

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

DESIGNATION CODE: 2011-12 CAPR 13

DATE SUBMITTED: April 5, 2012

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR)
SUBJECT: Five-Year Program Review for Communication
PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION REQUESTED: Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Review of the Communication BA and MA programs in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences at California State University East Bay and the recommendation that it continue without modification. The date of the next Five-Year review is 2013-2014¹.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on December 1, 2011, CAPR invited members of the Department of Communication to orally present the outcome of their five-year review process completed in 2010-11 and submitted to CAPR for review in December 2010. Prior to this meeting, the CAPR liaison to the Communication program review, Luz Calvo, examined the five-year review document in detail, applying a review matrix derived from the Academic Program Review Procedures suggested content for five-year review documentation, and used this as a basis for asking questions of the program Chair (see attached Appendix A). At this meeting, Dr. Young presented a summary of the communication five-year review to CAPR and participated in a question and answer session.

Overview description of the program

The Communication program offers both a BA and a MA degree in Communication. According to fall enrollment data compiled by PEMSA, as of 2009 there were 411 majors and 26 graduate students who were served by four instructional, tenure-track faculty, two 0.5 FERPs and 11 lecturer faculty. In 2009, the program generated a full-time equivalent student (FTES) level of 328.8. By 2009, the student-faculty ratio had climbed to 28.8, compared to 19.2 in 2005. The major in Communication consists of 52 units of core courses in communication, with an additional 44 units in one of two options for a total of 96 units; the B.A. degree requires a total of 180 units. Thus, with the 96 total units, the BA in Communication falls within the 180 units requirement of the CSU.

¹ The Communication programs were originally scheduled for review in 2007-08 and granted a two-year delay to 2009-10, This was shifted to 2010-11 due to the one-year postponement of programs during the budget crisis and was submitted in December 2010 with the external review and response submitted in May, 2011. Thus, taking into account the one-year shift in programs, the next scheduled review for Communications will be in 2013-14.

Overview of the documents submitted to CAPR

A short summary of the five-year review provided by the Communication department for its BA and MA degrees precedes the self-study, five-year plan, external reviewer's report and response to the external reviewer's report.

Note that the five-year documentation provided by the Department of Communication comingles the BA and MA program information. This is typical of many departments' approaches to their five-year review since although through this process CAPR approves continuation or discontinuation of programs, not departments, many departments' programs significantly overlap in terms of faculty, resources, recruitment, climate, and the many other program areas required to be reported on as part of the five-year review process.

The documents submitted to CAPR document the dire situation of this program, highlighting the desperate need for additional faculty lines as well as other resources. The documents note the loss of ten tenure-track faculty—with five of those in the last two years—which has lead to an unsustainable increase in workload for the remaining three full-time tenure-track faculty and the 0.5 FERP Chair as of 2011.

Program's Self-Study (2006/07-2010/11)

The communication program self-study has three parts: (I) Summary of Previous Review and Plan, (II) Curriculum and Student Learning Outcomes and (III) Graduate and Undergraduate Student Data/Demographics.

Summary of Previous Review and Plan

The communication program self-study begins with a reflection on the history of the department—formed from a merger between the Departments of Speech Communication and Mass Communication in fall of 2002. The previous Five Year Review was accepted by the Senate in 2003-04 (after a one year delay had been granted), but was clearly a review of a department that at the time was described as a “work in progress.”

The annual reports from the previous five years note serious problems, including a “faculty in disarray,” suspension of the Forensics Program, and some dissension regarding curriculum revisions. The self-study notes that challenges to the program include sudden changes in leadership, loss of tenure/tenure track faculty, and an unsustainable increase in the responsibilities for existing faculty. The study describes in detail the loss of faculty in key areas including advertising, journalism, and broadcasting. Despite these challenges, the program highlights several achievements, including a growing sense of collegiality among full time faculty, a significantly revised undergraduate curriculum, online versions of the Pioneer newspaper, inauguration of Pioneer Web TV, and a reinvigoration of the Advertising Agency.

Curriculum and Student Learning

The Department of Communication has not implemented a program-wide assessment of the department's student learning outcomes. They state that they will begin developing such an assessment in Spring 2011 for undergraduates and in Fall 2011 for the graduate program. They did present a matrix that links each of their SLOs (student learning outcomes) to undergraduate courses that address each outcome at one of three levels (entry, developing, and graduating.) The department has not yet discussed program level assessment for the graduate program.

