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Introduction

This program review is part of a process that began in the fall of 2011. We have collected and analyzed data from multiple sources. Some of the assessment reports contain complete information; others are still works in progress and suffer from a lack of consistent faculty input and a confusing array of information and statistics stored in a variety of different places within the university. This has made the assembly of this Five-Year self-report difficult.

It is clear that we have identified some challenges as well as some opportunities in this process. We have also identified some noteworthy achievements and evidence of high academic quality. Three excellent reviews from outside consultants are included in this report, as well as each program’s reactions to the reviewer’s comments and a quality improvement plan.

This report contains assessment analysis and data for our core curriculum, required of all Communication Division majors, a summary of an alumni survey conducted early in 2012, and individual assessments of each of the emphases within the Communication Major. All Communication majors are required to take at least a one-unit internship and many participate in additional High Impact Practices through their work on student media and competition on the debate squad.
The Communication Division includes six majors, a variety of High Impact/co-curricular programs, and a required internship program for all students. The majors are:

- Communication (with emphases in Rhetoric and Leadership, Interpersonal Communication, Intercultural Communication or Organizational Communication)
- Advertising
- Journalism
- Integrated Marketing Communication
- Media Production (formerly Telecommunications)
- Public Relations

The division also teaches approximately 40 sections annually of the general education introduction to speech course and houses the Center for Entertainment Media and Culture, a university entity uniting various academic units that focus on teaching and learning related to entertainment through the media.

The co-curricular programs include:

- *Pepperdine Graphic Media* (the weekly student produced newspaper, a once-a-semester magazine, an online daily newspaper, and special advertising supplements)
- Community news (NewsWaves) and student entertainment programming broadcast on TV 26 to homes in Malibu and the surrounding area
- KWVS, a student run radio station
- A nationally-recognized debate program specializing in parliamentary and policy debate

The division is housed primarily on the first and second floors of the Center for Communication and Business situated above the main part of the Seaver College campus. The first floor contains a large lecture classroom, a multi-purpose room used for university events, a television station, a radio station, and two student media production facilities. The second floor contains 7 classrooms (2 dedicated to classes needing computers) and 20 offices for 20 full-time and more than 20 part-time faculty members.

**Assessment Decision Process**

The area underwent its last Five Year Review in 2005. As this
assessment cycle approached, faculty met on several occasions to decide how to strategically divide the reporting tasks given an unusual number of full-time teaching openings and the absence of three faculty members to International Programs teaching assignments. Nonetheless, to establish proper benchmarks, the faculty decided to assess each of the emphases in Communication as if they were majors (programs) and to assess the four-course core curriculum, co-curricular offerings and internship program as if they were separate programs. While creating more complications in the process, this approach will yield richer assessment and benchmark data by which to accurately make decisions about future learning outcome improvements in those areas.

The Curriculum

The liberal arts colleges considered by Seaver College as peer offer communication studies or no communication courses at all. Larger peer and aspirational institutions may host separate communications studies and media studies departments. We are one of the few academic units attempting to offer students an integrated experience in communication with the opportunity to apply knowledge in specific areas as varied as rhetoric, public relations, media production and advertising. Though not without its challenges, this combination has found increasing acceptance and support across the paradigmatic boundaries that exist within the Division. One of the ways in which the boundaries are blurred and the disciplines integrated is through the four core courses that are required of all majors. These courses—Communication Theory, Message Creation and Effects, Introduction to Communication Research, and Communication Ethics—expose all students to the humanistic traditions and foundations of the discipline; the contributions of thought and methodology from the perspective of the social sciences; theoretical and applied implications of public, interpersonal, and mediated persuasion; and the application of both ancient and modern ethical approaches to public, interpersonal, and mediated communication.

Program Review Process

Planning for the Five Year assessment review began in May of 2011 at the annual end-of-the-year assessment day and at our two-day August 2011 retreat. At the two-day assessment workshop the division held in August of 2011, program curriculum coordinators received copies of just-completed program reviews from other divisions to use as templates for the preparation of this review. Training and research sessions have been held at least once a month in an attempt to bring all curriculum coordinators up to speed. Most of these sessions took place in lieu of the normal division information meetings held each month.

While curriculum coordinators were responsible for the research and writing of the program reviews, the division office and the chair of the division wrote all or most of two academic program reviews, plus the initial drafts of the Core, Co-Curricular and Internship reviews. This obviously is a weakness of this document, but was necessary because four critical faculty members (two of whom are curriculum coordinators)
were serving as visiting professors in International Programs during the year.

**History of the Communication Division**

**The George Pepperdine College Years**

The Bachelor's Degree in Public Speaking was offered in the first year of the operation of Pepperdine College (1937). Only one full-time faculty member was listed (Maleese *sic.* Black, M.A., University of Iowa). The designation of that faculty member's discipline was "Speech Art." With the exception of a course entitled "History of the Stage," all courses offered were skills courses. Both lower-division and upper-division courses were listed, sufficient for the degree.

By 1952, a "Master of Arts in Speech or Drama" had been added.

In 1958, the catalog indicated five areas of emphasis for the Bachelor's degree in the Department of Speech and Dramatic Arts: Drama, Forensics and Public Speaking, Interpretation, Speech Science and Correction, and Speech Education. With a full-time faculty of four, two held the Ph.D. degree.

Over the next ten years, the curriculum developed a new emphasis. The Department of Speech and Dramatic Arts listed courses such as Dramatic Criticism, Broadcast Station Management and Programming, German Political Speaking: The Hitler Years, and Critical Studies in Public Address—all courses that indicated a growing interest in matters beyond speech and drama skills. In 1968, there were still four full-time faculties, two holding the Ph.D.

**The Seaver College Years**

The advent of the "Malibu program" (Seaver College was not named until 1975 and was known simply as the "Malibu Campus") was put in place on the Los Angeles campus in the 1970 Pepperdine University Catalog. A pilot group of students took their first two years of classes at the Los Angeles campus in a curriculum separate from that of the larger Pepperdine undergraduate curriculum. The Communication Division was one of four divisions (the others were Humanities, Social Science, and Natural Science) but it was one of six divisions (Fine Arts and Religion were broken out of Humanities—there was no Business Division but only a degree in Economics within the Social Science Division) when the Malibu campus opened with about 600 students in 1972.

The academic model for the new campus aspired to the removal of departmental lines in favor of divisions that reflected an interdisciplinary structure. Degrees in Foreign Languages were to be earned within the
Communication Division and an interdisciplinary major in Communication was listed, along with the traditional majors in Speech, Journalism, and Theater.

In the interdisciplinary spirit, general education courses in written composition were listed and managed in the Communication Division and courses were offered in Language Arts, which initially included Advanced Grammar and Composition, and Creative Writing. The composition requirement remained within the Communication Division until 1986, when it was moved to the Humanities Division. Courses designated Language Arts increased in scope during the decade following 1972 to include such things as screen writing and novel writing. Stewart Hudson, who had been appointed to supervise and teach in the Language Arts area in 1972, came with an academic background in English Literature and had headed freshman composition programs in other institutions. He was appointed Chairman of the Communication Division in 1975 and served in that role until 1988—a product of the original interdisciplinary vision for Seaver College.

In addition to Freshman Composition, the Division’s general education course was COM 101, Communication and Culture, a lecture course utilizing multiple faculty and delivered in Elkins Auditorium. It covered a limited number of topics now seen in the core course, COM 200—Communication Theory—and relied on guest speakers from various background in communication, news, and entertainment for its mission of introducing students to the place of communication in society. Similar to today’s First Year Seminar, all freshmen were required to register in one "lower-division seminar" limited to fifteen students. Communication Division choices included "American Political Communication," "Communication and Freedom," "Dictators, Demagogues, and Agitators," among others.

The curriculum for majors in Speech continued to offer a limited number of performance courses but took on the new look with "Dynamics of Discussion" and "Rhetorical Criticism." The most significant shift in the Malibu curriculum was the addition of courses that reflected national trends in the communication-related disciplines such as "Mass Communication," "Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Motivation," "Communication Theories," "Semantics," "Cross-cultural Communication," and "Psychology of Communication." Journalism continued its emphasis on developing skills but also increased the number of theory and history courses required of majors. Theater offerings included courses in theater history, film theory and history, and criticism.

Introduced in 1975 were emphasis areas (within the B. A. in Communication) in Broadcast Management and Broadcast. This was apparently on the strength of a new carrier-current radio station-KMBU). In 1976, the Broadcast sequence remained as a Communication option, while Broadcast Management was placed as an optional sequence in Journalism. In 1977, the Bachelor of Arts degree in Communication included sequences in Management Communication, Media Management, Media Sales, and a Broadcasting emphasis (the radio station had actually been stolen, lock-stock-and-barrel, in the previous year and was not replaced in 1977-78). In 1978, the Bachelor of Arts in Mass Communication was introduced, with sequences in Journalism, Broadcasting,
Radio Production, Television Production and Performing (two classes) Broadcast News, Broadcast Sales and Management, Advertising, Public Relations, and Photojournalism; the next year saw the removal of Photojournalism, Advertising, Public Relations, and Journalism as sequences. This stabilized until 1986 when the B.A. was changed from Broadcasting to Telecommunications (with first mention of Channel 13) and sequences in Production and Broadcast News—still the configuration—and Media Management, no longer offered as a sequence.

Temporary modular facilities were provided for faculty offices and classrooms for all communication disciplines in 1986—located on the site of the present Center for Communication and Business. The John Stauffer Telecommunications Building was completed in time for classes in Fall, 1987, adding legitimacy to the Telecommunications degree.

First mention of a Public Relations sequence (within the Journalism degree) came in 1975, while Advertising sequence came in 1978 (within the Mass Communication Degree). From that point, there was periodic migration of the two sequences and even some years when one or another of them disappeared from the curriculum of sequences. In 1986, both were listed as majors, no longer sequences or emphases.

In 1980, an Organizational Communication sequence was established within the Communication major. It was joined by an Intercultural Communication sequence in 1996. In 1985, the Theater degree was moved to the oversight of the Fine Arts Division. In 1985, the general education course (COM 101—Communication and Culture), a large lecture course, was eliminated in favor of multiple sections of a skills course—Speech 180—in the interest of developing the oral communication skills of all Seaver students. This also increased the use of adjunct faculty in the Division, as more FTEs were required to staff the number of SPE 180 sections.

The movement of the Theater program to Humanities in 1985, general education composition course to Humanities in 1986, Foreign Languages majors to the Center for International Studies and Languages in 2001, and the projected 2005 movement of the Interdisciplinary Communication Sequence (Creative Writing) to the Humanities Division removes the last vestiges of Seaver’s original interdisciplinary vision from the Communication Division. Though the Division embraces a wide variety of disciplines in both human and mediated communication, languages and requirements or sequences in written communication have moved to other oversight.

**Creation of the Current Core Curriculum**

A move to bring some efficiencies and a more conceptual approach to the diverse areas remaining within the Division took place in 1997 when four core courses were established for all students majoring in Advertising, Communication, Journalism, Public Relations, Speech Communication and
Telecommunications:

- COM 200, Communication Theory, was introduced as a lower-division survey course.

- COM 300, Introduction to Communication Research, brought students to the research tools of the social sciences (since SPE 180 requires a paper using rhetorical standards to analyze a selected text, it was assumed that all majors within the division would have been introduced to qualitative methods).

- COM 301, Message Creation and Effects, provided students in all emphases—including those in mediated communication—with the theoretical basis for persuasion across endeavors as diverse as politics, religion, public relations, and advertising.

- COM 400, Communication Ethics, is required of seniors, most of who graduate in fields in which persuasion is central. This is to ensure that all graduates consider the ethical dimension of their chosen fields and professions.

While these were the final names for these courses, long discussions among faculty at the time attempted to delineate the learning outcomes for these classes long before learning outcomes became a popular term in the assessment world. Faculty intended that the theory class focus on communication theories and present theories from all aspects of communication, evenly split between human communication theories and media-related theories. The research course was set up to survey research applicable in all areas of communication, including surveys, focus groups, ratings, database mining for journalists, and archival research for those writing TV or film scripts. The message creation course was intended to help students see how to analyze messages and then create those messages in a variety of contexts from newspapers to narrative shorts to speeches. From a practical standpoint, few of the existing faculty had academic training broad enough to encompass all the required learning modules in the class. Pepperdine’s academic structure and policies discourage team taught classes. Thus most professors who taught in the core taught to their strengths, which led to courses more traditional in nature than originally conceived.

**Assessment via the Division Curriculum Committee**

The division’s standing curriculum committee is charged with monitoring the curriculum in these core courses and continually canvases professors to see if the theories and research taught in the core classes in some way is relevant to the more specialized program courses that follow. This process results in new theories being added or removed, new academic readings being introduced into the research class, and specialized readings on ethical expectations within media careers added to student readings. The monitoring of course content also led to a revamping of the
Journalism and Media Production requirements and Communication 301, Message Creation and Effects, was dropped as a required course in favor of Communication 205, Storytelling Through Media. Some assessment results reported elsewhere show the progression of the faculty’s thinking as they moved toward this curriculum revision in 2010.

**Outside Concentrations**

In the late 1980s the division instituted a policy of requiring all students to complete an outside concentration. The impetus for this decision was to ensure that students had a well-rounded education that also allowed them to essential minor in a subject of secondary interest. This decision also ensured that the curriculum for majors such as advertising, public relations, journalism and telecommunications remained consistent with the accrediting standards of the Accrediting Council of Schools in Journalism and Mass Communication (check!) The outside concentration requires students to complete a minimum of nine upper division units in another field of study. While these outside concentrations may be a secondary area within the division—so that a telecommunication major may also have a speech and rhetoric concentration—it is fair to say that many faculty encourage students to take concentrations outside the Division—so that a journalism major may have a history or political science outside concentration, bringing those with a significant **skills** emphasis in their majors to a greater exposure to the **liberal arts**

**High Impact/Co-curricular Offerings**

The weekly Graphic newspaper—written and edited by students—began in 1937, the first year of Pepperdine’s existence. In later years, students would also publish a yearbook and a magazine. Originally supervised by the English department, the student publications came under the oversight of the journalism major in the 1960s and were later incorporated into the Communication Division with the advent of the Malibu campus. In 1975, a student radio station was added with a Television major and television studio added a few years later. In the 1970s, Pepperdine also initiated a debate squad. All co-curricular opportunities are available to all Seaver College students, regardless of their major. A faculty member from the Communication Division serves as adviser to the co-curricular offerings.

