helpful, 67.2% and 29.9%, respectively. This number also explains why students' self-assessment of improvement in communication skills, namely, speaking, reading, writing, and listening, were so high: 89.2%, 86.9%, 85.7%, and 86.7%, respectively. Specifically, the tools that contribute to success in oral communication classes are:

- video recording equipment for rehearsals prior to speeches and presentations
- video recording equipment for graded speeches and presentations in the classroom
- video playback equipment for critical analysis of speeches and presentations completed in the classroom

The ephemeral and charged nature of communication that is evaluated—whether it is dyadic, small group, or public communication—make it essential for students to see, accurately, their level of preparedness prior to speaking in class; their actual speaking in class; and, finally, to engage in reflective thinking about that effort.

Additionally, for the minority of students who were unhappy with the lab and its services, qualitative comments attribute this to lack of access to the lab and lack of adequate staffing. Question #3 from "Student Satisfaction Survey Quantitative Data: Spring 2009" asked, "Overall, was the lab staff helpful?" To this, 99.3% replied "yes" and .7%, or a single individual, replied "no." In a separate narrative comment section, one respondent stated, "*I had to rush from work and barely make it before the lab closed so I got an annoyed instructor rushing me to finish my work so that they could close the lab and go home.*" A similar, more detailed comment is included in another section: "*The hours for the lab are not at all convenient for those who work. It was only open 1 day a week at a time when I could make it for 20 min. When I needed more time than 20 min I was not able to complete what I needed to.*" In Spring 2009, there were only two evenings when the Speech Lab was open until 6:20 pm, and the instructors staffing the lab both taught a 6:30 pm evening class.

Speech Communication students perceive mastery and success as linked with the ability to rehearse and view video recordings of their dialogues, speeches, or presentations; further, they use the lab to complete class or supplemental work. Therefore, when asked to discuss findings from assessment and programmatic changes planned in the lab, our reply is that, to serve our students equitably, we require faculty or classified staffing to keep the lab open to meet student needs.

c. If SLOs were assessed for courses or programs using the lab, briefly describe this evaluation. What are the findings of the assessment? Based upon this assessment, what changes to the lab will be considered or implemented in the future?

<p>SLOs by individual courses, Total Averages, below, with caveats noted:</p> <p>SPCH 100, Public Speaking, Total Averages, Spring 2009, Sections AA, AD, AH, AM, JA, JC <b>Instructors did not submit for AE, AF, AG, AJ, AK. No submissions for Fall 2008.</b></p> <p>SLO #1: Write coherent speech outlines that demonstrate the student's ability to use organizational formats with a clear specific purpose.</p> <p>Outline based on specific purpose: 84%</p>
--

Outline thesis properly expressed: 78%  
Outline mastery of outlining symbols: 81%  
Outline is logically coherent: 71%  
Outline includes intros, transitions, conclusions: 71%

SLO #2: Incorporate sound reasoning and evidence that support claims the student makes in the body of the speech outline/speeches.

Claims logically developed: 78%  
Claims supported with explanations: 76%  
Claims supported with cited research: 62%

SLO #3: Deliver speeches to inform and/or to persuade integrating visual aids effectively.

Successful paralinguistic delivery: 81%  
Successful kinesic delivery: 80%  
Effective use of visual aids, if used: 86%

SLO #4: Apply critical thinking skills when evaluating speeches.

Describes speech event: 79%  
Evaluates speech event: 79%  
Uses evidence from speech event: 77%  
Cogent development: 78%

SLO #5: Adapt presentations to the audience based on situational, demographic, and psychological audience development.

Accommodates to physical situation: 82%  
Adapts to audience demographics and BAV: 82%  
Adapts to constraints in the speaking situation: 83%

SLO #6: Describe, evaluate, and apply selected theories of rhetoric and/or communication theory.

