

Learning Support Centers Program Review

Program Name: **Communication Studies Resource Center**

Program Contact: **Motoyama, Kate**

Academic Year: **2016-2017**

Status: **Submitted for review**

Updated on: **10/03/2016 08:48 PM**

1. Description of Center

Provide a brief description of the center and how it supports the college's [College Mission and Diversity Statements](#), [CSM Strategic Goals 2013/14 to 2015/16](#), and other [Institutional Program Planning](#) as appropriate. What is the center's vision for sustaining and improving student learning and success over the next three years?

The Communication Studies Center supports students enrolled in Communication Studies courses. Students use the center to video record individual or team presentations, view and evaluate recorded in-class presentations, meet with student partners and teams, and receive one-on-one help from professors with subject matter expertise. The Communication Studies Center "promote[s] academic excellence" and "improve[s] student success" as a "responsive, high-quality program" [*College Mission Statement; College of San Mateo Strategic Goals: 2013-14-2015-16*]. Its resources provide a dynamic learning environment that encourages "multiple perspectives and the free exchange of ideas" [*Diversity Statement*]. *5 in 5 College Strategies*, a discontinued college initiative, will not be examined here.

Discussion:

- *Promotes academic excellence.* The center enables meaningful, rigorous application of principles of good speaking and listening across different contexts; students, in turn, better succeed in coursework and gain the liberal education that gives life its bearing. Academic excellence *informs* and *precedes* student success.
- *Improves student success.* The center conceives of student success as an outcome of academic excellence. Students have credited [video recording capabilities](#) (in the classroom and at the center) as integral to their academic achievement in communication studies courses; video recording and viewing of student speeches is a best practice in communication studies, according to the National Communication Association (NCA). Students have validated this practice by correlating center usage with success in course work [*Narrative, Student Survey, Spring 2015 & Fall 2015*].
- *Responsive, high-quality program.* The center aligns with best practices in the discipline. Communication labs and centers are more common at universities (CSU San Jose, CSU Long Beach, Stanford University, are examples in California). We are represented in the National Association of Communication Centers (NACCC), along with University of Colorado, Indiana University, Michigan State University, University of Washington, and so on; in a number of cases, CSM's center has superior resources for Communication Studies students, offering digital video recording, playback on a dedicated server, and longer, more consistent hours of operation (due to sharing space within the Learning Center). At other universities, students are required to purchase subscription services to store and view classroom presentations, but Media Services and ITS devised a system using QuickTime and a dedicated server to bypass additional costs for students.
- *Encourages multiple perspectives and the free exchange of ideas.* Capaciousness of mind developed in center users is difficult to measure, but students reported large gains in "work[ing] effectively with others of diverse backgrounds" and "acknowledg[ing] the value of diverse opinions and perspectives" [*Summary Data, Spring 2015 & Fall 2015*]. For our part, center staff recognize students' different needs, learning styles, cultural practices, and academic preparation. We listen to student suggestions and reflect on student interactions with the goal of expanding access to center services. "Access" is more than physical access; it is manifest in the center staff's openness in interactions with students. Expanded access as thus defined encourages students' perspective-taking and individual expression. Protecting access--especially for underserved populations--gives voice to students' "multiple perspectives" [See Section 2B1].

While Communication Studies Center resources are intended for COMM students, they are, in fact, used by any student who logs in for service at the Learning Center; lines of demarcation are erased because our center is coterminous with the Learning Center. COMM students must use our 20 MACs to view digital recordings; four Mac-enabled video recording booths are used for rehearsal of presentations. On any given day, most students using our center's MACs are non-COMM students and, to a lesser extent, non-COMM students also use the video booths. Center staff attend to the requests and questions of *all* students. The center is thus an "efficient use of resources"--but, perhaps, at the expense of our COMM students and our center staff [*College Mission Statement*].