**Quality of the Communication Division Offerings**

**Division student count**

The number of students majoring in one or more areas of Communication peaked in 2007 and has fallen since. This is a welcome occurrence because of the difficulties finding qualified faculty and classroom space.
Faculty Headcount

Trying to calculate faculty headcount proved to be daunting. One reason for this is the staff and faculty could not find a way to differentiate between visiting and full-time professors teaching partially for the GE speech course. We employ mainly visiting professors and adjuncts to teach those courses. In addition, the majority of core courses taught in the division are taught by short-term visiting (long-term visiting are those professors on contracts that are renewed for a set period of time, usually three to five years, verses short term visiting contracts which are for one-year only and usually only renewed for a year or two).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Hours taught</th>
<th>Fall 07</th>
<th>Spring 08</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
<th>Fall 09</th>
<th>Spring 10</th>
<th>Fall 10</th>
<th>Spring 11</th>
<th>Fall 11</th>
<th>Spring 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/ Tenure Track</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Release</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP release</td>
<td>1 Tenured</td>
<td>1 Tenured</td>
<td>2 Tenured</td>
<td>2 Tenured</td>
<td>1 Visiting; 1 Tenured</td>
<td>1 Visiting; 1 tenured</td>
<td>1 Visiting; 1 tenured</td>
<td>3 tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity Leave</td>
<td>1 Tenure Track</td>
<td>1 Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even if the methodology for choosing what to include in this credit hours tabulation is somewhat faulty, the trends in the data presented indicate a strong reliance on visiting instructors. Four of the visiting professors (Smith, Salas, Clancy, Wideroe) have been employed during the entire six-year period under consideration in this report. Each of these women play a key role in both the classroom and the co-curricular activities--Smith with journalism; Salas with television and radio; Clancy with debate; and
Wideroe with the internship program. All receive administrative release time for their contributions to the division. One of the reasons for the difficulties in assembling this report has been the over-reliance on visiting professors to teach, thus depriving the division of a sufficient number of tenure and tenure-track professors to oversee curriculum assessment activities.

The other factor to note is that the division almost always supplies one or more professors to International Programs, which often necessitates the hiring of a visiting professor to replace the faculty member who is serving overseas.

Incoming SAT and GPA of scores of students

The incoming scores of students in the Communication Division is consistent with the overall data for the typical Seaver College student. In interpreting these numbers it is important to realize that with the exception of journalism, most students don’t declare a Communication major until after arriving on campus. Thus these numbers are based on a limited number of students relative to the total number of majors in the division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLL TERM</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaver - Communication Division</td>
<td>AVG SAT READ</td>
<td>AVG SAT MATH</td>
<td>AVG HIGH SCHOOL GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major (Average Score)</td>
<td>584.69</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>583.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLL TERM</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaver - Communication Division</td>
<td>AVG SAT READ</td>
<td>AVG SAT MATH</td>
<td>AVG HIGH SCHOOL GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major (Average Score)</td>
<td>590.51</td>
<td>593.27</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender of the Communication Study Body

The gender of the students has remained at roughly 30 percent male and 70 percent female for the past five years. For the fall semester 2005, the division had 20 full-time faculty, 5 (25 percent) of whom were women. During the fall semester of 2010, of the 24 full-time faculty, 14 (58 percent) were female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seaver -Com Division</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Church of Christ Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Com. Div.</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Diversity of the Communication Student Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seaver – Com. Division</strong></td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPEDS Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more race</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>809</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALUMNI SURVEY

To better establish a benchmark of alumni perceptions of the Communication Division, during January 2012 a Survey Monkey survey was sent to a list provided by the Alumni Affairs Office of approximately 750 alumni from the years 2000 to 2011. One-hundred-thirteen responded, a 15% response rate. Of those responding, 62 percent graduated within the last six years, while the remainder graduated from 2000 to 2005. The majors responding to the survey were skewed toward Journalism (23.2 percent), Advertising (20.5 percent), Organizational Communication (17 percent), and Telecommunications/Media Production (17 percent). Only 2.7 percent of Public Relations majors responded although the major comprised approximately 15 percent of the students studying in the Division during the time period surveyed. This is no doubt due to the lack of consistent faculty leadership in the division and thus a lack of feeling of any loyalty to the major and the division by those graduates.

Useful findings from survey respondents included:

1. Fifty-seven percent found a job within three months of graduation, while another 18 percent found a job within six months of graduation. One-quarter of the graduates failed to find a job within six months to a year of graduation.
2. Students reported finding work in a number of professions, with nonprofit organization/Christian charity (27.5 percent), Marketing Communication (20 percent), news and information (13.8 percent), Media entertainment (10 percent), law (8.8 percent) and public relations (8.6 percent) topping the list.
3. Eighty-three percent said their current employment was directly or somewhat related to their major.
4. Just under 37 percent reported that they went on from Pepperdine to attend graduate school. Of those students, 61.7 percent (N=29) attained a master's degree. Another 17 percent (N=8) received a professional degree in law, architecture or another area, with 6.4 percent (N=3) attaining a Ph.D.
Alumni were also asked a series of questions using a five point scale from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. The answer receiving the most responses is listed in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH THE COMMUNICATION DIVISION</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>N.A.</th>
<th>Mean rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com Core classes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8% (3)</td>
<td>16% (17)</td>
<td>50.9% (54)</td>
<td>30.2% (32)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in your major</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8% (4)</td>
<td>13.2% (14)</td>
<td>32.1% (34)</td>
<td>50.9% (54)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Concentration Courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8% (5)</td>
<td>11.5% (12)</td>
<td>41.3% (43)</td>
<td>42.3% (44)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.8% (6)</td>
<td>10.6% (11)</td>
<td>46.2% (48)</td>
<td>37.5% (39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9% (3)</td>
<td>5.7% (6)</td>
<td>46.7% (49)</td>
<td>44.8% (47)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship Opportunities</td>
<td>1.9% (2)</td>
<td>14.3% (15)</td>
<td>18.1% (19)</td>
<td>28.6% (30)</td>
<td>31.4% (33)</td>
<td>5.7% (6)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring and other academic help</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8% (3)</td>
<td>24.5% (26)</td>
<td>21.7% (23)</td>
<td>11.3% (12)</td>
<td>3.9% (6)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>1.9% (2)</td>
<td>8.6% (9)</td>
<td>14.3% (15)</td>
<td>39% (41)</td>
<td>33.3% (35)</td>
<td>2.9% (3)</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of contact with faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8% (3)</td>
<td>3.8% (4)</td>
<td>24.5% (26)</td>
<td>68.9% (73)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for service learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8% (3)</td>
<td>25.5% (27)</td>
<td>43.4% (46)</td>
<td>20.8% (22)</td>
<td>7.5% (8)</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7% (5)</td>
<td>10.4% (5)</td>
<td>35.8% (38)</td>
<td>49.1% (52)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement services</td>
<td>11.3% (12)</td>
<td>23.6% (25)</td>
<td>33% (35)</td>
<td>10.4% (11)</td>
<td>6.6% (7)</td>
<td>15.1% (16)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.9% (1)</td>
<td>22.6% (24)</td>
<td>76.4% (81)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Opportunities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8% (3)</td>
<td>16% (17)</td>
<td>39.6% (42)</td>
<td>39.6% (42)</td>
<td>1.9% (2)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere of ethnic, political &amp; religious acceptance</td>
<td>2.9% (3)</td>
<td>5.8% (6)</td>
<td>17.3% (18)</td>
<td>37.5% (39)</td>
<td>36.5% (38)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Experience</td>
<td>.9% (1)</td>
<td>.9 (1)</td>
<td>5.7% (6)</td>
<td>49.1% (52)</td>
<td>43.4% (46)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

This chart indicates overall satisfaction with the academic experience according to the alumni. The vast majority of students felt satisfied or very satisfied with their academics. Of note, however, is their perception that job placement services were lacking. This is an observation worth consideration. It may indicate that Communication Division faculty are not reminding students of the existence of the
Seaver College Career Center, or it may indicate a lack of confidence in the Career Center’s services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often did professors provide you with:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very frequently</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement to pursue grad work</td>
<td>18.9% (20)</td>
<td>22.6% (24)</td>
<td>23.6% (25)</td>
<td>15.1% (16)</td>
<td>12.3% (13)</td>
<td>7.5% (8)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality academic advising</td>
<td>5.8% (6)</td>
<td>13.6% (14)</td>
<td>20.4% (21)</td>
<td>35.9% (37)</td>
<td>24.3% (25)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement in your life's calling</td>
<td>4.8% (5)</td>
<td>15.2% (16)</td>
<td>12.4% (13)</td>
<td>36.2% (38)</td>
<td>30.5% (32)</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional support and encouragement</td>
<td>3.8% (4)</td>
<td>13.3% (14)</td>
<td>15.2% (16)</td>
<td>28.6% (30)</td>
<td>36.3% (38)</td>
<td>2.9% (3)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9% (1)</td>
<td>7.5% (8)</td>
<td>34.9% (37)</td>
<td>56.6% (60)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A letter of recommendation</td>
<td>8.5% (9)</td>
<td>4.7% (5)</td>
<td>11.3% (12)</td>
<td>31.1% (33)</td>
<td>33.0% (35)</td>
<td>11.3% (12)</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to improve study skills</td>
<td>10.7% (11)</td>
<td>13.6% (14)</td>
<td>21.4% (22)</td>
<td>17.5% (18)</td>
<td>16.5% (17)</td>
<td>20.3% (21)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to improve writing skills</td>
<td>4.8% (5)</td>
<td>11.4% (12)</td>
<td>32.4% (34)</td>
<td>21.9% (23)</td>
<td>20% (21)</td>
<td>9.5% (10)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive feedback on class assignments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.8% (6)</td>
<td>18.3% (19)</td>
<td>34.6 (36)</td>
<td>41.3% (43)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to discuss coursework after class</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
<td>1.9% (2)</td>
<td>9.5% (10)</td>
<td>36.2% (38)</td>
<td>51.4% (54)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in achieving your professional goals</td>
<td>8.6% (9)</td>
<td>3.8% (4)</td>
<td>21.9% (23)</td>
<td>30.5% (32)</td>
<td>34.3% (36)</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role models worthy of emulation</td>
<td>0.9% (1)</td>
<td>5.7% (6)</td>
<td>14.2% (15)</td>
<td>28.3% (30)</td>
<td>49.1% (52)</td>
<td>1.9% (2)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual encouragement</td>
<td>6.7% (7)</td>
<td>12.4% (13)</td>
<td>17.1% (18)</td>
<td>25.7% (27)</td>
<td>25.7% (27)</td>
<td>12.4% (13)</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional contacts</td>
<td>11.3% (12)</td>
<td>24.5% (26)</td>
<td><strong>28.3% (30)</strong></td>
<td>13.2% (14)</td>
<td>19.8% (21)</td>
<td>2.8% (3)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

The data here indicate that students feel faculty are not providing them with enough professional contacts. Also, it would appear students don't perceive division faculty as assisting them with study skills or help to improve their writing. The division faculty should discuss these observations, as one area of weakness we've noted in our student's academic preparation is that they don't possess strong study or writing skills. It would also appear students don't perceive the division's faculty as supporting graduate school. This may be because the majority of the majors in the division don't feel the need for advanced study in media production, journalism, public relations and advertising.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well did communication division classes prepare you for</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Fairly well</th>
<th>Very strongly</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing original ideas, products, or services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.7% (8)</td>
<td>6.7% (7)</td>
<td>53.8% (56)</td>
<td>31.7% (33)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity evaluating your and others’ values and attitudes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9% (3)</td>
<td>6.7% (7)</td>
<td>56.7% (59)</td>
<td>33.7% (35)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A life-long commitment to learning</td>
<td>1.9% (2)</td>
<td>2.9% (3)</td>
<td>11.5% (12)</td>
<td>43.3% (45)</td>
<td>40.4% (42)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining and solving problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (13)</td>
<td>50.0% (52)</td>
<td>35.6% (37)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting along with people</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
<td>2.9% (3)</td>
<td>8.7% (9)</td>
<td>43.3% (45)</td>
<td>44.2% (46)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing oral skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9% (6)</td>
<td>4.9% (5)</td>
<td>47.1% (48)</td>
<td>42.2% (43)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing better writing skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8% (5)</td>
<td>11.5% (12)</td>
<td>50% (52)</td>
<td>33.7% (35)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing data and drawing conclusions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.6% (10)</td>
<td>15.4% (16)</td>
<td>50% (52)</td>
<td>25% (26)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in teams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8% (5)</td>
<td>46.2% (48)</td>
<td>49% (51)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding communication ethics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
<td>6.7% (7)</td>
<td>45.2% (47)</td>
<td>47.1% (49)</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

It would appear alumni perceive the division’s professors helped them consider not only writing and speaking skills, but also the skills necessary to thrive in the workplace and in life.
How often during the past 2 years have you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Mean rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted in a national or local election</td>
<td>12.5% (13)</td>
<td>43.3% (45)</td>
<td>44.2% (46)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated money to a church charity or cause</td>
<td>6.8% (7)</td>
<td>31.4% (32)</td>
<td>61.8% (63)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served as an elected or appointed government official</td>
<td>97.1% (100)</td>
<td>2.9% (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered at your church, synagogue or mosque</td>
<td>43.3% (45)</td>
<td>19.2% (20)</td>
<td>37.5% (39)</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached or refereed a youth athletic event</td>
<td>85.6% (89)</td>
<td>9.6% (10)</td>
<td>4.8% (5)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered at a nonprofit, scout troop, or other non-governmental agency</td>
<td>19.2% (20)</td>
<td>42.3% (44)</td>
<td>38.5% (40)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbied or written on behalf of a social movement</td>
<td>64.4% (67)</td>
<td>24% (25)</td>
<td>11.5% (12)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been on a short-term mission trip</td>
<td>73.1% (76)</td>
<td>18.3% (19)</td>
<td>8.7% (9)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored children other than your own</td>
<td>69.2% (72)</td>
<td>17.3% (18)</td>
<td>13.5% (14)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered to help at a Pepperdine event</td>
<td>70.2% (73)</td>
<td>22.1% (23)</td>
<td>7.7% (8)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

One measure of a college education is the extent to which students are encouraged to become involved in civic life through voting, volunteering and using their gifts for the benefit of others. Alumni responses to this series of questions would seem to indicate that they have not yet involved themselves in many of the activities associated with a strong sense of civic responsibility. This merits further discussion by the division’s faculty.
ASSESSMENT OF THE COMMUNICATION MAJOR/PROGRAM

THE COMMUNICATION PROGRAM AND CORE COURSES

The Communication Major consists of four emphases for students: rhetoric and leadership; organizational communication; interpersonal communication; and intercultural communication. The four emphases share several courses in common and professors in those areas also contribute to teaching the basic speech course, Communication 180, and the four core classes required of all students majoring in a Communication Division program. The basic speech course is part of the General Education curriculum and is assessed in a separate document from this. The core curriculum is assessed here as if it were a stand-alone program.