Describe rhetorical and communication theory: 66%  
Evaluate theory when presented with an original example: 69%  
Apply theory to a selected example: 65%

SPCH 111 & 112, Oral Interpretation of Literature I & II, Spring 2009

**Instructor did not submit for Spring 2009**

SPCH 120, Interpersonal Communication, Fall 2008, Sections AH, AM, AN, JE; AR eliminated because of faculty resignation. **Instructors did not submit for AC, AD, AF, JA, JC. NOTE: ONLY SLOS #2 & #5 ASSESSED IN FALL.**  
Spring 2009, Section JF, AL, AN submitted all SLOs except for SLO #2 & 5; instructor for Section BA submitted only SLO #2. Instructors did not submit for Sections AD, AG, AP, BA, JA, JC.

SLO #1: Explain the basic elements of the communication process in interpersonal settings.

Understanding of sender and receiver: 77%  
Message: 78%  
Feedback: 75%

Role of noise in communication: 75%  
Environment: 75%

SLO #2: Recognize the self-concept development process, its multidimensional identity and its role in communication.

Understood self-concept as a development process: 80%  
Understood the definition of self-concept: 84%  
Understood how self-concept influences communication behavior: 87%  
Used life experiences to show the multidimensional identity role, such as race, religion, etc.: 67%

SLO #3: Analyze physiological, social, and cultural factors that affect perception and misunderstanding.

Able to analyze physiological factors in perception: 84%  
Social factors: 85%  
Cultural aspects: 85%  
Identify the causes for misunderstanding: 81%

SLO #4: Analyze the nature of language and nonverbal messages as they apply to effective and ineffective encoding and decoding of a message.

Able to analyze symbolic nature of language: 76%  
Language as barrier or bridge: 74%  
Impact of nonverbal messages: 77%  
Analyze communication effectiveness caused by effective or ineffective decoding: 72%

SLO #5: Apply learned skills and communication theories in teamwork activities.

Participated with openness: 85%  
Demonstrated listening and speaking skills: 79%  
Showed empathy to diversity in personalities and work styles: 61%  
Understood role emergence and showed commitment to task: 74%  
Able to assess/evaluate peer work: 48%

SLO #6: Evaluate relational theories in terms of students' own experiences.

Able to apply relational theories in own relationships: 81%  
Able to evaluate own communication effectiveness: 81%  
Able to assess others' effectiveness in communication: 80%

SPCH 140, Group Communication, Total Averages, Fall 2008, Section AA  
**Instructor did not submit for Spring 2009**

SLO #1. Analyze a group discussion based on the transactional model of communication and definition and elements of communication competence.

Recognize and understand the transactional model: 96%  
Recognize and identify the elements of communication competence: 79%  
Impact of transactional model on group presentations: 64%  
Analyze presentation on transactional model and elements: 75%

**SLO #2: Instructor did not submit**

SLO #3: Elaborate on the task and social dimensions of a problem-solving group.

Recognize advantages of working in small groups: 79%

Recognize disadvantages of working in small groups: 71%

Understand leadership role in small group function: 79%

SLO #4: Discuss the pros and cons of competitive and cooperative group climates.

Understand definition of leadership: 100%

Understand the different leadership roles within a group: 86%

Understand how competitive or cooperative group climates can move or hinder group development: 88%

How does the individual's position in the group affect the group's climate: 100%

SLO #5: Apply the four major perspectives of leadership to different group situations.

Apply trait theory: 68%

Apply styles theory: 68%

Apply situational theory: 64%

Apply functional theory: 82%

SLO #6: Evaluate how different methods of group decision making, critical thinking (including errors), and creative problem solving techniques can affect a group in its decision making.

Understanding different methods of decision making and problem solving: 100%

Understand role emergence and shared commitment to group function: 86%

Participated in problem solving techniques to benefit the group: 75%

Showed empathy to diversity when working with others in decision making: 76%

Evaluated and assessed peer presentations: 86%

SPCH 150, Intercultural Communication, Total Averages, #SLO 1 & SLO #4, submitted Fall 2008 for Section AA; SLO #2, SLO #3, SLO #6, submitted Spring 2009 for Section AA. **SLO #5 removed from raw data by instructor.**

SLO #1: Explain the relationship of culture and communication using a model of intercultural communication.