In the next three years, the Communication Studies Center would like move towards excellence by improving conditions in four recording booths, training a new full-time Instructional Assistant (shared with the Learning Center), and employing more Student Assistants at the center. The request is modest and in

keeping with "promot[ing] all learning labs and centers" [College of San Mateo Strategic Goals: 2013/14 to 2015/16]. The request has been submitted multiple times.

2. Student Learning and Center Data

A. Discuss Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Reflect on recent SLO assessment results for the center. Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement. Specify how SLO assessment informs center development and changes to the center.

Spring 2016 SLO Assessment Results [TracDat] are as follows:

PLO 1 Students will have knowledge of Communication Studies Center resources, including how to access them [NEW]:

| SP 2016 | SP 2014 | SP 2013 | |
|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------|
| 3.9 | -- | -- | (Rubric: 4 = A; 3 = B; 2 = C; 1 = D) |

PLO 2 Students will be able to rehearse and deliver effective dyadic, small group, or one-to-many oral presentations [former PLO 1]:

| SP 2016 | SP 2014 | SP 2013 | |
|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------|
| 3.57 | 3.5 | 3.25 | (Rubric: 4 = A; 3 = B; 2 = C; 1 = D) |

PLO 3 Students will be able to view and evaluate effective dyadic, small group, or one-to-many oral presentations [former PLO 2]:

| SP 2016 | SP 2014 | SP 2013 | |
|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------|
| 3.26 | 2.9 | B* | (Rubric: 4 = A; 3 = B; 2 = C; 1 = D) |

PLO 4 Students will be able to demonstrate mastery of course concepts through completion of lab modules [former PLO 3]:

| SP 2016 | SP 2014 | SP 2013 | |
|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------|
| 3.51 | 2.5 | B* | (Rubric: 4 = A; 3 = B; 2 = C; 1 = D) |

Discussion:

All PLOs *exceeded* the set criterion, 2.0 or C, as in past program review cycles. There is some imprecision in the data points, as the Spring 2014 program review referred only to "SLO #2 and #3 dropp[ing] from B to C." It attributes the lower results to students "skipping lab assignments towards the end of the semester" and proposed that center assignments have earlier completion dates. This alteration may have improved Spring 2016 results for new PLO 3 and new PLO 4.

It stands to reason that highest mastery is observed in new PLO 1 (3.9)--being based on "knowledge" of resources and their usage (there are no tests of "knowledge" or usage, and center staff is always willing to assist). But while nearly all Communication Studies faculty require student rehearsal at the center [new PLO 2 (3.57)], a number of faculty do not utilize digital recording capabilities in the classroom--despite each being equipped with a MacIntosh laptop, digital camera, and tripod. This directly affects new PLO 3 (3.26, the lowest of four PLOs), as students cannot "view and evaluate" the "dyadic, small group, or one-to-many" classroom presentations for which they earn grades. COI-approved six year updates to all course outlines [September 8, 2016] include the expectation that classroom video recording be used so students may view at least two interactions, discussions, or presentations that receive instructor grades. The video record makes instructors accountable for their evaluations of student speech events.

Use of digital recording across all sections would increase center usage, justifying the shared staff position, in particular [see Section 1, 2C, 4B, 4B3]. These recordings would also enhance student performance, as many of the students' narrative comments have attested, improving student achievement.

Finally, the department's practice had been an annual SLO assessment of multi-section courses (such as COMM 110 and COMM 130), with a third year comprehensive SLO assessment of *all* courses (also including COMM 140, COMM 150, COMM 170/171). Annual assessment was a way to intervene and then measure whether an identified weakness could be ameliorated. We lack this longitudinal view of degree and certificate SLOs *and* center PLOs, and any modification of SLOs or PLOs (such as the mandated addition of new PLO 1) also problematizes extrapolations from the data.

B. Center Usage Indicators

1. Review center usage and discuss any differences in student success indicators across demographic variables.

Refer to [Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness \(PRIE\) reports](#), SARS records, and other data sources as appropriate.