All students who major in a program in the Communication Division are required to take four core classes. This curriculum was adopted in 2001 and remained unaltered until a slight modification in 2011. The core consists of four learning cornerstones the faculty deem important for anyone engaged in communication: theory, research, storytelling in various contexts, and ethics. The division considers Introduction to Communication Research (Communication 300) as the writing and research-intensive class in the division.

As originally conceived, the curriculum served students interested in traditional communication majors such as speech and rhetoric, while also providing a foundation in communication for students majoring in journalism, media production, public relations and advertising. Thus, for example, in addition to focusing on academic research using quantitative, qualitative and rhetorical methods alone, the curriculum of the research course would help students learn the research needs of professionals choosing careers in advertising, journalism and public relations. The idea was to teach a class on “researching” rather than research methods as traditionally taught at most sister institutions. Likewise the theory class was conceived as a course that would cover more theories than just those in a traditional communication theory book, giving equal weight to general as well as mediated theories.

The hope expressed by the authors of the division’s core curriculum was soon dashed by several realities: the majority of the teachers qualified to teach the courses were schooled in traditional methods of teaching theory, research and rhetoric; and the university’s registration system and compensation rules discouraged team teaching of courses. Thus a creative idea crashed back to reality. While professors attempted to adapt courses to meet the outcomes of all programs, their expertise and interests inevitably led to courses that mimicked traditional approaches to teaching communication theory, research, context and ethics. As a result, some mediated professors and students questioned the relevance of classes geared towards preparing
students for graduate school exclusively; others coveted the 12 units taken by the core and asked that it be dissolved to allow for courses those professors deemed more relevant to their particular majors. Although not reproduced in this report, journalism major student exit surveys from the period of 2007 to 2009 clearly indicated student discontent and misunderstanding of the core curriculum.

Rather than abandon the core curriculum, professors in the division began a continual dialogue over course content. In 2005, for instance, a review of the Communication Theory course by the division’s curriculum committee resulted in the addition and subtraction of certain theories from the course, providing a better balance of "human" and "mediated" theories. During the past two years, professors teaching the Communication Research course have sought examples of mediated research to share with students and have encouraged students majoring in media areas to pursue research projects on topics the students might research while employed at a media company.

In 2011, as part of the restructuring and re-naming of the media production and journalism majors, the Seaver Academic Council agreed to allow journalism and media production students to take a new course, Storytelling Through Media (Communication 205), instead of the core course entitled Communication and Context (Communication 301). The decision was based on student exit interviews, and capstone course assessment within the journalism and media production (then telecommunications) majors. The division felt this differentiation would allow the traditional core course, Communication and Context, to move more towards a focus on rhetorical analysis, while the new course would allow students to take one story and tell it across multiple platforms including newspapers, radio, video and the internet. Both courses still focus on communication in context, while differentiating the skills needed for analyses of messages.

Assessment of Storytelling Through Media is not yet available as the course was taught for the first time during the fall of 2011. An initial analysis of student projects using a grading rubric indicates that students are learning the expected outcomes for the course.

As this Five Year Review began, faculty in the division—at a meeting in May and again in August, 2011—discussed the best mechanism for assessing the outcomes of the core curriculum. In May 2011, professors Keli Myers, Steve Lemley, Juanie Walker, Ken Waters, Don Shores, Kimberly Stoltzfus and Caitlin Lawrence agreed that while the core courses are not a separate program/major, that for the sake of this report, the core should be treated as a separate program so it can be more appropriately assessed. Once this baseline is established, core assessment will be subsumed under the program assessment of the existing majors within the division.

Although the core may not be assessed as a separate program in the future, the group meeting in May and August of 2011 wrote a mission statement and student learning outcomes for the Communication core classes.
Mission statement:

The faculty of the Communication Division creates learning environments consistent with Christian values that encourage students to comprehend the diverse dynamics of human communication in all its contexts, and to use that knowledge and accompanying skills to become world citizens exemplifying lives of purpose, service and leadership.

Four core courses are required of all Communication majors. These courses establish a foundation of theory, research, writing, and ethics necessary for quality student learning in all majors within the division.

Core Student Learning Outcomes

Students completing the Communication Core classes will:

1) Describe the essential nature of communication as a field of study and recognize its significance in interpreting human behavior.

2) Acquire foundational skills in academic and professional research, writing, analysis and presentation necessary to excel in the major courses.

3) Demonstrate the ability, through practice and performance, to clearly and effectively express messages through multiple mediums.

4) Demonstrate knowledge of various ethical theories and how to apply ethical thinking to an array of ethical dilemmas.

Matrix of Core Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SLO 1</th>
<th>SLO 2</th>
<th>SLO 3</th>
<th>SLO 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com 205-Storytelling*</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 200-theories</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 300-research</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 301-persuasion</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 400-ethics</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grid:

I = Introduce  D = Develop  M = Master
*Fourth core course for media production and journalism majors. Taken in lieu of Com 301.

**Assessment Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>When to assess</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis and Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2011May 2011</td>
<td>Rubrics used for journals; imbedded test questions, Knowledge Surveys</td>
<td>Student feedback survey</td>
<td>Annual report/program review of each major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>Imbedded test questions; rubric of final project</td>
<td>Alumni surveys; student survey at midterm</td>
<td>Annual report/program review of each major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>Imbedded test questions; portfolio rubric</td>
<td>Student surveys</td>
<td>Annual report/program review of each major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Rubric of final project; Knowledge survey; imbedded essay questions.</td>
<td>Internship site supervisor evaluation; exit surveys conducted by individual majors.</td>
<td>Annual report/program review of each major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**History of Assessment of the Core Curriculum**

As the core curriculum has only been treated as a separate program for less than two years, little assessment data is available to share in this report. However it is important to note that assessment of the core has been ongoing, just not in the same form or fashion we are now being called upon to report. Discussions about student learning in the core are brought to the division’s curriculum committee for discussion. In the past, individual professors have brought concerns about what students are learning in the core to the curriculum committee for discussion. Expectations among faculty as to exactly what their students were supposed to learn in the core occasionally gives rise to division discussions at our monthly Wednesday morning meetings once the division curriculum committee, which meets at least once a month, has collected input from all the faculty. The data presented by the professors has
varied. It usually is indirect—exit surveys and lower than expected scores on a research or theory component of a capstone assignment being the principle data. In response to disappointing student-learning performance, several “loops” have been closed over the past five years.

1. The evaluation of the Communication 200 (Theories) course in 2008 resulted in a reduction in the number of theories covered from 25 to a more manageable 20. A common assessment measure was created for all sections to be used by all professors.

2. During this past year, at the urging of the Division Curriculum Committee, professors who teach Communication 300 (research) created a common syllabus and experimented with having students not only propose a research project, but also carry out the research and analyze the results. Some of the assessment results are reported later in this section of the document.

3. A rhetoric professor who teaches Com 301, Communication and Context, proposed converting that class to a rhetoric-based consideration of various ways in which people use words, images and their own bodies to communicate. Given that the Communication research course (300) focuses primarily on quantitative and qualitative research methods, the faculty felt the idea should be tried and assessed during the next two years.

4. The Communication 400 (ethics) professors created a common Knowledge Survey. Results are used to help each professor monitor how well students are gaining knowledge (SLO 1) and applying ethical theories to “real world” situations. An additional attempt to monitor student retention of key concepts from the other core classes was incorporated into a knowledge survey given to students the final week of class in Communication 400, as the class is restricted to seniors only.
Average class size is 28.65

**Bold Face type** indicates tenured Ph.D. professor. All others are visiting with M.A. degrees.

This is considered the gateway class to the Communication Division programs and is a prerequisite for most courses in the various majors. Over the time period studied, 34 Communication 200 sections were offered. Only 27 percent were taught by a Ph.D. tenured professor (Dr. Stephen Lemley). The remaining 73 percent of the courses were taught by visiting professors with M.A. degrees. This is an issue the Communication Division should address in its post-assessment discussions.

### Communication 300—Research Methods

Faculty and (Enrollment)

Average class size 17.8.
**Bold faced** denotes tenured or tenure track professor with Ph.D. All others are visiting with M.A.

Thirty-four sections of this social science and qualitative research course were taught during the time period reported. Of these, 38 percent were taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty. The remaining courses were taught by visiting professors or adjuncts. From the fall of 2009 to the present, those visiting and/or adjunct professors were completing Ph.D. programs at the University of California at Santa Barbara.

**Communication 301—Message Creation and Effects**
Faculty and (Enrollment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
<th>Fall 09</th>
<th>Spring 10</th>
<th>Fall 10</th>
<th>Spring 11</th>
<th>Fall 11</th>
<th>Spring 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clancy (26)</td>
<td>Jones (19)</td>
<td>Jones (20)</td>
<td>Stoltzfus (20)</td>
<td>Stoltzfus (27)</td>
<td>Sloan (23)</td>
<td>Jones (22)</td>
<td>Jones (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jone (17)</td>
<td>Gould (23)</td>
<td>Daum (20)</td>
<td>Jones (24)</td>
<td>Jones (21)</td>
<td>Sloan (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>House (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jone (19)</td>
<td>Clancy (22)</td>
<td>Stoltzfus (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waters (14) Lausanne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average class size 21.6

**Bold** denotes tenured professor. All others are visiting with M.A. with exception of Clancy who has Ph.D. but is still visiting.

Fifty-nine percent of the professors teaching the 27 sections of Communication 301 were tenured or tenure track professors.

**Communication 205—Storytelling Through Media**
Faculty and (Enrollment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 11</th>
<th>Spring 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stivers (18)</td>
<td>Stivers (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stivers (17)</td>
<td>Stivers (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salas (18) in Florence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average class size 17.5 (computer lab holds 18 computers).

Stivers, Ed.D; Salas MFA; Smith, MA. All are long-term visiting professors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
<th>Fall 09</th>
<th>Spring 10</th>
<th>Fall 10</th>
<th>Spring 11</th>
<th>Fall 11</th>
<th>Spring 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td>Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average class size 20.47

**Bold-faced** are tenured or tenure-track professors. Smith is M.A. (Pepperdine) on long-term visiting contract. Thirty-two sections were offered, with 94 percent taught by full-time tenured or tenure-track professors.

The core classes are considered the “core/foundational” courses in the major, yet over the past few years the 200 and 300 level courses have been taught primarily by short-term visiting professors. This is not ideal and the division needs to find ways to put more tenured and tenure-track professors into the core classes.
Summary and Discussion of Assessment Results

Communication Core Curriculum

PLO 1: Describe the essential nature of communication as a field of study and recognize its significance in interpreting human behavior.

Two direct assessment methods were used.

Communication 200—Communication Theory
Several assessment methods have been used to determine if students have understood the 33 theories required to be known in the class. This report will detail a Fall 2011 method used in two courses with an attendance of approximately 45 students.

Students were required to memorize a list of the 33 theories that were taught or discussed in class. At the beginning of the semester, students were given a list of the theories along with their theorists’ names and their key ideas. They were quizzed randomly on any 10 of the 33 theories throughout the semester. Students were required to match the theorist(s) name(s) with the theory and the key idea. By quizzing students throughout the semester, it can be determined if students are using long-term memory or short-term memory to access this information. Second, they address the second SLO, as the key ideas of the theories incorporate many vocabulary words that are central to understanding the theories. Finally, they address much of the third SLO, which states that students will develop basic knowledge of the theories and recognize their core concepts so that they can incorporate them into their writing and analysis. Obviously, these quizzes and exam questions determine if students can recognize the core concept (or key idea) of each of the theories.

When assessing student performance for the quizzes, three were used.
Students who scored below 70% on the quizzes were considered not meet the expectations for the class. Students with a score of 70% to 90% met the expectations and students with a score of 90% or higher exceeded expectations. For COM 200.01, seventeen students did not meet the expectations for the quizzes. However, of those seventeen, sixteen exceeded expectations for the final by receiving a score of 90% or higher. The other student met expectations for the final, receiving a score between 70 and 90%. Ten students met the expectations for the quizzes and every single one of those exceeded expectations for the final. Only one student exceeded expectations for the quizzes in COM 200.01.

For COM 200.02, only nine students did not meet expectations for the quizzes. Of these students, eight exceeded expectations for the final, while one met expectations for the final. Ten students met expectations and all exceeded expectations on the final. Eight students exceeded expectations on the quizzes and all exceeded expectations on the final except one, who met expectations.

This information demonstrates that students at Pepperdine are able to cram for
an exam and receive high marks. However, many of these students are not able to recall the theorists, theories and key ideas long-term. It is assumed that the majority of these students will have to relearn the material for their future classes. However, 38% of COM 200.01 and 67% of COM 200.02 appear to have fully developed a ready basic knowledge the theories. Hopefully this will be evident in their future classes. The Professor noted: I was curious if students who performed better on the quizzes did better in the class overall. I averaged the final grades of the students performing at each level and found the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COM 200.01 Final Grade</th>
<th>COM 200.02 Final Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Expectations (70-90%)</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Expectations (90+% )</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The professor remarked: I was surprised to find that students did better overall in the class if they met expectations for the quizzes, rather than doing better. However, the data is slightly skewed since there is only one student in COM 200.01 who exceeded expectations on the quizzes. Also, one student who excelled on the quizzes in COM 200.02 received a C+ due to poor grades on the exams and final paper. This lowered the average considerably. However, students who did not meet the expectations for the quizzes did have considerably lower final grades in both COM 200.01 and COM 200.02. I definitely plan on using this information this semester to encourage students to put more effort into knowing the theories, theorists and key terms long-term (which will help them perform better on the quizzes) rather than cramming for the exams.

In addition, I think I can do a better job of explaining why this class is significant and how it will help them in their future classes. The reason we teach COM 200 as a first course is to give students the vocabulary and theoretical understanding the need to excel in their major courses. If this is not conveyed to students, they see this class as memorizing a lot of useless information. I need to do a better job of connecting this class to their future classes. One way that I hope to do this is by briefly introducing the majors to the students, to help them see the connections and also help students decide which area they want to continue studying. Second, I need to remind them more often that the
information in this class will help put them on a successful path for their future classes. Finally, I need to continually remind students that those who gain higher scores on the quizzes (ie those who take the time to memorize these terms long-term) tend to receive much higher scores in the class.

**Knowledge Retention Exit Survey**

A second measure of knowledge gained used a knowledge survey “after” measure to determine how well students remembered key concepts from all of their core classes.