Culture defined: 41%

Communication defined: 36%

Cause and effect argument both ways articulated: 0%

Data from models used for substantiation of claims: 58%

Writing quality is clear: 76%

SLO #2: Differentiate between the macrocultures and microcultures within the US and discuss the influence they have upon one another.

Definition of culture (micro-): 44%

Define culture (macro-): 67%

Example of macro-and micro-cultures: 92%

Influence on each other: 67%

SLO #3: Distinguish between attitudes, beliefs, and values and critically analyze different value orientations.

Beliefs, values, and attitudes: 78%  
Collectivism or individualism: 73%  
High or low power distance: 100%

SLO #4: Discuss overt and covert cultural behaviors that manifest in the form of prejudices, discrimination, and ethnocentrism to increase self-awareness of factors that contribute to these social ills.

Definition and example of prejudice: 84%  
Definition and example of ethnocentrism: 88%  
Definition and example of discrimination: 81%  
Reasons for these social ills: 59%

**SLO #5: Instructor removed this material from raw data**

SLO #6: Demonstrate how different cultures use verbal and nonverbal communication.

Low and high context—be able to recognize differences: 76%  
Nonverbal indicators: polychronic and monochronic: 89%  
Nonverbal indicators: emotion and deception: 83%  
Nonverbal indicators: space (Mexico & US): 59%

SPCH 855, Speech for Non-Native Speakers, Total Averages, Section AA, Fall 2008

SLO #1: Explain proven methods for finding potential employers and researching information about them.

Sender/receiver 83%  
Verbal/nonverbal 83%  
Feedback and channels 81%  
Context 74%

SLO #2: Analyze audiences' demographics.

Age/generation: 82%  
Sex/gender: 79%  
Race/culture 77%  
Religion/strong beliefs: 71%

SLO #3: Deliver informative and persuasive speeches.

Vocal clarity/expression: 86%  
Eye contact: 87%  
Dynamism: 80%  
Comprehensibility: 83%

SLO #4: Perform job interview with skills.

Preparedness and confidence: 80%  
Clear answers with examples: 80%  
Knowledge of target job: 79%  
Created quality question for the job: 85%

SLO #5: Use critical thinking in persuasion/debate.

Use/interpretation of data: 63%  
Reasoning: 63%  
Pros/cons included: 63%  
Ability to assess others' argument: 68%

SPCH 860, Communication in the Workplace, Section A1, Spring 2009. **SLOs #4 and #6 removed by the instructor.**

SLO #1. Explain proven methods for finding potential employers and researching information about them.

Contact groups: 88%  
Noninterview interview: 75%

SLO #2. Describe and recognize the 7 factors that employers look for when interviewing a job candidate.

Aggressiveness: 88%  
Rational thought process: 100%  
Communication: 75%  
Maturity: 88%  
Record of success: 100%  
Planning: 88%  
Reaction to pressure: 100%

SLO #3: Skillfully field job interview questions that relate to the 7 factors that employers look for when interviewing a job candidate.

Aggressiveness: 76%  
Communication skills: 81%  
Record of success: 69%  
Rational thought process: 64%  
Maturity: 70%  
Planning/Organization: 73%  
Reaction to pressure: 58%

**SLO #4: Instructor removed this material from the raw data.**

SLO #5: Skillfully deliver an assertion (DESC) message.

Oral final: 81%

**SLO #6: Instructor removed this material from the raw data.**

SLO #7: Explain and perform the 4 parts of a door opener (from People Skills text) to help another open up.

Oral final: 56%



The quantitative data above represents a step forward in measuring SLOs for all speech communication courses; that being said, inconsistencies in data collection render the data unreliable at best. Not all instructors submitted SLOs for their courses; SLOs were partially submitted, sometimes for one semester, sometimes for the other, or else data was insufficient as a sample size for the class; instructors likely had multiple interpretations of SLOs as they related to student performance and achievement in their classes.