Center Usage Numbers

| | Unique SP16 | Repeat SP16 |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Accudemia: | 590 | 7,702 |
| PRIE: | 1,128 | -- |

Discussion:

The previous program review noted significant increases in center usage "in the last three years," and this year is no exception. The Communication Studies Center recorded 590 unique users and 7,702 repeat visits [*Usage Report by Location, Spring 2016*], an average of 13.05 visits per user. By contrast, PRIE data reveals a total of 1,128 users; no repeat visits are provided in this report [*Student Profile, Spring 2016*].

Both counts are relevant. Accudemia captured users enrolled in COMM courses who were using the Communication Studies Center; PRIE captured users who logged in to use our center—but who were not enrolled in COMM courses. The inadvertent discrepancy is telling. The number of our center's users is nearly doubled, from 590 to 1,128, equivalent to:

- nearly half the visitors in the Learning Center, 2,587 [PRIE number is 2,711], an academic support service for all college classes
- nearly half the visitors to the Writing Center & English 800 Center, 2,175 [PRIE number is 2,159], serving 174 sections

[*Usage Report by Location, Spring 2016 and Student Success and Core Program Indicators, Academic Years 2013/14 to 2015/16*]

Our department served 46 sections or 1,371 students in the same academic year, 2015-16. Our center was available to enrolled COMM students, in addition to those students not enrolled in our courses who logged in to use center services at our station. Note that counts for Accudemia and PRIE are for *one semester*, spring 2016, implying that usage of the center should be roughly doubled for an academic year.

The data speak to the reality of our operations and work conditions [see Section 1]. PRIE staff observed: "*Certainly, the larger count is most important in order to understand total student need for and use of COMMLAB resources.*"

User Survey Results

A user survey was conducted in Spring 2015 and Fall 2015, resulting in data from 133 respondents. The previous program review used Spring 2014 and Fall 2014 data from 15 respondents. Results may be viewed below:

| I can . . . | major/moderate progress | | minor/no progress | |
|---|-------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
| | SP/FALL 15 | SP/FALL 14 | SP/FALL 15 | SP/FALL 14 |
| a. express ideas and support them when I speak | 88.3% | 93% | 8.3% | 7.1% |
| b. adapt my speaking to be truthful while respecting others | 88.7% | 100% | 5.2% | 0% |
| c. comprehend, interpret, and analyze ideas I hear | 83.8% | 100% | 12.0% | 0% |
| d. listen to ideas and feelings of others - the whole person- even if I disagree with him or her | 87.7% | 100% | 6.1% | 0% |
| e. communicate effectively in a group or team situation | 86.8% | 100% | 9.1% | 0% |
| f. work effectively with others of diverse backgrounds | 88.9% | 100% | 6.0% | 0% |
| g. acknowledge the value of diverse opinions and perspectives | 90.6% | 78.5% | 5.1% | 21.5% |
| h. use communication principles to make reasoned decisions | 85.8% | 100% | 10.8% | 0% |

Recent survey results are more credible, due to the robust sample size (133 responses). Results supported our belief that integration of coursework with TBA requirements improves student outcomes and enhance personal growth.

Student Usage Across Demographic Variables

Center usage remained stable across demographic variables (ethnicity, gender, age, enrollment profile) with three exceptions: Asian, African American, and Pacific Islander.

| | <u>Spring 2013</u> | | <u>Fall 2014</u> | | <u>Spring 2016</u> | |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| | Center % | College % | Center % | College % | Center % | College % |
| Asian | 13.4% | 15.4% | 13.0% | 16.6% | 23.7% | 19.0% |
| African American | 5.3% | 3.5% | 4.5% | 3.3% | 2.6% | 2.8% |
| Pacific Islander | 2.1% | 2.2% | 3.2% | 1.9% | 3.1% | 1.9% |

[*Student Profile, Spring 2013, Fall 2014, Spring 2016*]

Discussion:

The Asian population's usage spiked from the 2013 and 2014 academic years to Spring 2016; the Asian students' overall representation in college demography displayed less dramatic growth. The previous program review discussed how some COMM sections had experienced increasing numbers of international students; the International Students Center's Fall 2014 program review revealed a "53% increase in total international students over one year" and that over half its students were from China (54%).