While the department could not provide any data on student learning outcome assessment (since

they have not gathered any due to a lack of faculty resources) they did provide information gleaned from a climate survey conducted in Spring 2010. The climate survey revealed both strengths and potential weaknesses of the program. For example, most students (79%) reported that they find faculty to be “approachable in the classroom” which seems fairly high. However, only 63% of students felt that the department is characterized by “mutual respect between students and professors.” In reflecting on the results of the survey, the faculty felt that some of the negative results were attributable to shortage of full time faculty as well as the effects of the budget cuts that reduced course offerings due to the cutback in lecturer hiring.

The self-study included a chart that compared the CSUEB program in Communication to similar programs in the Cal State system and elsewhere. What is most notable about the chart is the severe understaffing of the CSUEB program. For example, the program with a comparable number of majors is San Jose State Department of Communication Studies. They had fourteen tenure/tenure track faculty compared to CSUEB with approximately four.

The merged program in mass communication and speech communication makes CSUEB unique. In their self study, the department writes, “We are confident that such an integrated program is the way of the future because it parallels the actual practices in the communication industry and the research”. The revised curriculum breaks down the traditional division between these two fields, with 52 units required in a “core” curriculum and then two options, one in “media productions” (broadcasting, journalism) and another in “professional and organizational” (advertising, organizational, public, public relations). The masters program is based in communication theory and research complemented with seminars from a variety of areas including rhetoric, organizational communication, and interpersonal communication, among others. The culminating experience is a thesis, project, or comprehensive exam.

In addition to teaching courses for their majors, the faculty are responsible for supervising the four studios/labs (e.g. Comm Lab, TV Studio, Newsroom, Advertising). In addition the communication program is also responsible for teaching the CSU oral communication GE requirement, COMM 1000. This course is staffed by a combination of regular faculty, lecturers, and graduate students. No assessment of student learning outcomes for this GE component has occurred. The department cites “the revolving chairs and lack of support from IR for data input and analysis” as the reason for the lack of assessment in this area. It was reported by Chair Young in her written comments to CAPR following the December 1 meeting that all of the regular faculty have strong assessment backgrounds and understand how to sample, how to do rubrics, and so forth but lack the institutional support for an electronic platform that will allow them to input rubrics and the data from embedded in-class assessments, and then to analyze the data.

With regard to diversity, the self-study states the department’s commitment of “educating students to thrive in a multicultural world,” and makes mention of several courses that focus on one or more “diversity attribute.” They also note their participation in the “Viewing Diversity” freshman cluster.

Graduate and Undergraduate Student Data/Demographics

The communication program offers both a BA and a MA degree in Communication. According to fall enrollment data compiled by PEMSA, as of 2009 there were 411 majors and 26 graduate students who were served by four instructional, tenure-track faculty, two 0.5 FERPs and 11 lecturer faculty. In 2009, the program generated a full-time equivalent student (FTES) level of 328.8. By 2009, the student-faculty ratio had climbed to 28.8, compared to 19.2 in 2005. The major attracts a diverse group of students of whom two-thirds (2/3) are women and fifty-five

percent (55%) are students of color. The tenure-track faculty (full-time and FERP) is somewhat less diverse, especially with regard to gender (four men/one woman) and could be more diverse in terms of race/ethnicity. The faculty reports their racial diversity as follows: one African American, one bi-cultural African American and Jew; one Canadian; two European-Americans. The ratio of GE to degree courses has changed substantially over the past five years, rising from 37% to 53%. Consequently, the proportion of degree courses fell from 62% to 47%. Almost all classes except for an occasional public speaking class are offered on the Hayward campus and the department has experimented with teaching online and hybrid courses. Institutional data shows that in the five years under review all sections except one were taught in a “face to face” format. In her written response to CAPR following the December 1, Chair Young informed CAPR that the program regularly teaches three hybrid classes per quarter but no fully online classes.

External Reviewer’s Comments & The Department’s Response

In the five-year review process, programs prepare their self-study and their five-year plan (draft) and submit these to their external reviewer prior to their visit to campus. The program then gets the chance to finalize their five-year plan based on comments made by the external reviewer and the response of their Dean to their document and the external review report. It is thus summarized in this CAPR recommendation prior to its analysis of the final five-year strategic plan. The external review of the CSU East Bay communication program was conducted by Dr. Lee Brown, professor emeritus of Journalism, Cal State Long Beach and Dr. Andrew F. Wood, professor of Communication Studies, San Jose State University. The visit took place on April 18-19, 2011 and consisted of an extensive document review as well as meetings with the college deans, department chair, faculty collectively and individually and undergraduate and graduate students.