Additionally, the instructional aide did not log individual hours devoted to SLOs this semester; however, he and one faculty member together spent five hours producing the results above for section IIc. The aide estimates he spent 30-50 hours on tasks related to SLOs, and that much of that time was devoted to setting up the spreadsheets and entering data when individual faculty happened to submit it. Often the sheets that came in were lacking section numbers or semesters. Speech Lab coordinators are unable to do this volume of work without the assistance of an instructional aide, nor does .2 reassigned time each semester compensate for the nearly 30 hours spent researching and producing this program, review in addition to regular coordination duties in the lab.

- d. Using the results from the “Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey,” summarize the findings in the grid below on how students rated their progress on general education Student Learning Outcomes.

The column headings identify the GE-SLOs. The first row headings indicate the matrix/scale students used to self-assess progress.

GE SLOs→ Matrix/Scale:	Effective Communication	Quantitative Skills	Critical Thinking	Social Awareness and Diversity	Ethical Responsibility
Major Progress	87% (percentage includes major and moderate progress)	71.9%	84.1%	85.8%	81.5%
Moderate Progress	--	--	--	--	--
Minor Progress	13% (percentage includes minor and no progress)	28.1%	15.9%	14.2%	18.5%
No Progress	--	--	--	--	--
Does Not Apply to Lab					

- e. If general education Student Learning Outcomes have been measured using another type of assessment, such as student surveys, summarize the findings in the grid below

on how students rated their progress on these Student Learning Outcomes. (Please identify data sources.)

Not applicable. The Speech Lab did not use any other type of assessment other than "Student Self Assessment and Satisfaction Survey," 7/6/09.

GE SLOs→	Effective Communication	Quantitative Skills	Critical Thinking	Social Awareness and Diversity	Ethical Responsibility
Matrix/Scale:					
Major Progress					
Moderate Progress					
Minor Progress					
No Progress					
Does Not Apply to Lab					

III. **DATA EVALUATION** (Data resources: "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys; "Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring 2009"; "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" for department(s) using lab obtained from the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness – see website at [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program\\_review.html](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html).)

- a. Referring to all lab usage data available, evaluate the proportion of students using the facility versus the potential population of users. If data is available, indicate the number of users and specify whether this is a duplicated or unduplicated count. If applicable, discuss programmatic, course offering or scheduling changes being considered as a result of lab usage projections? Will any major changes being implemented in the program (e.g. changes in prerequisites, hours by arrangement, lab components) require significant adjustments to lab operations?

As stated in IIIb, if 674 students were enrolled in spring 2009 speech communication classes, and if, for one semester (17.5 weeks), we can use 16 weeks as the time frame of actual student usage of the lab, the total would be 10,784 visits per semester.

However, "Speech Lab Usage: Spring 2009" shows the total visits to be 2,718 visits, with the following breakdown per instructor:

Kramm	5 classes	455 visits
Li	4 classes	907 visits
Motoyama	4 classes	739 visits
Paoli	5 classes	6 visits
Perry	1 class	62 visits
Reed	3 classes	267 visits
Rope	3 classes	282 visits

The Speech Department website, which contains lab modules that may be electronically accessed and delivered

to the lab, registered 6,756 pageloads, of which 3,447 were unique, 2,851 were first-time visitors, and 596 returning visitors.

These numbers are to be taken under advisement. Speech faculty, if they require students to use the Speech Lab at all, can assign perhaps 5 activities at the most be completed during the semester. This is due to the minimal coverage by faculty and staff due to lack of resources and the logistics of the space, which is 600 square feet. The hours of the lab combined with the hours of the Foreign Language Center represent the fewest number of open hours of labs within the division. Moreover, there is a range of quality in the assignments given using the Speech Lab; students consistently named the video recording of rehearsals, video recording of class presentations, video playback of rehearsals and class presentations, and critical analysis of those speech events to be *the* most important component of their learning in oral communication classes. Some modules could easily be accomplished in class, as opposed to sending individual students to the lab for their completion.