Approximately 75 graduating seniors taking Communication Ethics were given a knowledge survey in December of 2011. The survey included 44 questions taken from each of the four core classes plus a core course for media majors, MSCO 570, Communication Law. A knowledge survey is supposed to measure the confidence of students in their ability to answer questions at the beginning of a class and again at the end. For the sake of this direct assessment, students took the “end” survey only. While the methodology of using a knowledge survey in this way is novel, if not suspect, the resulting data proved helpful in alerting teachers in the division to concepts students might not recall once the class is concluded. Thus in later classes, these would be concepts professors would need to reinforce to help student retention of the knowledge.

The knowledge survey measures student confidence about the ability of the student to answer the question immediately (1), within a short period of time (2), or not at all (3). For the sake of analysis, mean scores greater than 2 were considered as evidence that students did not recall the concept with sufficient confidence. Using this scale, students expressed confidence in being able to answer 70 percent of the questions, a somewhat disappointing but still acceptable rate of confidence.
The questions of concern included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is determinism?</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which epistemology rejects the notion that truth exists apart from the knower of the truth, that truth can only be understood from the viewpoint of individual experiences?</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Name the viewpoint that believes, “You cannot not communicate.”</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What is the major premise of the media ecology theory?</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Explain the Toulmin model.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. What does IRB stand for?</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Construct a semantic differential scale.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. What’s reliability co-efficient?</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. What philosophy underlies critical research methodology?</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Explain how grounded theory is created.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Which theory is most applicable to social movements?</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Who said, “Man is a symbol using and misusing animal?”</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Explain the concept of “chaining out.”</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of this survey tend to indicate that students in Communication 200, Communication Theory, did retain knowledge of those theories Communication division professors singled out to test in the Knowledge Survey.

Of concern in this assessment were several areas of knowledge students appeared to struggle to retain. This included qualitative research theory and methods (questions 31 and 32), rhetorical theory and methods (questions 41, 42) and theory building concepts from the Communication Theory course. The lack of confidence in qualitative
and rhetorical theory and methods points out one challenge in the current configuration of the Communication Research course. That is, it is too focused on teaching quantitative techniques (in part because most professors are trained primarily in quantitative methods). The Division Curriculum Committee is already discussing ways to modify the emphases in the research course to provide a better survey of all research approaches. The fact that the current textbook is no longer being printed will likely result in a faculty-selected course book that not only broadens the students’ exposure to research methods, but also to ways in which research is used in careers such as advertising, public relations, marketing, journalism and media production. It is students in these majors who most often comment on exit surveys that they don’t see the relevance of the research methods course.

The knowledge survey itself is an imperfect instrument for assessment. A different tool may be chosen in the future. In addition, if the division decides to continue to assess the core separately, the questions on the Exit Knowledge Survey will be improved.

**PLO 2): Acquire foundational skills in academic and professional research, writing, analysis and presentation necessary to excel in the major courses.**

The core knowledge survey identified potential weaknesses in student knowledge retention about a few concepts in the research course, the primary vehicle through which PLO 2 is assessed. PLO 2, though, suggests that students will move from strictly acquiring knowledge of how research is done to creating literature reviews, research proposals and, in some cases, completion of the actual research project.

**Direct measurement:**

To more accurately assess skills outcomes in research, several professors have consulted together on comparing assessment results from their particular classes, some of which require a research proposal, some a proposal and a finished research project. This report provides an example of the assessment of two courses taught in the spring of 2011. It serves as a benchmark for future assessment of the Com 300 course.

In Dr. Myers’ courses, on the first day of class, the 31 students were given a short (20 item) knowledge assessment test. This test included questions/items on knowledge that would be assessed on the class midterm and final exams. The average scores on this assessment test were then compared with the students’ average test scores as the semester progressed.

In Com300.03 the students correctly answered 52% of the assessment questions. On their course exams, they, on average, correctly answered 80% of the questions. This demonstrates a large gain in knowledge across the semester.

In Com300.04 the students correctly answered 60% of the assessment questions. On their course exams, they, on average, correctly answered 82% of the questions. This demonstrates a large gain in knowledge across the semester.

In addition to this assessment measure, faculty teaching Communication 300 devised grading rubrics for the final project. That project was either a group research report, usually a survey of students on campus (in which the students submitted their project for IRB approval) or an individual research proposal. The rubrics are reproduced in the Appendix section of this report. In future semesters, those rubrics will be standardized and a random sample of student work will be assessed using the standardized rubric.
**Indirect Assessment**

To assess the extent to which the class learning outcomes were met, students in the spring 2011 research methods class were (anonymously) asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed that they were able to meet each of the five outcomes. A six point Likert scale was used. The survey prompts were:

I am able to:

1. Identify the characteristics of and differences between humanistic (rhetorical) and social scientific (quantitative & qualitative) research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Identify the major research methodologies within the social scientific orientation, explain the types of projects for which each is best suited, and summarize the basic steps or operations involved in each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Understand and carefully analyze communication research published in peer-reviewed, scholarly journals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Design your own research projects (e.g., propose sound research questions and hypotheses, write a literature review in APA format, construct a survey instrument and collect data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Think creatively, independently, analytically, and systematically about how researchers and communication practitioners in industry rely on **rigorous** research methods to understand human behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table shows the average student responses for each of the learning outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.2593</td>
<td>.76423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.8148</td>
<td>.73574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.3704</td>
<td>.79169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.2593</td>
<td>1.05948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.2963</td>
<td>.72403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome_Average</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.2000</td>
<td>.57379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, students agree that they are able to perform/understand each of the learning outcomes that were specified in the course syllabus.

**PLO 3: Demonstrate the ability, through practice and performance, to clearly and effectively express messages through multiple mediums.**

**Direct Assessment**

Communication 301, Communication and Context, is the primary class in which this PLO is assessed. A standard assessment method was introduced in 2011 and has been tested over the past two semesters. The assessment consists of imbedded questions in the final exam representing key knowledge and theoretical concepts. The second assessment uses a rubric to measure the ability of students to “express messages through multiple mediums.” Students were given the option of writing a 10-page paper, creating a multimedia advertising campaign, or creating a short documentary. Because of time and technology constraints most students chose the paper option.

Results of imbedded test questions:

During the past two semesters of assessment, answers to the imbedded questions indicated that most students understood ancient rhetorical theories more than more contemporary theories such as the Narrative paradigm of Walter Fisher (17 of 48 students responded correctly). Scores on other questions related to contemporary theories ranged from 20 correct out of 48 students to 29 correct out of 48 students. In closing the loop on these results, the principle professor, John Jones, has rewritten the question related to Walter Fischer’s paradigm and reviewing the Enlightenment and more recent theories (all of which are covered the first few weeks of school) during
the last class of the semester to see if student recall is improved.

During the past two semesters, the 48 students assessed in Com 301 turned in acceptable projects demonstrating their ability to apply theory to the creation of a persuasive campaign. Thirty-nine of the students “exceeded expectations” on a collapsed grading rubric, while five “met expectations.” No student scored unsatisfactory in their final campaign project.

This would indicate that student learning outcome number 3 is being achieved by most students in the communication in context class.

**PLO 4: To demonstrate knowledge of various ethical theories and how to apply ethical thinking to an array of ethical dilemmas.**

**Knowledge Survey:**

Professors teaching the Communication Ethics course conduct a knowledge survey each semester. For the sake of this assessment report, the findings from two separate courses taught during two different semesters will be considered. The survey consists of 40 questions covering major concepts and philosophers. Students are asked to indicate their level of confidence in being able to answer the question, based on a scale of 1 (very confident) to 3 (no idea of where to even start). Generally, when the aggregated mean scores of students is over a 2.0 on their “final” knowledge survey, that is an indication that students did not understand the concept.

During the two semesters for which data is reported in this report, four questions elicited a less than satisfactory level of confidence. Two of these were from the chapter on diversity ethics.

**Ethical Analysis**

The final project in one of the sections asks six groups of four students to conduct a seven-to-ten pager analysis of a recent ethical communication dilemma faced by a corporation or individual. Five categories were used in the rubric: appropriateness of the ethical issue analyzed; research and explanation of the situation; ethical analysis; writing; and usefulness as a teaching tool. To assess this SLO, I looked at the ethical analysis and writing sections of the rubric. I collapsed the rubric into three categories: above average, adequate and inadequate for this assessment.

Results of the analysis and writing sections of the final project for Fall 2010:

- Analysis of the ethical dilemma: 3 above average, 2 adequate, 1 inadequate
- Writing and clarity of insight and arguments: 4 above average, 2 average

During the spring of 2011, results on two dimensions of the grading rubric, once collapsed into three categories, yielded the following results:

“the uniqueness and appropriateness of the ethical issue analyzed.”

Of the 25 case studies submitted, the results were as follows:

- 1 unsatisfactory
- 23 satisfactory
- 1 outstanding

“Ethical analysis—how well and with what appropriate principles did you analyze the
situation?”
Of the 25 case studies submitted, the results were as follows:
3 unsatisfactory,
22 satisfactory
0 Outstanding

The professor notes: I am comfortable with the fact that the majority of students submitted case study analyses that indicated they had learned the material for the course and could apply that material to the consideration of a real-life situation, one they may likely face in their own careers.

Closing the Loop:

Four issues arise from a study of the data presented.

1. Each course in the core now has a common syllabus, but common assessment methods still need to be refined.
2. The division needs to discuss whether it is comfortable with the majority of the introductory courses in theory (Com 200) being taught by visiting professors. While the current visiting professors have been in the division for several years and are now schooled in assessment techniques, a new group of visiting professors may not be capable of providing adequate assessment data.
3. Class size in the core classes, with the exception of Com 205 and Com 400, is fairly high. One way to close the loop is to offer the theory (Com 200) and message and effects (Com 301) classes in large lecture formats to free up professors to ensure that the research class and the ethics class can remain below 20 students.
4. The division needs to decide if it would prefer to assess the core courses separate from the programs, or incorporate assessment of the core into the program assessment cycles.
COMMUNICATION PROGRAM

Intercultural Communication Emphasis

Prepared by

Sarah Stone Watt, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Communication
Director of Forensics

Milton J. Shatzer, Ph.D.
Professor of Communication
Intercultural Communication Curriculum Coordinator

Kenneth E. Waters, Ph.D.
Professor of Journalism
Communication Division Chair
Introduction and Overview

In today's ever-expanding global community, intercultural communication is inevitable.\(^1\) As participants in communities (both physical and virtual), classrooms, and workplaces, citizens are continuously faced with the need to communicate with people from differing cultural backgrounds. The Intercultural Communication sequence provides knowledge of diverse cultures to students in the major, as well as the general education curriculum. Professors bring knowledge of various cultures, and cultural communication styles, to the classroom. They help students understand the history of those communication styles, and address current and future issues facing the global community. Students in the major also have the opportunity to test their intercultural communication competencies through experiential learning internships. Through this process, the Intercultural Communication curriculum provides students with deeper insights into a core university objective of increasing student sensitivity to multicultural and international issues and challenges. Thus, students are better prepared for lives of purpose, service, and leadership.

Intercultural Communication Program History

Intercultural Communication, as a sub-discipline of the field Communication, has grown tremendously since the Korean War. Those coming back from Foreign Service positions realized that Americans were grossly unprepared for communicating with other cultures. Dr. Fred Casmir, who taught in this area during his thirty-year Pepperdine career, was a huge contributor to the field nationally and internationally. Since the 1970s, courses in intercultural communication have become an important part of any four-year undergraduate degree. Many of our peer and aspirational schools require that this course be taken by every student as an important part of being a global citizen. After the initial course in intercultural communication was started at Pepperdine, there were Irvine Foundation monies given for researching the idea of adding new courses to the curriculum. One of those courses, Media Impact and U.S. Minorities, has been taught every fall for the last 13 years. This has become a course not only for Intercultural Communication majors, but also for Ethnic Studies and Women’s Studies minors. It is also taken by students in programs such as Social Action and Justice, Fine Arts, English, and more. Another popular course that attracts students from a variety of majors is Global Media Worldwide. There is also a course that is cross-listed with International Studies: International Negotiation. Eventually, a Senior Capstone course was added: Intercultural Communication Case Studies. Many students discover the Intercultural Communication major when they study abroad. For most of them, the interdisciplinary approach of communication, cultural studies, anthropology, and social psychology is both new and exciting.

Some of the most significant changes to the Intercultural Communication sequence have been in the area of faculty assignments. At the time of the last review Dr. Lynn Reynolds, who had been hired to replace the retiring Dr. Fred Casmir, served as the curriculum coordinator for the major. She left Pepperdine in 2005 for a position at another university. In the fall of 2006, after returning from being the visiting faculty member in Heidelberg, Germany, Dr. Milton J. Shatzer filled in for Dr. L. Reynolds as a designated advisor for the Intercultural Communication major, as the Communication representative on the International Studies Council, as a professor teaching all of the shared courses with the International Studies majors, as the major advisor in the International Studies (International / Communication Studies Emphasis), and as the sole mentor, advisor, and instructor of the INTS 597 senior thesis seminar in the International Studies major. Since the departure of Dr. L. Reynolds in 2005, no full-time, tenure-track faculty member has been hired to teach in this sequence to replace her.

The void left by Dr. L. Reynolds has been filled by tenure track faculty who specialize in related areas of communication, such as rhetoric, organizational communication, and journalism, and by a variety of visiting instructors. Over the past seven years, 23 different faculty members have taught in this sequence. In 2007 two faculty members with degrees in rhetoric, Dr. Sarah Stone Watt (tenure-track) and Dr. Kristine Clancy (visiting), were hired to work with the debate team and also took on teaching and advising responsibilities in intercultural communication. Dr. Stone Watt has taught COM 513 and regularly teaches COM 512, but she also directs the debate team, teaches in the Social Action and Justice Program, and teaches and advises in the Rhetoric and Leadership sequence. Dr. Clancy regularly teaches COM 513, 514, and is filling in for Dr. Shatzer in COM 515 while he is teaching abroad in spring 2012. The bulk of her teaching has been in intercultural communication and, despite her visiting status, she has taken on undergraduate advisees, graduate committees, and internship supervising for the intercultural major. Unfortunately, Dr. Clancy will be leaving Pepperdine University at the end of the spring 2012 semester. This assessment, along with the two previous reports (Reynolds 2004 and Shatzer 2009), demonstrates that the Intercultural Communication sequence has been operating at minimum staffing levels for too long, and would greatly benefit from the addition of a full time faculty member to replace Dr. L. Reynolds.

**Mission of the Intercultural Communication Program**

The intercultural communication major explores the interrelationship of culture, language and thought. The program develops students’ empathy for diverse cultures and provides the skills they need to become competent intercultural communicators.

---

2 Seventeen of these faculty members, and their involvement in the major, are detailed in the 2009 Five-Year Review. The remaining six faculty have been added since 2009 and are listed with the current faculty on page three of this report.
Program Learning Outcomes

Students who complete an emphasis in Intercultural Communication can:

1. Understand the definitions, philosophies and relevant research that contribute to the definition of “Culture” (and co-cultures) and the ways culture is shaped by the relevant institutions of a society.