The external reviewer report agrees with the overall gist of the program’s self study, describing their report on the program as being “critical” and “occasionally bleak” due to lack of faculty and resources. At the same time the external reviewer highlights the dedicated and hard-working faculty. The biggest problems cited by the reviewers can be traced to three main issues: the loss of faculty, the rapid and frequent turnover of Chairs, and the grim economic climate in the State of California.

The external reviewers’ report is structured into nine sections: (1) Mission, Governance, and Administration (2) Curriculum and Instruction (3) Diversity and Inclusiveness (4) Full and Part Time Faculty (5) Scholarship, research, creative/professional activity (6) Student services (7) Resources, facilities and equipment (8) Professional and public service and (9) Assessment of learning outcomes

Each section of the external reviewers’ report includes concrete suggestions.

Mission, Governance, and Administration

The external reviewers’ report begins with acknowledgement that in the past the program has had administrative problems. The current Chair, Dr. Gale Young, is praised for being “hands on” and report notes that she is on FERP, and thus a “part time chair.” The report notes that interviews with faculty revealed frustration with higher administration (Dean, Provost, and President) due in part to the “revolving door” problem. Most of the suggestions for this section revolve around making an effective case for future hiring:

- Use new “school” (if it materializes) to negotiate faculty lines
- Revise and recalibrate mission statement

- Generate data about distribution of undergraduate students to make case for future hires

Curriculum and Instruction

In the area of curriculum the external reviewers stated that the program in Communication is still a “work in progress.” Most of the faculty members (3 out of the 5) have backgrounds in speech communication and so the fields in mass communication are severely understaffed. The catalog is out of date with many more courses listed than are being offered. The reviewers felt the department should rethink the number of minors (including minors in communication skills, mass communication, speech communication, and organizational communication). The reviewers praise several of the curricular changes that have happened or are underway, such as the plan to incorporate contemporary social media into the curriculum. They are concerned, though, that the streamline down to two options may have gone too far. They note that many students major in Communication, not to enter into journalism or allied fields, but to improve the communication skills necessary for the job market. The reviewers note the need for small class sizes to give the kind of help that students need to develop these writing and thinking skills. The reviewers raise some concerns about whether the MA program is sustainable with the shortage of tenure track faculty; but also note the need for graduate students who teach the GE oral communication course.

Finally, the question of faculty and staff workload was addressed. The reviewers called the faculty “heroes” for the way they have carried on the work of the program with so few resources.

The reviewers make the following suggestions in the area of curriculum and instruction:

- Reduce the number of programs (reference to minors)
- Consider adding an option in communication principles or concepts, separate from print/broadcast/digital/journalism option
- Adopt ACEJMC national standard for student-faculty ratios
- Skills classes should be prerequisite for entrance to MA program
- Poll other CSU institutions to learn release time practices in similar programs

Diversity and Inclusiveness

The reviewers note that the multicultural vibrancy of the State of California is reflected in the students in the program, although less so with faculty. The hiring that needs to happen in the years ahead provides a good opportunity to increase the diversity of the faculty in the department with regard to both racial and gender diversity.

The suggestion in this section:

- Set goal of achieving gender diversity in future hiring decisions

Full and Part Time Faculty

The reviewers make the case that in no uncertain terms that the small number of tenure and tenure track faculty produces an “increasingly untenable situation and a predictable outcome of burnout”. Moreover, the department faces the loss of two additional senior faculty in the near future, the reviewers write, “Neither outside reviewer can recall ever witnessing a communication department so under-resourced”. The lack of resources is compounded by lack of administrative

support at all levels. In addition, though, is a problem on internal divisions. They note that reduced resources “pit individual faculty members against each other”. An even sharper divide exists between tenure/tenure-track faculty and lecturers. One member of the faculty is quoted as describing this relationship, “akin to apartheid.” One element of this discontent was brought to the attention of CAPR in a formal email correspondence from one lecturer on behalf of herself and another part-time faculty member that was shared with the committee and Chair Young. This correspondence stated that some lecturers did not even know that the five-year review was taking place and that they were not given the opportunity to meet with the external reviewers. In her response to this correspondence, Chair Young stated that the external reviewers met with two lecturers out of 12. The external reviewers’ visit was well publicized and the lecturers received emails inviting them to the meetings. This information notwithstanding, CAPR notes that there does appear to be some discord among part-time faculty with respect to the issue of representation and integration into departmental affairs.