- b. **Discuss staffing of the lab. Obtain FTE data for classified and certificated personnel assigned to staff the lab (available from division deans). Evaluate the current data and departmental projections as indicated on the “Core Program and Student Success Indicators.” 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? If student assistants work in the lab, discuss hours of employment, job duties, and how they support program services and scheduling.**

For four academic years [2005-06 through 2008-09], 11-13 units were assigned for Lab staffing each semester, in addition to 2-4 units for coordination. The Speech Lab received nine hours of an instructional aide’s time per week, sharing the aide with Foreign Language Center (nine hrs per week), except during one semester, Spring 2009, when the lab received a full time instructional aide to staff these two centers (20 hours per week each). The lab has not made use of student assistants in the past.

As indicated by the “Core Program and Student Success Indicators,” enrollment declined a combined 10% during the same four-year period [2005-06 to 2008-09]. Enrollment for 2005-06 was 1,446, but, by 2008-09, was 1,310. The decline was caused by *reduced course offerings*, from 57 sections in 2005-06 to 50 sections in 2008-09—a loss of seven sections or rate of reduction of about 13%. The commensurate loss of students from 2005-06 through 2008-09 is 10%--again, due to the reduced number of sections.

Using spring 2009 enrollment data at census, the Speech Lab needs to serve 674 students per week which, if multiplied by 16 weeks [roughly the length of one semester, which is 17.5 weeks], would total 10,784 visits. Programmatic change implied by longitudinal data is that lab staffing, both in the form of instructor- and instructional assistant-hours, should increase to accommodate enrollment in speech communication classes. Further, the lab should utilize student assistants to support faculty and the instructional aide.

- c. **Report on student satisfaction as indicated in the “Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey” and, if applicable, as indicated in other student surveys.**

From “Student Satisfaction Survey Quantitative Data: Spring 2009:”

Question #2: “Overall, how would you rate the quality of the lab services you received?”

Excellent	61.0%
Very Good	32.6%
Good	4.3%

Fair	2.1%
Question #3: "Overall, was the lab staff helpful?"	
Yes	99.3%
No	.7%

IV. **STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS** (Data resources: "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys; "Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring 2009"; "Educational Master Plan, 2008" – see website at [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional\\_documents.html](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional_documents.html); student success data from departmental "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" – see website at [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program\\_review.html](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html); previous Program Review and Planning reports; other department records.)

- a. Based on findings from the "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey" and other student surveys administered by the lab, briefly describe how effectively the lab addresses students' needs relative to overall 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.)

Please identify the survey instruments used and the number of respondents.

According to "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey" results,

93% of respondents [132 out of 141] rated the quality of the Lab service as very good to excellent  
99.3% [139 out of 140] believed that the staff was very helpful  
95.7% [135 out of 141] found the procedure for using the lab was clear and easy to follow  
97.2% [137 out of 141] understood what lab activities were expected out of them.

In addition, the following results report the extent to which the Speech Lab addresses students' needs:

91.5% of respondents [129 out of 141] reported that the Lab was available always or most of the time  
97.8% [137 out of 140] were able to get help always or most of the time  
84.2% [48 out of 57 of those who had chosen individual meetings with faculty found those meetings very helpful while 15.8% [9 of the 57] found the experience somewhat helpful,  
for a total of 100% satisfaction for students finding one-on-one consults to be very or somewhat helpful  
96.4% [101 out of 115] were able to access learning resources always or most of the time  
97.1% [133 out of 137] believed that their work in Speech Lab greatly helped their academic performances in courses linked to the Lab.