2. Comprehend the interrelationship of culture, language and thought and the various dimensions of cultural similarities and dissimilarities (e.g., individualism vs. collectivism, etc.).

3. Analyze complex interactions between people of different cultures and design plans that facilitate the constructive transfer of meaning, thus helping diffuse conflict and misunderstanding.

4. Construct ethical messages that are appropriate for targeted audiences.
**Intercultural Communication Curriculum**

The 2011-2012 Seaver Catalog explains,

> The Intercultural Communication Sequence is concerned with the communication behavior which occurs when people from different cultures come together and interact with one another. Students interested in careers in which an understanding of cultural adaptation is important will find this sequence beneficial.

In addition to the Communication Division's core curriculum, Intercultural Communication majors take the following courses:

- COM 220  Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication
- COM 512  Media Impact and U.S. Minorities
- COM 513  Intercultural Communication
- COM 515  Capstone: Intercultural Communication: Case Studies
- COM 519  Communication and Conflict
- COM 595  Experiential: Communication Internship

They choose one from the following course offerings:

- COM 483  Small Group Communication
- COM 506  Media World Wide
- COM 514  International Communication and Negotiation

Majors are also required to complete an outside concentration of 12-16 upper division units, usually taken in their senior year.

There have been no curricular changes since the program review in 2004. However, as a result of the 2009 program review, one curriculum change has been accepted by the Communication Division Curriculum Committee for proposal to the Seaver Academic Council in spring 2012. This proposal would convert COM 513: Intercultural Communication, to COM 313. COM 513 is the introductory course for this sequence, but it also fulfills a major requirement in International Studies (International Studies and Languages Division), and is one of the non-western General Education options for students college-wide. Because of its popularity, the course is taught on a fairly consistent basis in one or more of the college's International Programs campuses. The course regularly enrolls students with no prior knowledge of the subject, thus professors teaching the course cannot reasonably expect 500-level work from students in a discipline they are being introduced to for the first time. The faculty determined that the course would be more appropriately offered at the 300 level.
**PLO Curriculum Matrix**

Table 1: The following table reflects the alignment between our curriculum and our overall Student Learning Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>SLO #1</th>
<th>SLO #2</th>
<th>SLO #3</th>
<th>SLO #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 180</td>
<td>Understand the definitions, philosophies and relevant research that contribute to the definition of “Culture” (and co-cultures) and the ways culture is shaped by the relevant institutions of a society.</td>
<td>Comprehend the interrelationship of culture, language and thought and the various dimensions of cultural similarities and dissimilarities (e.g., individualism vs. collectivism, etc.).</td>
<td>Analyze complex interactions between people of different cultures and design plans that facilitate the constructive transfer of meaning, thus helping diffuse conflict and misunderstanding.</td>
<td>Construct ethical messages that are appropriate for targeted audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 220</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 483*</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 506*</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 512</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 513</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 514*</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 515</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Choose courses

I=Introduce, D=Develop, M=Master
### Institutional SLO Alignment Map

Table 2: The following table demonstrates the alignment between the Intercultural Communication Student Learning Outcomes and the overall Student Learning Outcomes of Pepperdine University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand the definitions, philosophies and relevant research that contribute to the definition of “Culture” (and co-cultures) and the ways culture is shaped by the relevant institutions of a society.</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Scholarship</strong>&lt;br&gt;Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comprehend the interrelationship of culture, language and thought and the various dimensions of cultural similarities and dissimilarities (e.g., individualism vs. collectivism, etc.).</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Scholarship</strong>&lt;br&gt;Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Analyze complex interactions between people of different cultures and design plans that facilitate the constructive transfer of meaning, thus helping diffuse conflict and misunderstanding.</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Scholarship</strong>&lt;br&gt;Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Scholarship</strong>: Apply knowledge to real-world challenges</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Scholarship</strong>: Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faith and Heritage</strong>: Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice</td>
<td><strong>Faith and Heritage</strong>: Respond to the call to serve others</td>
<td><strong>Faith and Heritage</strong>: Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions to be informed by a value-centered life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Global Understanding</strong>: Demonstrate commitment to service and civic</td>
<td><strong>Community and Global Understanding</strong>: Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Global Understanding: Develop and enact a personal and professional vision that values diversity</td>
<td>Community and Global Understanding: Develop and enact a personal and professional vision that values diversity</td>
<td>Community and Global Understanding: Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice</td>
<td>4. Construct ethical messages that are appropriate for targeted audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Course Schedule

Intercultural Communication majors are typically advised to enroll in classes according to the following schedule:

### First Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 180</td>
<td>Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 200</td>
<td>Communication Theory (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sophomore Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 220</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Junior Year

COM 300  Introduction to Communication Research (3)
COM 301  Message Creation and Effects (3)
COM 513  Intercultural Communication (4)

Choose one course from the following: COM 483; COM 506; COM 514; Outside Concentration Courses

Senior Year

COM 400  Communication Ethics (3)
COM 519  Communication and Conflict (3)
COM 512  Media Impact and U.S. Minorities (4) – Fall Only
COM 515  Capstone: Intercultural Communication: Case Studies (3) – Spring Only
COM 595  Experiential: Communication Internship (1)

Choose one course from the following:

COM 506  Media Worldwide (4) – Spring Only
COM 514  International Communication and Negotiation (4)
SPE 483  Small Group Communication (4)

Enrollment Trends

The following tables and graphs report the enrollment trends for the Intercultural Communication Program over the past five to seven years. The data reveal an apparent drop in enrollment that may be attributed to the expansion during the past four years of the International Relations major, a joint major hosted by both the Communication and the International Studies and Languages divisions. Despite the appearance of an overall drop in students, enrollment in the capstone course, COM 515, has remained fairly consistent over time, indicating that interest in the program remains strong.
### Table 3: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005—Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Intercultural</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 06</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 07</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 08</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 09</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 1: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005—Fall 2011

Intercultural Major Retention

**Fall 2008 to Fall 2011**
Declared Intercultural Initially: 3
Declared after one or more semesters: 10

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued as Intercultural major</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to major within the</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall 2009 to Fall 2011**

Declared Intercultural Initially: 2
Declared after one or more semesters: 3

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued as Intercultural major</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to major within the</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall 2010 to Fall 2011**

Declared Intercultural Initially: 2
Declared after one or more semesters: 2

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued as Intercultural major</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to major within the</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Enrollment Trends by Year in School

It should be noted that due to the existence of an error in the University’s historical record-keeping process (students who double-major are only tracked as graduates in their first declared major) there may be significantly more graduates in the intercultural major, since it is common for students to double major with one of the foreign language programs.

Table 5: Degrees Awarded from Fall 2005—Summer 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Intercultural</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COM 513: Intercultural Communication is regularly offered both on the Malibu campus and in International Programs. Data from both programs demonstrate that the number of students enrolled in the course far exceed the number of students who have declared an Intercultural Communication major. It would appear that the course plays an important role in the non-Western component of the general education curriculum and the study abroad experience (See Tables 6 &
Table 6: Enrollment in COM 513, Malibu Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F08</th>
<th>Sp09</th>
<th>Su09</th>
<th>F09</th>
<th>Sp10</th>
<th>Su10</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>Sp11</th>
<th>Su11</th>
<th>F11</th>
<th>Sp12</th>
<th>Su12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Enroll.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shatzer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownlow</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lawrence</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Watt</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DellaPace</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clancy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD Wallace</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemley</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golbert</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ballard</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Ballard</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Totals</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 7: Enrollment in COM 513, International Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Su09</th>
<th>F09</th>
<th>Sp09</th>
<th>Su10</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>Sp11</th>
<th>Su11</th>
<th>F11</th>
<th>Sp12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Florence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby, Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby, Heidelberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters, Lausanne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Florence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lawrence, Heidelberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daum, Lausanne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemley, Heidelberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Shatzer, Florence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IP Totals</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8: Enrollment Totals for Com 515, the Intercultural Communication Sequence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sp09</th>
<th>Sp10</th>
<th>Sp11</th>
<th>Sp12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment in the capstone course, COM 515, appears to be fairly stable, with a slight dip in the spring of 2010. Thus it would appear that despite the growth of an International Studies major that interest in the Intercultural Communication major is holding steady.

**Program Quality**

**Student Profile**

Students who indicate a desire to major in Intercultural Communication as first year students possess an incoming high school GPA slightly above that of the average student choosing another major within the Communication Division.

Table 9: High School GPA from Fall 2005—Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Intercultural</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Intercultural Communication Major Admissions Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pepperdine</strong></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAT Math</strong></td>
<td>595</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAT Verbal</strong></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on data obtained from the Office of Student Information and Services, the average GPA of the Intercultural Communication majors upon graduation has been a 3.39 in 2004, a 3.34 in 2005, a 3.33 in 2006, a 3.35 in 2007, a 3.54 in 2008, and a 3.37 in 2009. The chart below gives a graphic representation of these data:

Figure 3: Intercultural Communication majors GPA at graduation
Over the past few years, the average GPA of graduating Communication majors is 3.33. The Intercultural Communication majors are slightly higher than the Communication Division average.

**Faculty Profile**

Table 11: Faculty Members Teaching in the Intercultural Communication Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Rank/Tenure</th>
<th>Courses taught in Intercultural Communication Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milt Shatzer†</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Professor, Tenure</td>
<td>COM 506 Media World Wide&lt;br&gt;COM 512 Media Impact and U.S. Minorities&lt;br&gt;COM 513 Intercultural Communication&lt;br&gt;COM 514 International Communication and Negotiation&lt;br&gt;COM 515 Intercultural Case Studies&lt;br&gt;INTS 497 Senior Seminar&lt;br&gt;COM 595 Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lemley</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Tenure</td>
<td>COM 519 Communication and Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Waters</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Chair, Professor, Tenure</td>
<td>COM 506: Media World Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanie Walker</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Tenure</td>
<td>COM 220 Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Stone Watt</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Pre-tenure</td>
<td>COM 483 Small Group Communication, COM 512 Media Impact and U.S. Minorities, COM 513 Intercultural Communication, COM 595 Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Andreas</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Pre-tenure</td>
<td>COM 519 Communication and Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Ballard</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Pre-tenure</td>
<td>COM 220 Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication, COM 513 Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ballard</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
<td>COM 220 Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication, COM 513 Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lloyd‡</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Tenure</td>
<td>COM 514: International Communication and Negotiation, INTS 497 Senior Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Golbert‡</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
<td>COM 515: Intercultural Case Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† These faculty members have their primary teaching responsibilities in the intercultural communication program.
‡ Affiliated faculty from other divisions.
Student Evaluations

With so many faculty involved in teaching the three main Intercultural Communication classes (Com 506, Com 513, Com 514, Com 515 and Com 519), the student evaluations for the past school year (2010-2011) were compiled for the sake of this report. In the future, a system will be developed to better capture GPA and student evaluation data. Here are the results of student evaluations for the 2010-2011 academic year:

Table 12: Average professor/course evaluation scores for 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com 512</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 513</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 514</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 506</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 513</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 514</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 515</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 519</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural sequence mean</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com Majors Mean</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the limited time period studied, the student evaluations of faculty who teach courses taken by Intercultural Communication majors is consistent with those of the other sequences within the
Communication major. Approximately half the courses evaluated are taught by tenure track or tenured professors; the other courses are taught by a visiting professor.
Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

In order to complete an assessment of mastery level competency in all of the program learning outcomes, the Intercultural Communication faculty proposes the following assessment plan. We plan to assess one PLO each year for the next four years, allowing a comprehensive review in year five.

Each PLO will be assessed using direct and indirect evidence. Direct evidence will include course-based materials such as embedded exam questions, research papers, group projects, and presentations. Indirect evidence will include course evaluations, student surveys, alumni feedback, and outside reviews of course material. A sample of our assessment plan appears in Table 13.
Table 13: Five Year Program Learning Outcome Assessment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td><strong>1,2,3,4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td><strong>2,3,4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO Assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers are in **red/bold** if the course is designed to produce mastery level competency in that PLO.

While individual instructors will do their own assessment of each course, the program level assessment will focus on those courses designed to develop or master the PLO.
Table 14: Plan for Gathering Assessment Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>Assessment Courses</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis and Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>COM 513</td>
<td>Exam Questions</td>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
<td>Annual report / Program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 514</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 515</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COM 506</td>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual report / Program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 514</td>
<td>Exam Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 515</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 595</td>
<td>Reflection Papers</td>
<td>Supervisor Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COM 512</td>
<td>Exam Questions</td>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
<td>Annual report / Program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 513</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 515</td>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 595</td>
<td>Reflection Papers</td>
<td>Supervisor Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>COM 400</td>
<td>Exit Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Evaluation Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 512</td>
<td>Group Projects</td>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 515</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 595</td>
<td>Reflection Papers</td>
<td>Supervisor Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

assessment / Program review
Program Learning Outcome Assessment Data

The results of our Program Learning Outcomes assessments over the past five years are as follows:

**COM 515: (Capstone) Intercultural Communication Case Studies**

For the 2010-2011 assessment period, it was decided (in discussion with the division chairperson) to assess the capstone course in the intercultural communication sequence in regards to the fourth Program Learning Outcome for the major. At the time, this learning outcome was, "Become a competent, ethical intercultural communicator both verbally and nonverbally." The professor for the course provided direct and indirect evidence of this learning outcome. An additional faculty member reviewed the evidence and provided feedback.

**Direct Evidence**

For this Program Learning Outcome, students were asked, in groups of three to four people, to research cross-cultural tensions between co-cultural groups within the contemporary United States. For example, one group investigated tensions between African Americans and Latino Americans. The second, third, and fourth groups respectively researched tensions between Native Americans, Asian Americans and Arab Americans and the dominant U.S. culture. Based on this research, the groups were then asked to develop a junior / senior high school course curriculum, or a teacher training workshop, or a parent-teacher seminar, or similar project, which could hypothetically be carried out or conducted. This project was then presented to the class and evaluated by classmates and the instructor.

As direct evidence of assessment, below are some exemplars from the student group projects that reflect the learning that took place in this course:

Exemplar One:

From the group project involving tensions between Asian Americans and the dominant U.S. culture

“Teachers must understand that different cultural styles too often hinder the communication process
between teacher and student. This break in communication negatively affects students’ learning outcomes. Furthermore, teachers’ ability to more easily communicate with students who share their culture (culturally similar students) facilitates greater academic success for those students. The disparity between the dominant U.S. group and minority groups’ access to high quality education in relation to teaching practices is called Equity Pedagogy (Bennett, 2002; “Pedagogy,” n.d.). This approach to educational reform primarily focuses on the actual learning process – attaining skills in literacy, mathematics, civics, etc., whereas other reforms focus on human relations. The assumption underlying Equity Pedagogy is that a less prejudiced, more equitable society requires education reform for teachers as more competent intercultural communicators (Banks, 1993).”