The external reviewers recognized the hard work of the staff and returned to the issue of the overburdened and overworked full time faculty and expressed concern about the sustainability of the current situation, noting “we do not see how this program can endure without a rapid infusion of tenure/tenure track faculty.”

Suggestions for this section:

- Have philosophy that the “right people are in the room”
- Chair should send out agendas and invite lecturers to department meetings
- Four faculty hires in next two years and at least two more hires in subsequent two years
- University should give line item funding for staff members

Scholarship, research, creative/professional activity

The report praises the productivity of the faculty, both in terms of traditional research and publications but also in terms of school newspaper, web TV, and other media projects. The external reviewers felt that more attention needed to be focused on these achievements.

Suggestion:

- Use public relations resources to promote achievements of department faculty

Student services

The external reviewers determined the faculty were doing as well as possible given their reduced numbers, however, advising of students is suffering. The reviewers also had recommendations for student organizations and clubs that would help students professionalize but they also understand that without additional faculty lines, these suggestions are unworkable.

Resources, facilities and equipment

The external reviewers noted that the newspaper department equipment was inadequate. They noted that the television facility was superior (although it was noted by the Chair in her response to CAPR that the equipment therein was also inadequate but has since been upgraded thanks to recent equipment funding). The reviewers also noted problems associated with relying on ASI/IRA funds.

Professional and public service

The external reviewers praised faculty participation in university and professional service, especially given the demands on their time. The reviewers restated their earlier suggestion:

- Use public relations resources to promote achievements of department faculty

Assessment of learning outcomes

The reviewers laud the department’s desire to launch a meaningful learning outcomes assessment and note that this project is still in “planning stages.”

The reviewers make two suggestions:

- Provide necessary administrative support to aid completion of assessment plan for graduate program
- Complete follow up to Winter 2010 climate survey

The department wrote a three-page response to the external review, concurring with most of the suggestions, stating that they would prioritize the recommendations during their annual fall retreat in September 2011.

Program’s Five-Year Strategic Plan 2011-2016

The five-year plan for the communication program was submitted in the form of a two-page chart. Here is the chart in its entirety:

COMMUNICATION DEPARTMENT 5-YEAR PLAN

<i>Area</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Implement Stages</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Needed Support</i>
<i>Curriculum</i>	Assess Student Learning: BA; MA;	Progress Yearly BA: 2011-forward MA: 2011forward	Chair Young & faculty	IR assist with programming electronic rubrics & data analysis
	Refine BA Curriculum	2011-12: Discuss and submit revisions	Chair & Faculty with input from Students and Alumni Board	Support 4 TT faculty requests
	Revise MA Curriculum to include Media Productions	2011 Discuss Winter & Spring, 2011-12 Begin Revision	Chair & Faculty with input from Students and Alumni Board	Support 4 TT faculty requests
	Establish Pioneer Internet Radio	2012 Establish 2 new courses and 1 workshop added as electives in Media Production Option	Chair & Faculty	Dean Rountree Curriculum Committees

	Develop 1-2 DCIE Certificates	2011-12 Develop first Certificate	Chair & Faculty w/ input from Students and Alumni Board	Assist from DCIE
	Assess, refine, and develop Internship and Service Learning	2011-Discuss develop plan with faculty	Chair & Faculty with input from Students and Alumni Board	IR Support with programming electronic rubrics and data analysis
	Seek funding for Forensics Program	2011-12 Develop Forensics re-start plan	Chair & West, and Advancement	Advancement
	Progress to AEJMC accreditation	2012-13 Develop Plan 2013-15 Build infrastructure & support	Chair & Faculty	Dean Rountree Provost Houpis
Area	Outcome	Implement Stages	Responsibility	Needed Support
Students	Increase Enrollments to 600	11-12: 460 majors 12-13: 500 13-14: 550 14-15: 600	Chair & Faculty with input from students	Funds for public relations materials 4 TT hires
	Improve Advising	2011-Continue with Advising Clinics 2011-Develop on-line hours 2012- Survey	Chair & Faculty with input from students	4TT hires
	Improve Climate	2011 Hold quarterly showcase of student productions. 2011 Highlight student scholarship 2012 Survey	Chair & Faculty with input from students	
	Set up mentorships with Alumni	2012 Occurs after alumni identified and contacted	Chair & Faculty in cooperation with Advancement	Advancement
	Support student organizations	Meet quarterly with leaders and attend student meetings.	Chair	