The above results may explain slightly higher student success rates in speech communication classes as compared to college-wide rates. "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" reported the retention rate for speech communication classes was 85% from academic years 2005-06 through 2007-08 [82% college-wide], and the success rate for speech communication classes was between 74%-71% for that same time period [68.4% college wide].

A programmatic change the department will consider as a result of this data--particularly the 100% satisfaction rate with one-on-one consults with faculty—is requesting more than the 13 units allotted to faculty staffing of the Speech Lab each semester. Increased faculty staffing would better accommodate--to use our past example--the 674 students enrolled in our classes in spring semester 2009.

- b. Briefly discuss how effectively the lab addresses students' needs specifically relative to equity, diversity, age, and gender. If applicable, identify unmet student needs and describe programmatic changes or other measures that will be considered or implemented in order to improve student success with specific regard to equity, diversity, age, and gender.

The "Student Profile/Student Satisfaction Survey" reveals no gender and age differences in retention and success rates. However, Hispanic and Pacific Islanders have the highest non-success rates, 22.4% and 31.6% respectively. Non-success rate for these two populations college-wide is significantly higher, 38.6%, and 39.2% respectively.

Three Speech Communication faculty members—George Kramm, Yaping Li, and Kate Motoyama--will participate in Basic Skills Initiative-affiliated project to work with counselors and faculty from other divisions to help students better succeed. Realistically, considering our students' underpreparedness for collegiate work and the competing obligations in their lives, the small amount of monies relative to need that the system has allocated for the BSI, and CSM's recent cuts--including elimination of our instructional aide--substantive improvements in retention and success are unlikely.

V. REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT SUCCESS *(Data Resources: "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys; "Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring 2009"; "Educational Master Plan, 2008"; "2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan" – see website at [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional\\_documents.html](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional_documents.html); student success data from departmental "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" – see website at [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program\\_review.html](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html); previous Program Review and Planning reports; department records; other environmental scan data.)*

- a. Using the matrix provided below and reflecting on the lab relative to students' needs, briefly analyze the lab's strengths and weaknesses and identify opportunities for and possible threats to the lab (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 lab; review program links to other campus and District programs and services; look at similar labs at other area colleges; and investigate auxiliary funding.

Note: Please indicate the source of the data that was used to complete this section.

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty who staff the lab receive consistently high student evaluations in the classroom; we can infer that they bring discipline expertise and immediacy skills to their duties in the lab.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Speech Lab has received recognition regionally (WSCA) and nationally (NCA) as a resource in teaching and learning in the field of communication studies.</li> </ul>

<b>Weaknesses</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Speech Lab has accepted an inequitable allocation model for labs within the Language Arts Division.</li> <li>• Faculty are inconsistent in requiring students to honor HBA requirements.</li> <li>• Some lab modules test lower levels of student learning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>
<b>Opportunities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Speech Lab coordinators could identify and tap funding sources outside of the college.</li> </ul>
<b>Threats</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inequitable cuts to the lab due to the state’s worsening economy could continue or worsen, leading to elimination of Speech Lab.</li> </ul>

- 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).

This question has been answered in section IIIB, which reads:

*Using 2008-09 enrollment data, the Speech Lab needs to serve 674 students per week which, if multiplied by 16 weeks [roughly the length of one semester], would total 10,784 visits. The programmatic changes suggested by longitudinal data are that lab staffing, both in the form of instructor- and instructional assistant-hours, should increase. The lab should make use of student assistants to support faculty and the instructional aide.*

The department made repeated requests for a new faculty line but more recently has argued the importance of a full-time faculty position in the Speech Lab [a “Student Success Coordinator,” following the recommendation of an outside reviewer for the department’s *Comprehensive Program Review*]. The department has, in both the *Program Review*, submitted Fall 2008, and the *Comprehensive Program Review*, submitted Spring 2009, requested a full-time classified position to support the full-time faculty position in the lab. In the past, the lab has either had no instructional aide, which was changed to a 25% position (9 hours for the Speech Lab), which was then improved to a 50% position (20 hours for the Speech Lab), and which was most recently zeroed out as of July 2009. The two full-time positions for Student Success Coordinator and Instructional Aide are justified by the numbers: 674 potential student visits per week, or 10,784 per week.