The African American population showed a drop in center usage for the same time periods, which could, perhaps, be understood in light of declining enrollment of African Americans in COMM classes; there were 61 African Americans in COMM courses in 2013-14; 61 in 2014-15; 46 in 2015-16. The center will require new data to determine whether the decline is anomalous or representative of a disquieting trend.

The Pacific Islander population seemed stable in center usage; however, examining successful course completion rates provides a fuller picture of the three populations--how they access center services, and succeed and persist in COMM classes:

| | <u>% Success</u> | | | <u>% Withdraw</u> | | |
|------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|
| | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 |
| Asian | 76.4% | 82.8% | 87.4% | 13.5% | 10.7% | 6.0% |
| African American | 67.2% | 75.4% | 76.1% | 11.5% | 9.8% | 15.2% |
| Pacific Islander | 62.0% | 64.3% | 66.7% | 12.0% | 11.9% | 9.3% |

[*Communication Studies Student Success and Core Program Indicators, Academic Years 2013/14 to 2015/16*]

The Asian student population has consistently shown *greatest* success in COMM coursework and at CSM in general (if the population were disaggregated, we would likely observe differential performance). Even so, success for this demographic variable increased dramatically over the three academic years displayed, and it is doubly advantaged with the lowest withdrawal rate of *any* student group. The African American student success rate improved (but was nearly 10 percentage points lower than that of the Asian student population); further, the population's marked increase in percentage of withdrawals in the 2015-16 academic year reveals disproportionate impact that must be remedied were the trend to continue. The Pacific Islander student population showed improved success *and* lower withdrawal rates--perhaps correlated with the COMM department's involvement in the MANA learning community [see previous department program review]. MANA's inaugural year was 2015-16. Even with these improvements, Pacific Islander students' percentage of success remained *lowest* of all ethnic groups.

Center staff is committed to *meaningful* access for all students. The opportunity gap and disparities in persistence between populations are morally troubling; to respond, we had submitted a funded proposal for institutional support of the MANA learning community (now in its 3rd semester). Inclusion of COMM 110 in MANA appears to have resulted in gains for Pacific Islander students. We commit to strengthening access and support in our center so that African American students may also succeed, persist, and enjoy educational equity in COMM classes [see Section 4B1]. The full-time instructional aide position would work towards consolidating gains for Pacific Islander students and improving center services' responsiveness to African American students, in particular.

2. Discuss any differences in student usage of center across modes of delivery (on-campus versus distance education). Refer to [Delivery Mode Course Comparison](#).

COMM 110H had been notable for its weak enrollment, retention, and performance [*CSM Delivery Mode Course Comparison, Student Success Indicators: Fall 2013, Fall 2014*]:

| Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| <u>Trad Course</u> | <u>Trad Course</u> |

| | COMM 110H | Average | COMM 110H | Average |
|-------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| # enrolled | 15 | 27 | 18 | 28 |
| % success | 60.0% | 73.7% | 44.4% | 78.8% |
| % retention | 73.3% | 84.5% | 61.1% | 86.9% |

Weak results in all measures characterized COMM 110H since it was offered (for example, a 26% success rate had been reported in the previous program review, Fall 2012). The department removed COMM 110H and replaced it with a traditionally delivered course. The previous Communication Studies program review discussed COMM 110H's poor performance, as well as faculty reservations about offering the hybrid course.

The *Student Success and Core Program Indicators* report does not disaggregate responses of students in the hybrid course. We believe, however, that students enrolled in a hybrid course were not inclined to make a special trip to use the Communication Studies Center. It's likely COMM 110H students did not use center resources as frequently as those in traditionally-delivered courses (13.05 times/semester; see Section 2B)--despite being on campus for orientation, four rounds of speeches, and two examinations, or a total of seven weeks out of a seventeen-week semester.