Exemplar Two:

From the group project involving tensions between Asian Americans and the dominant U.S. culture

“Conclusion

The larger objective of our workshop is to equip the participants, teachers of Asian American K-12 students, with effective tools and practices that will enhance Asian Americans’ school experience in the classroom. To achieve this goal, teachers’ must understand not only the state of Asian Americans in schools today, but also the historical events that led up to it. The background of key historical events in Asian immigration and acculturation to U.S. society are presented. More specifically, the development of misperceptions surrounding the model minority stereotype is expounded on. Then, teachers are provided with curriculum approaches and pedagogical strategies that facilitate higher quality education for Asian Americans. Finally, strategies are presented that foster more positive cross-cultural relations among all parties in the classroom. These approaches combined can drastically enhance school experiences of Asian Americans, their peers, and ultimately contribute to a more democratic society through higher quality education.”

Indirect Evidence

The following items from the course evaluations of COM 515 in the spring of 2011 serve as indirect evidence of the desired learning outcome:
1. Things you like best about the course: “I like how we were able to analyze other cultures and how they relate to our dominant American culture.”

2. “It has caused me to think about the ideas of race and ethnicity in America more. It has provided opinions of other Americans but I am not sure if I was "taught" pure facts. "Truth, having nothing to fear from investigation, should be pursued relentlessly in every discipline."

3. Things you like best about the course: “There are a lot of projects to get you thinking about other cultures. The reflection paper was the most interesting because I was able to observe a new culture other than my own.”

4. Things you like best about the course: “Learning about race as a social construct and Islamaphobia (sic) in the United States.” Suggestions for improvement: “Offer it as a non-western to more students, not just Intercultural Comm majors. Have another curriculum for the capstone of intercultural communication majors.”

5. ”There is a great deal of reading and the final project is hefty, but all of it is very meaningful and relevant to the course goals, as well as our lives as members of society.”

6. “This course should be taken by every student at Seaver if the University is aiming to provide an education that cultivates individuals who fully comprehend the realities of our society today.”

Reviewer Comments

The direct evidence of student learning provided demonstrates that these groups understand some of the challenges faces by educators who attempt to communicate across cultures. Their recommendations point to the fact that they also understand the importance of seeking solutions to these problems. However, there is insufficient data to determine the number of students in the class who have become “competent, ethical intercultural communicator[s], both verbally and non-verbally.” Additionally, the excerpts from teaching evaluations for this course certainly demonstrate the value students find in the course, and that it is an important part of the intercultural curriculum. However, they do not offer an indication of their competencies as intercultural communicators. In the future, I recommend that the target audience for the message be more clearly identified and characterized according to the information that the students have learned. That practice will help reviewers understand whether the group has truly demonstrated competence because the reviewers will be able to see how the message interacts with what we know of a given culture/target audience. The rewording of this PLO will help in this regard moving forward.
When this course is assessed again, it will utilize the revised PLO #4: Construct ethical messages that are appropriate for targeted audiences. At that time, I recommend that all student projects should be reviewed, according to a general rubric identifying standards for excellence regarding this PLO, by at least two members of the faculty. Ratings and narrative comments regarding the projects should be compared to determine the level of accomplishment in this area.

Reflections and Future Goals

The Intercultural Communication Program plays a vital part, not only in the Communication Division, but also in Seaver College’s General Education curriculum and International Programs. It provides students the opportunity to learn how to communicate as a global citizen as they prepare for lives of purpose, service, and leadership. Although enrollment has dropped off somewhat over the last two years, societal factors would suggest that demand for the major will remain constant or return to the higher level of 2007.

Intercultural Communication majors appear to be having a rewarding internship experience. The students’ responses demonstrate that their internships had a positive effect on their leadership skills, ability to work as a team player, knowledge of personal strengths and weaknesses, time management skills, written communication skills, verbal communication skills, analytical and critical thinking skills, personal values and ethics, and vocational direction. As reported earlier, the strongest impact reported from the end of term evaluations done by the students was in the area of verbal skills (M = 4.60). This demonstrates that the internships may be an important part of achieving PLO #4, construct ethical messages that are appropriate for target audiences, and the relationship between the internship and their abilities in this area ought to be assessed more directly through students’ internship journals and reflection papers. The least amount of impact was reported in the area of vocational direction (M = 4.27). The question that needs to be asked now in terms of internships is what needs to be done to have the internship experience have a greater effect on vocational direction (an area in which one would suspect the internship to be most influential).

Evidence from the capstone course (COM 515) indicates that Intercultural Communication majors appear to be mastering PLO #4 in the classroom setting. From the direct evidence of the capstone examinations, papers, capstone projects, and in-class presentations, the students appear to be mastering the information and knowledge provided in the intercultural major.

Students did very well in the capstone course. The average grade on the midterm exam was an 83%, the average of the annotative bibliography was an 89%, the average on the book review was a 93%, on the cultural reflection paper the average was a 94%, the average on the final exam was an 85% and the average on the group project was a 94% (for the paper portion) and a 91% (for the in-
Despite our strengths, our program review has revealed areas in which we might seek to improve going forward:

1. **Hiring.** Previous program reviews (2004 & 2009) have both called for more full-time, tenure-track faculty to be hired to teach in the sequence. The 2004 program review noted, and the 2009 review reaffirmed, that many students at Seaver College take COM 513 (Intercultural Communication) as their Non-Western Cultures General Education requirement. Thus, many of the students who take COM 513 are not communication majors, let alone intercultural communication majors. This produces a demand in the division to teach multiple sections of COM 513 each semester (including the summer sessions). Because there has been no full-time, tenure-track replacement for Dr. Lynn Reynolds in the intercultural sequence, this has placed a strain in terms of teaching and advising on the sole full-time professor teaching in the area, Dr. Milton J. Shatzer. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that Dr. Shatzer is also called upon to teach courses and advise in the International Studies: International / Intercultural Communication Studies Specialization. Therefore, one FTE is stretched between two divisions. Additionally, in the past five years Dr. Shatzer has been on leave due to his health, and has also been called away to teach in International Programs. The temporary solution has been to assign a visiting professor and other Communication Division faculty to this area to fill in the gaps. This temporary solution has been in place for eight years and may be contributing to the decline in majors. It is time for this area to replace Dr. Lynn Reynolds with a faculty member who is trained in intercultural communication and assigned to teach, advise, and recruit majors in this area.

2. **COM 513: Intercultural Communication.** The trend of large numbers of students taking COM 513: Intercultural Communication as a GE course, and the fact that this is course is designed as an introductory level course, has prompted discussion concerning the need to renumber the course as COM 313. Much of the course content would remain the same, but the reading load and work demanded of students could be reduced slightly to insure that they have the skills necessary in this area before they are being asked to conduct senior/graduate level research in this area. The proposal has been presented to, and accepted by, the Communication Division Curriculum Committee and will proceed to the Seaver Academic Council for approval this semester (spring 2012).
3. **Faculty Coordination.** It appears that there needs to be more coordination among the faculty who teach in the Intercultural sequence in terms of the Student Learning Outcomes for each of the courses and how well these SLOs in each class reflect the Program Learning Outcomes for the entire sequence. Currently we have professors teaching the COM 513: Intercultural Communication course (especially in the International Programs) with very little coordination as to SLOs, etc. Without infringing on the academic freedom of each individual faculty person, it would be well to share specific learning objectives and coordinate these with the program outcomes in the future. Additionally, if the recommendation concerning the renumbering of 513 to 313 is accepted, faculty teaching that course should coordinate to adjust the demands of the course in a consistent manner across sections.

4. **Classroom Assessment.** The 2009 Intercultural Assessment reflects the confusion regarding the various assessment procedures attempted in the Communication Division over the past five years. At that time, the recommendation was made that the Intercultural program should begin to focus on classroom assessment. That process has started, but will become more consistent with the establishment of uniform PLOs and an outline of the courses to be assessed in the coming years. As we move forward, a consistent method for assessment of each PLO should be established that can be repeated in the coming years.

5. **“Choose” Courses.** One of the burning questions in assessing the intercultural major is the relevance of peripheral courses such as COM 483: Small Group Communication and COM 519: Communication and Conflict. Currently, these courses are listed as “choose” courses in the major and thus they need to be examined to see how they “fit” into the overall program outcomes of the intercultural major. Further, their Student Learning Objectives and course content need to be examined to see that these mesh with the intercultural sequence.

6. **COM 515: (Capstone) Intercultural Case Studies.** Although preliminary assessment data reveals that students in this course are achieving stated learning outcomes, student evaluations and informal conversations with faculty in this area reveal two problems that need to be addressed with regard to this course:

   a. COM 515 is also offered as a course that could be taken by students in the International Studies major (Intercultural and International Communication sequence). This means that the COM 515 class is composed of students from two separate (although somewhat related) majors. The student recommendation was that the COM 515 capstone course should be one only open to intercultural communication majors in which students write a senior thesis instead of doing a final project. Having said this, it needs to be noted that this suggestion comes from only two student comments and may not be representative of all of the intercultural communication majors. This idea needs further study.

   b. In the spring of 2012 Dr. Shatzer, the usual instructor for COM 515, is teaching in International Programs and an affiliated faculty member from another division is teaching the course. Although the students find her knowledgeable, and generally
enjoy her teaching style, some have complained that they should not be learning
about Intercultural Communication from the perspective of another discipline (in
this case Anthropology) in their capstone course. At the end of the semester, student
research and evaluations should be examined to determine whether this is a
significant issue. If it is, this would further demonstrate the need to hire an
additional faculty in the intercultural area. If a new faculty member still is not hired,
the possibility of using a visiting faculty member with expertise in intercultural
communication should be explored in cases where the primary faculty member
cannot teach this class.

7. **Alumni Survey.** An alumni survey should be conducted to determine if the knowledge and
experience students gain in the intercultural sequence is of value to them in their life after
graduation. In other words, what have they learned that is most valuable to them in their
occupations and in community life? Moreover, what material did they learn that did not
serve them well in their lives as life-long learners? Furthermore, when reflecting upon their
education in the intercultural communication major, are they satisfied with the liberal arts
education they received? Alumni surveys have already been conducted in the
organizational communication sequence, in the communication graduate program, and in
the telecommunications major so these surveys can serve as guides for a similar survey in
the intercultural sequence.
Interpersonal Communication Emphasis

Prepared by: Bert Ballard, Assistant Professor of Communication, in conjunction with the following faculty teaching in the Interpersonal Program and from the Communication Division: Juanie Walker, Associate Professor; Dorothy Andreas, Assistant Professor; Keli Myers, Assistant Professor; Ken Waters, Professor, Chair of Communication Division
Introduction and Overview

The Interpersonal Communication program is one of four possible concentrations within the Communication Major, which is housed in the Communication Division of Seaver College at Pepperdine University. The program officially began in the fall of 2008 and, since then, has grown to 27 majors. Although it began in 2008, the program is still early in its development having only recently hired a faculty member to serve as a coordinator in 2011. The program has a varied curriculum that combines theoretical and skill-based approaches to interpersonal communication in a variety of contexts with a strong emphasis on the ethical development and analysis of communication abilities students will need to be successful in professional, ministry, and personal contexts and relationships. The program draws from expertise in other communication emphases including intercultural, organizational, and rhetoric and leadership. Students are exposed to excellent classroom teaching and scholars with a wide range of publications, applied expertise, and consulting experience.

This document reports the result of the interpersonal communication program’s Five Year Program Review and is divided into the following sections:

- The Program’s History
- Enrollment Trends
- Mission of the Program
- Program Student Learning Outcomes (with Curriculum Matrix, Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan, Program Learning Assessment, and Institutional Student Outcome Alignment Matrix)
- Program Quality Indicators (with SAT/GPA indicators and Curriculum and Learning Environment comparisons with other institutions)
- Future Goals

Interpersonal Program History

The interpersonal communication program in the Communication Division at Pepperdine University is one of four sequences undergraduates in the Bachelor of Arts in Communication program can select. The other three are intercultural communication, organizational communication, and rhetoric and leadership.

The interpersonal communication has been in existence since Fall 2008. It originated from a 2004-2005 Speech Communication Program Review. In that review, it was suggested that two critical goals needed to be achieved: (1) the need to revise the curriculum to reflect a more up-to-date major, and (2) the need to develop clearer program goals or learning outcomes. The review also noted the challenge of attracting more students to the major—a challenge that updating the curriculum would likely help to meet.
Based on those goals, the Speech Communication major was eliminated altogether and replaced with the Rhetoric and Leadership sequence.

To remain in line with other exemplary communication programs in the nation, the interpersonal sequence was developed. The interpersonal program possesses a distinct research and theoretical identity, level of student interest, and is a primary undergraduate program at many of the high caliber United States university communication programs like University of North Carolina, Villanova University, Purdue University, and the University of Southern California as well as private Christian schools Azusa Pacific University and Biola University. In regards to the peer and aspirational schools as identified by Pepperdine University, none of them had a specific interpersonal communication major, sequence, or concentration. Three had a communication major (University of San Diego, Baylor University, and the University of Wake Forest); the University of San Diego required an interpersonal communication course in two of their concentrations; and Baylor University covered material from interpersonal communication and required an upper level undergraduate course for one of its concentrations.

For the interpersonal major, courses with high levels of interpersonal communication content from other majors were included in the curriculum, such as COM 483: Small Group Communication, COM 513: Intercultural Communication, and COM 519: Communication and Conflict. These courses were bookended by an introductory course in Interpersonal Communication (COM 220) and Advanced Interpersonal Theory (COM 530). This is addition to the core courses (COM 200: Communication Theory, COM 300: Introduction to Communication Research, COM 301: Message Creation and Effects, and COM 400: Communication Ethics) common to all communication majors. In addition, like other communication majors, interpersonal majors are required to complete a one-unit internship. They further choose electives from COM 418: Communication in Organizations, COM 450: Communication and Leadership, and COM 590: Selected Seminars courses.

Because there has been no dedicated faculty member for the interpersonal communication major, COM 530: Advanced Interpersonal Theory has not been offered in recent years and students have taken COM 518: Advanced Organizational Communication as a capstone for the interpersonal major. The COM 530: Advanced Interpersonal Theory course will now be offered and will be designed as a capstone course. It is anticipated that future courses endemic to interpersonal communication such as family communication or relational communication will be developed and offered.