- VI. **Action Steps and Outcomes** (*Data Resources: “Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey”; other lab surveys; “Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring 2009”; “Educational Master Plan, 2008”; “2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan” – see website at [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional\\_documents.html](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional_documents.html); student success data from departmental “Core Program and Student Success Indicators” – see website*)

at [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program\\_review.html](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html) ; previous Program Review and Planning reports; department records; other environmental scan data.)

- a. Identify the lab's action steps. Action steps should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to the "Educational Master Plan, 2008"; "2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan"; the Division work plan; and GE- or certificate SLOs.

A single action step will restore the viability of the Lab. The Lab's instructional aide was cut as of July 2009. Without instructional aide hours, there remain 13 units of faculty time for lab operation [includes supervising equipment use, modules, consultation], severely curtailing hours of operation.

Action Step #1. By summer 2009 and in light of chronic underfunding of the lab, restore at least a 50% time instructional aide in the Speech Lab.

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

The SLOs presented in IIa are as follows. After using the Speech Lab, the student will have been able to:

1. Rehearse and deliver effective dyadic, small group, or one-to-many oral presentations
2. View and evaluate recordings of dyadic, small group, or one-to-many oral presentations
3. Demonstrate mastery of course concepts through completion of lab modules

The *Educational Master Plan 2008* states that 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 requiring basic skills who enroll into our classes directly affects their retention and course completion rates.

Yet, qualitative data from "Student Satisfaction Survey Narrative Comments: Spring 2009" for Question 13-- "Which activities or services in this lab did you find helpful? (Please explain)"--reveal that, of 104 respondents to this question, 82 respondents *directly* named video recording and playback of practice and actual speeches and presentations to be helpful. Four respondents who referred ambiguously to "video" in their comments, could be added to this 82 to total 86 out of 104 respondents who attest to the value of the lab in achieving these 3 SLOs. A sample from the 86 comments is provided:

*"The ability to video tape oneself was especially helpful (if embarrassing) because it allowed one to examine oneself in order to improve speaking skills."*

*"Teachers were always giving me the help I needed to complete my outlines for the course. Seeing myself after being recorded, it sort of took time to watch myself, but it did help a lot. I began to realize some physical impacts the nervousness had over me, and eventually I was aware of it when I was giving a speech in class."*

*"Recording myself speaking was very revealing and motivated me to be more rehearsed and prepared."*

*"The video recording and playback was the most helpful for my enrichment in this course."*

*"Videotaping myself and watching it afterward gave me a good look at what I need to improve."*

*"Being able to see my speeches (in the private room) allowed me to adjust my high level of fear before giving the speech in front of my class. I learned how to use gestures while I speak."*

*"I had to video tape myself and see my speech. This helped me know how I present myself in front of others. So I became aware of my talk, speech, gestures, clarity, eye contact. I think this was really helpful."*

*"Viewing my speeches, I have made significant changes to my old style based on the viewing."*

*"The video part and the computers, allowed time to work on the speech, and allowed us to prep with fewer nerves, making the speeches easy."*

Zeroing out staff time for a lab that has the capacity to serve 674 student per week--let alone students who require remediation in reading, writing, and critical thinking—is a betrayal of the *1960 Educational Master Plan* (not to mention the system's commitment to BSI). This document promised access to a higher education to all wishing to benefit from it. But access is a hollow promise without even marginal resources, such as those required to minimally operate a lab that enables students to fulfill 3 lab-affiliated SLOs by

- (1) video recording rehearsals prior to the scheduled speech
- (2) video recording and then viewing speech events recorded in class, *which constitute the basis for the grade that student received from that assignment*
- (3) writing a reflective analysis after viewing the speech, and having that completed lab module be evaluated by a faculty member.