C. Center Efficiency Indicators. Is the center efficient in meeting student needs?

Discuss center efficiency, including staffing, hours of operation, tutorial and other services, space utilization, equipment, or technology as appropriate.

The Communication Studies Center's operation rests on a distribution of resources that has persisted over time. Its *2014-2015 Program Review* discussed receiving fewer FLCs relative to other TBA-generating centers and losing a full-time Instructional Aide position in 2008.

Below is a table of usage, displaying both Accudemia and PRIE data for selected centers at the college; note these are counts for a single semester, Spring 2016:

| | Acc. Unique* | Acc. Repeat* | PRIE |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Learning Center | 2,587 | 31,516 | 2,711 |
| Writing Center & ENGL 800 Center | 2,175 | 14,939 | 2,159 |
| Integrated Science Center | 771 | 7,340 | 771 |
| Reading Center/ESL Center | 261 | 3,057 | 261 |
| Communication Studies Center | 590 | 7,702 | 1,128 |

The PRIE data, 1,128 visits, is salient because it accurately reflects *actual* student usage of the Communication Studies Center [see Section 2B1].

What complicates center usage is that, being located within the Learning Center, non-Communication Studies students utilize our MacIntosh computers and, to a lesser extent, our video recording facilities. Students from every discipline use our resources (for example, Digital Media students work on our center's Macs when the DGME lab is closed on Fridays; students in Sociology, Biology, Ethnic Studies, to name a few, research, write, or print using our Macs--even students enrolled in English, who can only earn TBA credit at the Writing Center, use our center; American Sign Language and Spanish students use our video booths). Our center welcomes more visitors than the Accudemia numbers show.

Further, there is LOAD (WSCH/FTEF), to which TBA-generating centers contribute. Below is a table of LOAD in our division:

| LOAD | |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| English & Literature | 406.7 |
| Reading | 351.1 |
| English as a Second Language | 389.4 |
| Communication Studies | 480.1 |

TBA-generating courses improve our department's LOAD, though "productivity" is not the measure of excellence for our center (see Section 1). But the number of classes offered that makes up LOAD is based on precedent and "need"--however that is defined, which, in turn, directly affect each centers' usage. If our department were permitted *more* course offerings due to high LOAD, our user base for the center would increase.

The Communication Studies Center is currently staffed by one half-time Instructional Aide (18 hours per week) and three faculty with a total of 17 FLCs (22 hours of faculty lab hours per week). We receive \$1500 for student assistants per academic year. We are open when the Learning Center opens, 8:00 am -

8:30 pm, Mondays-Thursdays and 8:00 am - 2:30 pm, Fridays. Equipment and technology have been discussed [see Sections 1, 4B3]. Given the number of students served, our center is efficient (see Section 2B1).

Another way of quantifying efficiency is combining the number of students served by the Communication Studies Center and Learning Center, especially as we are requesting a shared full-time Instructional Aide position. There is no other academic support service at the college that serves as many students:

- 3,177 unique users [Accudemia] or • 3,839 unique visitors [PRIE]
- 39,218 repeat users [Accudemia]

These are numbers for a single semester; for the academic year, the numbers should be roughly doubled.

No academic support service operates as efficiently as the Communication Studies Center and the Learning Center, working in partnership.

3. Additional Factors

Discuss additional factors as applicable that impact the center, including changes in student populations, state-wide initiatives, transfer requirements, advisory committee recommendations, legal mandates, workforce development and employment opportunities, community needs. See [Institutional Research](#) as needed.

The populations of students who make use of the Communication Studies Center can be affected by district initiatives and college priorities, such as the Trustees' decision to expand services to international students [see Section 2B1].

4. Planning

A. Results of Center Plans and Actions

Describe results, including measurable outcomes, from plans and actions in recent program reviews.

Plans and actions from the previous center program review are below:

Action 1: Assess center SLOs [now PLOs]. Results were consistently satisfactory, ranging from 3.5 - 2.5 (C or better) on three SLOs.