Area	Outcome	Implement Stages	Responsibility	Needed Support
Faculty	Secure 4 TT hires	2011-12 Journalism 2011-12 Video-Broadcast 2012-13 Visual-Internet 2012-13 Advertising A	Chair & Faculty Dean Rountree Provost Houpis	Dean Rountree Provost Houpis
	Restore Graduate Coordinator Time	Increase Enrollments	Chair & Faculty	Dean Rountree
	Assign time for faculty coordinators of News Room, Broadcast, and Internet Studios, Advertising Agency, & Comm. Lab	Increase Enrollments	Chair & Faculty	Dean Rountree
	Support Scholarship	2011-12 Hold Quarterly research presentations 2011-12 Assist Grant Development 2011-12 Highlight research on bulletin boards & Newsletter	Chair	Research & Sponsored Programs; Faculty Center; Advancement
Area	Outcome	Implement Stages	Responsibility	Needed Support
Instructionally Related Facilities & Equipment	Secure urgent funding of \$200,000 for production Studios	Submitted Equip Requests Submitted Request for Course Fees	Chair in consultation with faculty & staff	Dean Rountree & Provost Houpis IRA Board and Provost Houpis
	Secure 1M to upgrade & sustain equipment	Submit funding needs for media studios	Chair in consultation with faculty & staff	Provost Houpis & President Qayoumi
	Remodel TV studio into a Media Studio to be used by Comm., Art, Multimedia, Music and Theatre & Dance.	2010 Developed Funding Plan Submit to Advancement	Chair in consultation with faculty & staff	Advancement Office
	Pursue new building	Work with Advancement office	Chair Advancement	Provost Houpis & President Qayoumi

Area	Outcome	Implement Stages	Responsibility	Needed Support
Development	Locate & Assess Alumni	Done by Advancement Office	Chair & Faculty	Advancement
	Establish twice yearly Newsletter to Alumni	Produce newsletter Winter 2011	Chair & Students	Advancement
	Hold Events	Spring 2011	Chair & Faculty	Advancement
	Set up Mentorship Program	Begin developing structure Fall 2011	Chair & Faculty	Advancement
	Nurture Donors	On-going	Chair & Faculty Advancement	Advancement
Area	Outcome	Implement Stages	Responsibility	Needed Support
Structural	Collaborate w/ Art, MM, Music, Theatre for College of Comm., Arts, Media & Music.	Develop 5-year outcomes & strategies. Submit to Senate	Chair & Faculty	Dean Rountree Provost Houpis Academic Senate
	Move Comm. Lab to SCAA	Secure MOU with Library Director	Chair	Dean Rountree Provost Houpis

CAPR Analysis Of The Program's Five-Year Review

a. Program

A number of issues related to instruction, curriculum, and faculty were raised in the self-study, plan and external review. CAPR therefore proposes the following recommendations for the coming five-years:

- The Communication department should follow through on its stated goal to actualize an assessment plan and begin the process of assessing their student learning outcomes in both their undergraduate and graduate programs, reporting back on this in their annual reports; it is suggested that at a minimum one learning outcome be assessed each year for five years
- The Communication department should continue to work on climate issues, especially with regard to lecturer faculty
- The Communication department should assess the BA curriculum in light of the external reviewers' comments and consider the suggestion to adopt three option paths
- The Communication department should assess the MA curriculum with respect to its character as a "terminal" degree for communications professionals and the division of skills classes between the BA and MA programs

b. Resources

The main concern for the coming five years is to address the need for additional tenure-track faculty, particularly in the areas of mass communication. CAPR therefore proposes the following recommendations for the coming five years:

- The Communication department request four tenure track hires in the fields of journalism, video-broadcast, visual Internet, and advertising. CAPR concurs with the program that these hires are urgent.
- The Communication department seek funding to bring the newsroom up to date, for instance from instructional technology budgeting and from A2E2 funds if appropriate
- The Communication department request from its dean that she provide release time for faculty that have duties above and beyond normal workload

This document and the recommendation to approve the communication BA and MA programs for continuation without modification was approved unanimously by CAPR at its April 5, 2012 meeting.

CAPR Recommendation For Continuation Of The Program

Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Review of the Communication BA and MA programs in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences at California State University East Bay and the recommendation that it continue without modification. The date of the next Five-Year review is 2013-2014¹.