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

Action Step #1. The action step is related to the lab's viability and continued survival. It is a support service for students enrolled in all speech communication courses offered at the college or 674 students weekly. The action step will have been reached when

- a data-driven allocation model for Language Arts labs is adopted as the basis for decision-making in the division
- a 50% time instructional aide is restored to the Speech Lab as of the start of Fall 2009

VII. **SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH LAB ACTION STEPS** (*Data Resources: "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys; "Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring 2009"; "Educational Master Plan, 2008"; "2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan" – see website at [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional\\_documents.html](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional_documents.html) ; student success data from departmental "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" – see website at [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program\\_review.html](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html) ; previous Program Review and Planning reports; department records; other environmental scan data.)*

- a. In the matrices below, itemize the resources needed to reach lab 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 lab changes or plans. Ideally, SLOs are assessed, the assessments lead to planning, and the resources requested link directly to those plans.**

Faculty Time 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 lab action steps based on SLO assessment.
<p>The Department submitted the request for full-time faculty positions (below) in its Program Review submitted Fall 2008 as well as in the Comprehensive Program Review submitted Spring 2009; 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.</p> <p>Full Time Faculty Learning Assistance Coordinator for Speech Lab (100%)</p> <p>The Learning Assistance Coordinator must meet the minimum qualifications or equivalencies and be authorized to teach in the Speech Communication department.</p> <p>Further, in the Comprehensive Program review, one reviewer suggested a name change from “Learning Assistance Coordinator” to “Student Success Coordinator:”</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p>Discussed in Fall 2008 Program Review as well as the Comprehensive Program Review submitted Spring 2009; we are awaiting a response to both documents.</p> <p>If granted:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 during this instructional activity.</p> <p>[HBA Regulations Update, Elias Regaldo]</p> <p>If not granted:</p> <p>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 <i>should</i> serve each</p>	<p>Discussed in Fall 2008 Program Review as well as the Comprehensive Program Review submitted Spring 2009, for we are awaiting responses.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>New discussion not in Fall 2008 Program Review:</b></p> <p>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.</p>

<p><i>the increased performance is not manifest in one year, the position should be re-framed or eliminated.</i></p>	<p>week.</p>	
--	--------------	--

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 lab action steps based on SLO assessment.
<p>The Department submitted the request for Full-Time Staff Positions (below) in its Program Review (submitted Fall 2008) as well as in the Comprehensive Program Review (submitted Spring 2009); 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].”</p> <p><b>Update:</b> The Speech Lab and Foreign Language Center gave up a shared 48% instructional aide position and received a 100% staff position (January 2009) because the Language Arts Dean was able to persuade the Writing Center/English 800 Lab to make the switch. Note that this new arrangement is a shared position between two labs, so the position request for a <i>Full Time</i> Instructional Aide is still pending.</p> <p><b>Update:</b> In May 2009, after one semester of sharing a 100% Instructional Aide, Speech Lab and Foreign Language Center coordinators were informed that our staff position had been eliminated due to managed hiring. Further, we</p>		

were informed by the dean that these labs could not expect any classified support for academic year 2008-09. The Speech Lab lost 20 hours of staff support.		
---	--	--

- 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 lab action steps based on SLO assessment.
No request.		

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

VIII. **Course Outlines – for labs that are discrete courses** (*Data Resources: department records; Committee On Instruction website; Office of the Vice President of Instruction; Division Dean*)

- a. If applicable to the lab, list by course number (e.g. CHEM 210) 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.

Not applicable.

Course Number	Last Updated	Six-year Update Due

Upon its completion, please email this Program Review of Labs and Centers 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 of Labs and Centers report team:

Primary program contact person: Kate Motoyama  
Phone and email address: 574-6676, Motoyama@smccd.edu

Full-time faculty: Yaping Li

Part-time faculty:

Administrators:

Classified staff:

Students:

---

---

---

---

---

*Faculty's signatures*

*Date*

*Dean's signature*

*Date*