During its first term, 10 students enrolled in the interpersonal sequence and it has since then experienced significant growth (150%) in three years. There have been six degrees awarded overall. However, until the 2011-12 academic year, there have been no dedicated faculty associated with the program and advising and curriculum planning responsibilities have been distributed amongst the division’s faculty, primarily to Dr. Keli Myers. In 2011-12, Dr. Bert Ballard was hired to coordinate and provide leadership for the program, and has commenced teaching the introductory level interpersonal communication course, hosting focus groups with students, developing a family communication course, developing of the capstone class (COM 530), hosting a career, and beginning formal assessment of learning objectives in the classroom. With the addition of
Dr. Ballard, more growth and robust assessment of the program is expected by the next five-year review of the sequence.

**Enrollment Trends**

As shown in the tables, the interpersonal communication major was formally instituted in Fall 2008, with a total of 10 enrolling in the major in that semester. Since then the major has grown steadily each semester annual, increasing in all but two of the semesters. Current enrollment shows 25 students enrolled in the interpersonal communication major, a growth of 150% since the inception of the program over 3 years. These trends are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005—Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>COMIP</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Degrees awarded**

Since the inception of the interpersonal communication major, there have been 6 degrees awarded in the major as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Degrees Awarded from Fall 2005—Summer 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>COMIP</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interpersonal Major Retention**

**Fall 2008 to Fall 2011**

Declared Interpersonal Initially: 3  
Declared after one or more semesters: 4  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued as an Interpersonal major</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major within the Communication Division</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside of Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall 2009 to Fall 2011**

Declared Interpersonal Initially: 3  
Declared after one or more semesters: 9  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued as an Interpersonal major</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major within the Communication Division</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside of Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2010 to Fall 2011

Declared Interpersonal Initially: 0

Declared after one or more semesters: 1

| Continued as an Interpersonal major | 0 |
| Changed to a major within the Communication Division | 0 |
| Changed to a major outside of Communication | 0 |
| Left Pepperdine | 0 |

*Graph not applicable

Mission of the Interpersonal Communication Program

The Interpersonal Communication sequence is for students who want the knowledge and ability to work closely with people. Classes explore the dynamics of human communication in one-on-one and small group settings, exploring such issues as social attraction, nonverbal communication, intimacy and distance in relationships, conflict management, and group dynamics, all from a communication-centered perspective.

The Interpersonal Communication sequence provides students with the knowledge and skill to be effective and ethical communicators in a variety of personal and professional settings, as well as preparing them for advanced study. Students with an academic focus in Interpersonal Communication are prepared for careers in a variety of fields, ranging from human resources to sales and development, from counseling and social work to conflict negotiation and arbitration, from college recruiting and admissions to political advocacy — in short, any kind of profession that requires the ability to work effectively with other people.

Program Learning Outcomes

An Interpersonal Communication major who graduates from Pepperdine can:

1. Describe and analyze the variety of important interpersonal communication theories and research (both quantitative and qualitative).
2. Explain the power of interpersonal relationships to influence people’s beliefs, attitudes, values and behavior.
3. Distinguish between constructive and destructive communication in various interpersonal settings—family, dating relationships, marriage, friendships and the workplace—and in situations involving diversity of gender, ethnicity, religion and culture.
4. Assess varied interpersonal communication interactions and create ethical, constructive strategies for improving the impact and success of those communication exchanges.

**Interpersonal Communication Program Curriculum**

**Total Units – 40-42 Units**

**Communication Core Requirements - 12 Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 200</td>
<td>Communication Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 300</td>
<td>Introduction to Communication Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 301</td>
<td>Message Creation and Effects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 400</td>
<td>Communication Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Required Courses – 18 units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 220</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 483</td>
<td>Small Group Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 513</td>
<td>Intercultural Communication (GE)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 519</td>
<td>Communication and Conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 530</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 595</td>
<td>Communication Internship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Choose four courses from the following – 10-12 units**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 418</td>
<td>Communication in Organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 450</td>
<td>Communication and Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 590</td>
<td>Seminar in Communication</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(May be repeated when topics vary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PLO Curriculum Matrix**

The following table reflects the alignment between our curriculum and our overall Student Learning Outcomes.

Table 4. Program Learning Objective Matrix and Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SLO 1</th>
<th>SLO 2</th>
<th>SLO 3</th>
<th>SLO 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com 220</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 513</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 450</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 530</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 595</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 519</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 483</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 590</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I=Introduce    D=Develop    M=Master

**Assessment Plan**

Based on the program’s 1-year review (2010-2011), formal assessment of the interpersonal major was delayed until the 2011-2012 academic year because of the lack of expertise to coordinate the curriculum and assessment plan. With the addition of Dr. Bert Ballard, that assessment has now commenced. The following table represents an assessment plan and timeline, essentially measuring each PLO through a variety of direct, indirect, quantitative, and qualitative measures. The assessment plan presented here is a modification from the 1-year review submitted and approved for 2010-11. The reason for the change is that Dr. Ballard, in concert with the division, believed there was a need to establish baseline data across all four program learning objectives over the next few academic years in order to offer the most consistent data for the program in the future.
Table 5. Assessment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>When to Assess</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis and Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, &amp; 4</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>Embedded exam questions; Interpersonal student focus group</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>Annual Report/Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, &amp; 4</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>Embedded exam questions; capstone project rubric; Interpersonal student focus group</td>
<td>Student satisfaction survey; Senior Survey</td>
<td>Annual Report/Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, &amp; 4</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Rubric of final class projects; imbedded exam classes; capstone project rubric; Interpersonal student focus group</td>
<td>Student satisfaction survey; Senior Survey</td>
<td>Annual Report/Program Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Learning Outcome Assessment Data

During 2011-12, the interpersonal communication major began conducting a comprehensive assessment of the program’s learning outcomes. Two direct measures were employed: Embedded exam questions/evaluation of capstone projects and a focus group. Two indirect measures were employed: a student satisfaction survey and a review of student internship data. These results are provided below.

**Direct Measure #1: Embedded exam questions/evaluation of capstone projects**

Because the interpersonal communication major did not offer its capstone course, direct evaluation of program learning outcomes occurred in COM 518: Advanced Organizational Communication and indirect assessment from COM 519: Communication
and Conflict. Eight of the 11 students in COM 518 were interpersonal communication majors, so an embedded exam question/optional end of course survey and course evaluation data are summarized here along with comments on their capstone research projects. Additionally, summary of course evaluation data for COM 519 is provided as three of the course’s learning outcomes directly address the interpersonal communication program’s learning outcomes.

**COM 518: Advanced Organizational Communication Embedded Examination Question/End of course survey:**

As part of a final examination, students were asked three questions about their knowledge of interpersonal communication as a way to assess the major’s program learning outcomes. Specifically, the following questions were asked and the results are reported below. Six of the students responded to the questions.

**Question 1: What is interpersonal communication? (does not address any PLO specifically)**

- **Response summary:** 5 of the 6 (83% correctly responded that it is communication that involves 2 people).
- **Interpretation:** Most students can understand and distinguish interpersonal communication from other forms, but interpersonal majors should understand this 100% across the board. The one incorrect answer dealt with individual management of feelings and relationships as opposed to interpersonal communication involving only 2 persons and the construction of meaning.

**Question 2: Based on your experience in relationships, list three ways that you think you could use knowledge of interpersonal communication to improve relationships.**

- **Addresses:** PLO 2: Explain the power of interpersonal relationships to influence people’s beliefs, attitudes, values and behavior; and PLO 4: Assess varied interpersonal communication interactions and create ethical, communication exchanges.
- **Response summary:** Responses essentially fell into two categories, personal principles and theory to apply/incorporate.
  - Personal principles listed: identify cycle of abuse, mediate discussions and conflicts better, apply ethics and values to personal relationships, don’t overcommunicate, listen more, be more civil (2), more self-disclosure, establishing clear expectations, understand how meaning comes from relationships, having more complex understanding of social interaction and relationships, complementary relationship between emotion and rationality, articulate thoughts more precisely
  - Theory to apply/incorporate: Apatow’s dialogic communication, Bakhtin’s notion of discourse, Habermas’ ideal speech situation, social penetration theory, expectancy violation theory
• **Interpretation:** There is a clear preference for and ability of the interpersonal students to apply concepts to their personal experience with interpersonal communication, translating the concepts and ideas into their words that make sense and cohere with major ideas in interpersonal communication. It is encouraging for them to directly name and identify interpersonal theories and communication philosophies in regards to how to improve relationships in their own lives.

*Question 3: Provide one example of a relational experience (positive, negative, or both) that you can explain with an interpersonal theory or concept.*

• **Addresses:** PLO 1: Describe and analyze the variety of important interpersonal communication theories and research (both quantitative and qualitative); and PLO 3: Distinguish between constructive and destructive communication in various interpersonal settings--family, dating relationships, marriage, friendships and workplace--and in situations involving diversity of gender, ethnicity, religion and culture.

• **Response summary:** Theories listed: social penetration theory, looking glass self, cognitive dissonance, spiral of silence, dialogic communication, social attribution theory.

• **Interpretation:** Students seem to name theories and provide examples for very individual focused theories that have to do with their communication choices. This is not surprising given the developmental stage of the students as well as the preponderance of social science/psychology-based history of interpersonal communication. However, students also need to develop more awareness of relational, collaborative, and constitutive based theories to interpersonal communication.

*Summary of COM 518: Advanced Organizational Communication Course Evaluation by Dr. Dorothy Andreas, instructor for the course:*

“The numerical data from the course evaluation assessment indicates strong evidence that the students demonstrated learning at the development and mastery level of each of the first 3 student learning outcomes and at the development level of the 4th student learning outcome for the course (note that these SLO’s are for the COM 518 course and not for the interpersonal communication major). Whether or not the students were at the developing or mastery level largely depended on the individual students’ abilities and accomplishments. However, regarding the fourth learning outcome, all students appear to be at the developing level as they are still constructing their abilities to connect the theories and concepts they learn with wisdom and ethical judgments.

This semester, the majority of the class was interpersonal majors who were taking the class as a substitute for COM 530 (the reason that there were not very many organizational communication majors is that the seniors of this cohort are not required to take COM 518 in their degree plan—that begins for the next cohort). Because the class had so many interpersonal majors, I focused it on individual experiences in the workplace. And I believe this accommodation was meaningful to the students—they were interested in the material
and engaged in the class. However, several were disappointed to not be able to take their capstone class and a couple of them commented on this in the course evaluation."

Comments on COM 518: Advanced Organizational Communication Final Group Projects:

In addition to the course evaluation information, the interpersonal communication students completed four group projects (2 people per project). Two created workplace campaigns and two conducted original research. Because this direct assessment is in its early stages and involves a course outside of the major, no formal rubric was designed to assess the projects; however, a combination of grades and feedback by the course instructor (Dr. Dorothy Andrea) with a review by the interpersonal major coordinator (Dr. Bert Ballard) of the projects provides an adequate evaluation to assess what these interpersonal students have learned in their program.

The workplace campaigns involved Performance Appraisal, with an accompanying framework, information, and proposal for a listening workshop, a self-determination contract form for use between supervisor and supervisee, and a brochure describing the framework for performance appraisal. The campaign was developed with MTV Networks specifically in mind. The second campaign outlines a proposal for a small business that provides tools, quotations, and everyday inspirations to support employees who were experiencing stress and burnout in their jobs. Both of these campaigns were based on a solid review of the literature in their respective topic areas.

An evaluation of these projects demonstrates a strong ability for the interpersonal students to identify needed areas and to apply their learning in interpersonal communication to organizational contexts. The work on performance appraisal directly incorporates concepts of listening and its importance to the supervisor-supervisee workplace relationship, however lacks original, groundbreaking material. The stress and burnout project identifies a needed area in today’s contemporary workplace and how to provide interpersonal inspiration through social media. Both projects are in need of application to assess the strength and quality of the ideas, but demonstrate an adequate application of interpersonal concepts and theories to practical, organizational problems.

The research projects were approved by Pepperdine’s IRB and involved researching the connection between emotion work and stress and burnout with employees in an organization that works with the elderly and researching the sensemaking of faculty in the communication division at Pepperdine University. Although the research between emotion work and stress and burnout had only 7 participants, the students created 11 different Likert scales for a total of 58 questions that were posed to employees at the organization. Their findings found that emotional stress was present in employees and that employees sought out social support from friends, family, and co-workers.

The second research project involved interviewing 17 Communication Division faculty and assessing how they individually made sense of communication as a concept, discipline, and in their workplace. In their study, faculty drew heavily from the Christian mission, indicated high levels of interest in and care for students, and sought to empower and encourage students to make a difference. This study has become an important document for the Communication Division as it moves forward with its division planning and discussions about its identity. The study was also accepted at the Western States Communication Association conference held in February 2012 and was awarded the top undergraduate paper at the conference.

Overall, the research projects also demonstrate a strong ability for the students to
apply interpersonal concepts like social support and relational quality to organizational contexts. They both also indicate a strong mastery of the research process and the ability to engage in an original research project. All four projects surpassed an 80% threshold for learning and quality.

**Summary of COM 519: Communication and Conflict Course Evaluation by Dr. Dorothy Andreas, instructor for the course:**

COM 519 is a required course for the interpersonal, intercultural, and organizational communication majors and is an elective for rhetoric and leadership majors. For interpersonal communication majors specifically, student learning outcomes #1, #2, and #3 for the course match with program learning outcomes #1, #3, and #4 for interpersonal communication majors as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes for COM 519</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes by Communication Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand and compare theories and research in conflict communication (OC1, IP1).</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication PLO 1—Describe and analyze the variety of important interpersonal communication theories and research (both quantitative and qualitative).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distinguish between constructive and destructive communication in applied settings: interpersonal, organizational, intercultural, and public sphere (IP3, Rh4, IC3, OC2).</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication PLO 3 — Distinguish between constructive and destructive communication in various interpersonal settings--family, dating relationships, marriage, friendships and workplace--and in situations involving diversity of gender, ethnicity, religion and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Construct effective and ethical messages that result in productive management of conflict (IP4, Rh4, IC4, OC2, OC3).</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication PLO 4 — Assess varied interpersonal communication interactions and create ethical, communication exchanges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is an assessment summary written by course instructor, Dr. Dorothy Andreas: “Although the numerical data presented above do not fully capture the depth of learning experienced by the students in this course, they do provide strong evidence that the students demonstrated learning of all the course learning outcomes. About two thirds of the class demonstrated a developing ability in objectives. About one third of the class demonstrated mastery of the course learning outcomes. Most of the communication majors expect students in the class to demonstrate developing abilities of these learning outcomes and, thus, this course satisfies, and for some students, exceeds the program requirements.”

**Direct Measure #2: Interpersonal Student Focus Group**
On January 17, 2012, a focus group was held with 13 interpersonal students. The focus group had multiple purposes. First, it introduced Dr. Bert Ballard to the interpersonal students and outlined his background and philosophy. Second, it offered students a chance to assess their learning and experience in the major. Third, it allowed students the opportunity to make recommendations about the future of the major, its curriculum, and for the students. The results of the focus group are reported below.