Result: No action needed. Range of results: 3.9 - 3.26 [see Section 2A1]. We were instructed to add a fourth PLO (new PLO1).

Action 2: Request Two MacBook Pro laptops with two digital cameras for adjunct faculty.

Result: No action needed; equipment received. *All* faculty teaching COMM courses are equipped for digital recording.

Action 3: Submit request to restore full-time IA position.

Result: Request denied; request is resubmitted with this year's program review.

Action 4: Request of 3 FLCs for faculty staffing of center.

Result: Request denied; request will not be resubmitted with this year's program review.

B. Future Center Plans and Actions

Prioritize the plans to be carried out to sustain and improve student success. Briefly describe each plan and how it supports the [CSM Strategic Goals 2013/14 to 2015/16](#). For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes. Plans may extend beyond a single year. Describe the professional activities and institutional collaborations that would be

most effective in carrying out the center's vision to improve student learning and success.

The Communication Studies Center's three-year vision was discussed and annotated in Section 1. It includes:

- improving the lighting and installing opaque walls in the recording booths to improve conditions for student video recording
- hiring and training a full-time Instructional Aide (shared with the Learning Center) to expand access to services for students
- utilizing student assistants to better serve users

[see Section 1 for discussion of *College Mission; Diversity Statement; College of San Mateo Strategic Goals: 2013/14 to 2015/16; Narrative, Student Survey, Spring 2015 & Fall 2015; Summary Data, Spring 2015 & Fall 2015*]

If both requests are granted, the six-year plan includes these plans for the full-time Instructional Aide:

1. Develop and implement a peer tutoring program for communication students.

The full-time Instructional Aide would take the lead to research, develop, and administer a peer tutoring program for communication students. We would work in partnership with the National Association of Communication Centers and the Learning Center's Peer Academic Tutor program.

Section 2 revealed center usage for a single semester, Spring 2016:

| | Unique SP16 | Repeat SP16 | Unique SP16 w/Learning Ctr | Repeat SP16 w/Learning Ctr |
|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Accudemia: | 590 | 7,702 | 3,177 | 39,218 |
| PRIE: | 1,128 | -- | 3,839 | -- |

[*Accudemia Usage Report by Location; Student Profile, Spring 2016*]

Annual student usage (excluding summer) roughly double these numbers. The peer tutoring program can be a lifeline to students in a heavily used center, connecting them with a student tutor who has already taken a communication class.

2. Develop and implement pathways for underserved communication students.

The full-time Instructional Aide would collaborate with the Communication Studies department and the Learning Center to develop pathways to success for African American and Pacific Islander students enrolled in our classes.

Section 2B1 revealed inequitable rates of success and persistence of communication students:

| | % Success | | | % Withdraw | | |
|------------------|-----------|-------|--------------|------------|-------|--------------|
| | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 |
| Asian | 76.4% | 82.8% | 87.4% | 13.5% | 10.7% | 6.0% |
| African American | 67.2% | 75.4% | 76.1% | 11.5% | 9.8% | 15.2% |
| Pacific Islander | 62.0% | 64.3% | 66.7% | 12.0% | 11.9% | 9.3% |

[*Communication Studies Student Success and Core Program Indicators, Academic Years 2013/14 to 2015/16*]

The highest success rate, 87.4%, and the lowest withdrawal rate, 6.0%, should be the "floor" for all students; that is what it means to achieve equity. We would like to capture the wisdom of students themselves as well as that of the community (elders, leaders, community organizations) to develop the center's outreach and retention efforts for African American and Pacific Islander students at the center.

3. Work with Communication Studies faculty to assist in carrying out best practices in the classroom.

The full-time Instructional Aide would assist faculty in making the transition to using video recording in the classroom; these digital recordings would enable students to observe their classroom presentations for which they receive grades. The video files are maintained on the dedicated server and accessible from the center.

Section 2A1 revealed that, PLO 3 has the lowest student perception of success of all PLOs, 3.26. The reason "*view and evaluate effective dyadic, small group, or one-to-many oral presentations*" earned the lowest rating is that nearly half the courses do not utilize in-class digital video recording. That being said, the range of perceived success is more than satisfactory, ranging from a low of 3.26 to a high of 3.57 [TracDat].

5. Program Maintenance

A. Course Outline Updates

Review the [course outline update record](#). List the courses that will be updated in the next academic year. For each course that will be updated, provide a faculty contact and the planned submission month. See the [Committee on Instruction](#) website for [course submission instructions](#). Contact your division's [COI representatives](#) if you have questions about submission deadlines. **Career and Technical Education courses must be updated every two years.**

| Courses to be updated | Faculty contact | Submission month |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| ALL courses submitted for update | Kate Motoyama | September 8, 2016 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

B. Website Review

Review the center's website(s) annually and update as needed.

| Faculty contact(s) | Date of next review/update |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Kate Motoyama | Completed June 2016 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

C. SLO Assessment Contacts

| Faculty contact(s) | Date of next review/update |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
|--------------------|----------------------------|

| | |
|-----------|---------------------|
| Yaping Li | Completed June 2016 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

6. Dominant Themes Summary for IPC

Briefly summarize the dominant, most important themes or trends contained in this program review, for division deans to collect and forward to the Institutional Planning Committee. What are the key program issues that matter most? (Brief paragraph or bullet points acceptable).

The draft of program review was completed and sent for review to faculty and the dean (9/4/16) using the original template provided on the website; since then, the template was modified to its current state, eliminating 4B1, 4B2, and 4B3. Modifications to the program review template should have been finalized prior to Flex Day workshops; now, completed sections of our document do not appear here and must be migrated to a different document.

Included below are missing sections that remain *relevant* to our document but which have no place in the resource request form link (the resource request was completed for dean's review on 9/20/16):

4B1. To guide future faculty and staff initiatives, describe the professional enrichment activities that would be most effective in carrying out the program's vision to improve student learning and success.

The current program review has no recommendation for professional enrichment activities that would help carry out the center's vision of improving student learning and success. Evidence indicate the center's operations are consonant with its vision of student access, equity, and academic excellence, but that additional staffing is required to make meaningful progress on these indicators [see Sections 1, 2A1, 2B, 2C, 4B, 4B3, 5].

4B2. To guide future collaboration across student services, learning support centers, and instructional programs, describe the interactions that would help the program to improve student success.

The Communication Studies Center would like the college to connect students with EOPS and the Multicultural Center. Each semester, they have spaces that could have been filled by a student from the first day of class. Some of our center's underserved and *eligible* students would have benefited from the excellent services, counseling, bus passes, and book vouchers that they would have received. We would like to work more closely with EOPS and the Multicultural Center to better serve our African American and Pacific Islander populations.

The center would ask the college to commit to a solution so that eligible students may purchase books on or before the first day of class as opposed to receiving Financial Aid checks in the second, third, even the fifth week, of classes. By this time, some textbooks are sold out, requiring the student to wait until the order is delivered--further delaying access to classroom materials. Similarly, dropping students for non-payment of fees--while a standard and fiscally responsible practice--severely curtails access to education for populations of students. The problems are systemic, but we could develop solutions to assist students, particularly underserved students.

Further, we ask for assistance in developing alliances with community leaders and services that could work in partnership with our center to address educational equity for our African American and Pacific Islander students.

Finally, the college should consider working with agencies to establish direct bus service to the campus. We have connections with the San Mateo County Transit District and San Mateo County Transit Authority that could begin a dialogue for transportation solutions that better service students. A dedicated shuttle service might also assist students.

The *themes and trends* requested in 6 are stated and documented throughout this program review. To narrow these to one: "**The Communication Studies Center submits its review and requests to (1) narrow opportunity gaps observed in student populations we serve and to (2) continue to address the numbers of students we serve.**"