When asked what they liked about and wanted in teaching and pedagogy, students responded with:

- Continue to be application and practical oriented
- Address the stigma of communication on campus, seen as a second class major
- Help understand the “doing” of communication, when to apply theories, concepts, and principles and in what settings
- Help translate theory into practice
- Offer more opportunities to do original research
- Offer and inform students about independent/directed studies and research opportunities
- Incorporate (more) service learning into courses
- Add in more opportunities for qualitative research, like ethnography

When asked what they wanted for the interpersonal communication program going forward, students responded with:

- Workshop on career choices and how to position interpersonal major in career/job search
- Connections with past alumni
- Regular major events to bring together community of students and faculty
- Opportunities to present at and attend conferences like NCA

When asked what kind of courses and topics they would like to see offered in the interpersonal program, students responded with:

- Family communication (currently being offered)
- Friendship communication
- Advanced small group communication
- Romantic relationships
- Intergenerational communication
- Personality and interpersonal communication
- Professional and workplace relationships
- Identity
- Advanced conflict and communication
- Relational communication
Indirect Measure #1: Student Satisfaction Survey

During the first half of the spring 2012 semester, a student survey was sent out to all interpersonal communication majors and asked them to assess their experience in the major thus far and recommendations for the future of the major, its curriculum, and for the students. The results of the survey are reported below:

Interpersonal Majors Survey

1. Are you an interpersonal communication major?
   - Yes: 13
   - No: 0

2. Did you choose Pepperdine because of the interpersonal major option?
   - Yes: 0
   - No: 13

3. In what year did you become an interpersonal communication major?
   - Freshman: 3
   - Sophomore: 7
   - Junior: 3
   - Senior: 0

4. Why did you become an interpersonal communication major?
   - I became one because the one thing I am passionate about other than religion is people and relationships; this was the closest major to that.
   - I took this class as a Sophomore while abroad, and I greatly enjoyed it. At the time, my major was undeclared, so I decided to change it to a subject that I enjoyed. I am interested in relationships and friendships and enjoy learning more about that. After graduation from Pepperdine, it is likely that I will get a master’s degree in nursing, and interpersonal communication is very important in the field of health and medicine.
   - I spoke with Dr. Lemley while I was abroad and looked into the different divisions of the communication major. I loved what Dr. Lemley had to say and it looked like interpersonal was most applicable to me, whether I go in to ministry or counseling or whatever I do. I want to be able to work closely with people.
   - Originally, I was a psychology major. However, I realized that pursuing a major in interpersonal communication not only captures the essence of what I find interesting and stimulating, but also provides more options and opportunities when it comes to entering the work force.
   - I would love to expand my communication skills and be able to use them in a business environment.
   - I thought it was very practical, useful, interesting and applicable to my minor, social work.
Because I enjoyed my public speaking class, and I have always enjoyed the dynamics behind relationships.

It appealed to me initially as an incoming student because it was the area of communication I was interested in. However COM 200 made me reconsider. However, Dr. Selby encouraged me to reconsider it through speaking of the great worth of a Comm degree and thus I switched back to Interpersonal Comm. when I returned Jr. year from overseas.

Honestly, not sure. During my freshman year a group of friends kind of created a small group which we called "Deep Conversation Wednesdays" (because they took place on Wednesdays). And it was where we talked about what was really on our hearts and going on in our lives that we would otherwise not talk about.

I felt as if my life calling was drawing me more towards a focus on being relational, and living a people-oriented life. I was sort of pushed here by my desire to see and experience wholeness in families specifically.

I like both psychology and sociology a lot and I see this almost as a mixture of both.

Initially it was from a process of elimination and communication looked interesting, but I stayed in the major because I want to go into a field that works directly with people, whether social work or some type of counseling, and interpersonal communication directly fits into that idea.

I’m going to be a social worker and I value the interpersonal relationships between the client and the social worker. I felt that this major could be applied to many other majors as well if I ever chose anything different than social work.

5. What other majors, minors or other academic programs are you enrolled in? (Please list)
   - Religion and Philosophy Minors
   - none at the moment, but I am considering double majoring in organization communication
   - Religion minor
   - I am minoring in Sociology.
   - Social work minor
   - Religion and Philosophy
   - none
   - Creative Writing minor
   - Religion minor.
   - none
   - I took some social work classes but ended up dropping the minor because it was too much.
   - I have a social work emphasis

6. In your opinion, of the courses in the curriculum, which ones are the MOST relevant to the major program?
   - COM 220 Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication: 12
   - COM 519 Communication and Conflict: 7
   - COM 483 Small Group Communication: 6
7. In your opinion, of the courses in the curriculum, which ones are the LEAST relevant to the major program?
   - COM 300 Introduction to Communication Research: 8
   - COM 301 Message Creation and Effects: 4
   - COM 400 Communication Ethics: 1
   - COM 200 Communication Theory: 1
   - COM 418 Communication in Organizations: 1
   - COM 590 Seminar in Communication: 1
   - COM 220 Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication: 0
   - COM 483 Small Group Communication: 0
   - COM 513 Intercultural Communication (GE): 0
   - COM 519 Communication and Conflict: 0
   - COM 530 Interpersonal Communication Theory: 0
   - COM 595 Communication Internship: 0
   - COM 450 Communication and Leadership: 0

8. What subject areas would you like to see more courses offered in, either integrated into the curriculum or as a 590 special topics course? (List suggestions)
   - Interfaith COM, COM within the church, Conflict Resolution
   - I would like to see seminars in health communication and law and also more classes specifically for interpersonal communication. I feel as if some of the classes for interpersonal communication are more geared for other majors.
   - Career options for Communication Majors
   - Communication and Ministry/Church
   - COM 300 addressing qualitative research Communication and Human Development, Communication and Romantic Relationships
   - Communication and the Church; Vocational Communication; Communication in Romantic Relationships; Interpersonal Behavior (like storytelling).
   - Maybe a social-psychology related course
   - More classes directly involving interpersonal communication. I’m a senior and COM 530 was never offered so I had to take another org comm class. I don’t know interpersonal theories.
I would say family communication, but I realized through this survey it's being offered. I would have like too seen a course focusing on the communication between mothers and daughters.

9. Are there any courses you would like to see less of that are currently in the curriculum?
   - COM 300 Introduction to Communication Research: 3
   - COM 513 Intercultural Communication (GE): 2
   - COM 400 Communication Ethics: 2
   - COM 418 Communication in Organizations: 2
   - COM 301 Message Creation and Effects: 1
   - COM 590 Seminar in Communication: 1
   - COM 220 Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication: 0
   - COM 483 Small Group Communication: 0
   - COM 519 Communication and Conflict: 0
   - COM 530 Interpersonal Communication Theory: 0
   - COM 595 Communication Internship: 0
   - COM 450 Communication and Leadership: 0
   - COM 200 Communication Theory: 0

10. What are your current plans after graduation?
   - I don't know yet
   - I am considering going to nursing school after graduation. If not, though, I am not entirely sure what I would do with this major. I would love to attend a seminar or lecture exploring career opportunities for students studying interpersonal communication.
   - I don't have any! Still trying to figure out where God wants me.
   - I wish I knew the answer to this question.
   - I hope to travel and do nonprofit work.
   - Unknown
   - Don't really know yet
   - Graduate studies in either Education, Counseling, or Communication
   - Good question. Not sure yet. Maybe some kind of ministry. Maybe work in a correction facility such as Camp David Gonzalez with teens.
   - Potentially mission work, finding a position in a non-profit, conflict management work, or some form of counseling (possibly focusing on recovery from tragedies, or family/faith counseling).
   - Either
   - Do something social work related. Not completely sure.
   - To work at an agency as a case manager

11. Please indicate your level of agreement:
   - The interpersonal major academically rigorous.
     - Strongly Agree: 0
     - Agree: 8
• The interpersonal major provides me practical skills.
  o Strongly Agree: 5
  o Agree: 5
  o Disagree: 0
  o Strongly Disagree: 0

• The interpersonal major courses are MORE difficult than other Seaver College courses.
  o Strongly Agree: 0
  o Agree: 1
  o Disagree: 11
  o Strongly Disagree: 0

• There is a strong sense of community among interpersonal majors.
  o Strongly Agree: 4
  o Agree: 4
  o Disagree: 1
  o Strongly Disagree: 0

• Community with other interpersonal students and professors is important to me as an interpersonal major.
  o Strongly Agree: 9
  o Agree: 3
  o Disagree: 0
  o Strongly Disagree: 0

• I am very satisfied with the curriculum and courses for interpersonal majors.
  o Strongly Agree: 5
  o Agree: 2
  o Disagree: 3
  o Strongly Disagree: 0

• I am very satisfied with the interpersonal major program as a whole.
  o Strongly Agree: 2
  o Agree: 7
  o Disagree: 2
  o Strongly Disagree: 0

12. In your opinion, what is working well in the interpersonal communication major program?
   o I believe that the classes are very engaging.
o I have not taken all of the courses for my major yet, so that is one reason I disagreed with some of the questions above. With the classes that I have taken, I think that the professors are great.

o It is engaging and interactive in that Communication Professors encourage and inspire dialogue among and with students.

o The classes are very interesting.

o I think that the major is small enough to provide a sense of community.

o The courses are really enjoyable and informative. Furthermore, the professors are also very passionate about teaching.

o The broad subjects it covers, the relationships with faculty and their support,

o I was not really sure of what the Interpersonal Major consisted of or what it even meant. When taking Professor Ballard's Com 220 class last semester, I got a better sense of what it meant to be an Interpersonal Major. I like that class as an intro class and that works well.

o I love how the professors are willing to go to such a personable, informal level by inviting students into their homes and reinforcing the material with experiential knowledge. I really like that the material covers many environments in which interpersonal communications occurs.

o There is a broad range of classes.

o That the professors are eager and willing to work with their students

13. What would you like to see changed in the interpersonal communication major program?

o I would try to focus the classes on more of an interpersonal communications professional field: such as more emphasis on the applications of interpersonal com in the workplace.

o It seems as though this major is not entirely concrete yet and is still developing. I would like to see more classes specifically relevant to interpersonal communication

o I have noticed a lot of repetition. I would like to see a greater range of topics and concepts.

o More defined curriculum. I’m not sure why I’m taking these specific classes and what they will do for me.

o More interpersonal courses!

o I would like to see some information regarding previous alumni who where interpersonal com majors and their life after graduation, as far as, where they went with that major.

o More courses focused in Interpersonal Communication, and an Interpersonal Communication faculty advisor for majors for all four years

o More direction in terms of careers after college.

o Honestly, I think it’s pretty great. However, I wouldn’t be opposed to some more get-togethers for interpersonal majors! It would also be great to provide an emphasis occasionally on different fields that value this major; i.e., what we can do with it after graduating.

o Make more classes that have to do with interpersonal

o I would like to see some of the courses a bit more challenging and engaging
14. Please add any comments you would like to about the interpersonal communication major program.
   o I am only a freshman and I have much work ahead of me, but I am very excited to continue in this program and see what else it has to offer me.
   o I love the major and enjoy the classes. I just wish I could see more of its practical use in the job market more. More exposure of that would be nice, as far as what type of jobs I could get with that major.
   o I honestly believe it is an excellent major. I am regretful that seniors this year have not had a solid faculty member for guidance specific to our major, so I am excited for your leadership for underclassmen Interpersonal Majors!
   o I love it! Thank you!
   o I wish I knew who all the other interpersonal majors are

**Indirect Measure #2: Internship Data**

Although not in the original assessment plan, a review of the internship experiences of the interpersonal majors has not been conducted. During spring 2012, a review of those internship experiences was conducted and the results are reported below:

**Student and Employer Internship Evaluation Survey**

**Student Survey:**

1. When was your internship?
   o Spring 2011: 4
   o Fall 2011: 2

2. Your year in school:
   o Junior: 3
   o Senior: 3

3. Was your internship paid?
   o Yes: 0
   o No: 6

Did your internship pay for transportation?
   o No: 3
   o Yes: 1
Please list any other forms of compensation you received, such as parking, lunches, or other perks:

- Only compensation was for traveling I did while at my internship. Not driving to the internship
- Boss treats us to lunch, when I work before or during lunch hours.
- Parking and lunches were free.

Course 1 Number & Section:
- Com 595.04: 3
- Com 595.05: 1
- Com 595.09: 1
- SW 959.01: 1

Course 1 Professor's Name:
- Keli Myers: 1
- Emily Scott- Lowe: 1
- Debbie Wideroe: 1
- John Jones: 1
- Gary Selby: 1
- Dorothy Andreas: 1

Can other students contact you?
- Yes: 1
- N/A: 5

Name of Company/ Agency:
- MTV Networks
- ONEgeneration
- Universal Music Group
- The Los Angeles Athletic Club
- Apatow Productions
- EcoMalibu

Internship Title/Type:
Employer's Location:

- Santa Monica, CA (2)
- Los Angeles, CA 90014 (2)
- Van Nuys, CA
- Malibu CA, 90264

Please rate the following using this statement: "This internship had a positive impact on my..."

- Leadership Skills:
  - Strongly Agree: 3
  - Agree: 1
  - Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 0
  - Disagree: 2
  - Strongly Disagree: 0

- Ability to work as a team player:
  - Strongly Agree: 4
  - Agree: 0
  - Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 0
  - Disagree: 1
  - Strongly Disagree: 1

- Knowledge of personal strengths and weaknesses:
  - Strongly Agree: 3
  - Agree: 1
  - Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 0
  - Disagree: 2
  - Strongly Disagree: 0

- Time Management Skills
  - Strongly Agree: 2
  - Agree: 2
• Written Communication Skills
  o Strongly Agree: 1
  o Agree: 3
  o Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 1
  o Disagree: 0
  o Strongly Disagree: 1

• Verbal Communication Skills
  o Strongly Agree: 3
  o Agree: 1
  o Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 0
  o Disagree: 1
  o Strongly Disagree: 1

• Analytical and Critical Thinking Skills
  o Strongly Agree: 2
  o Agree: 1
  o Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 1
  o Disagree: 1
  o Strongly Disagree: 1

• Personal Values and Ethics
  o Strongly Agree: 2
  o Agree: 1
  o Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 1
  o Disagree: 1
  o Strongly Disagree: 1

• Vocational Direction
  o Strongly Agree: 2
  o Agree: 2
  o Neither Agree Nor Disagree: 0
  o Disagree: 2
  o Strongly Disagree: 0

1. What were your responsibilities?
• I was responsible for helping the music and media licensing team with music synchronization licensing, filing, and creating and sending out contracts. I also reviewed TV shows and online content to make sure they didn’t contain any copyright problems.
• I was the coordinator of 6-month home visits. Evaluating the senior to see if they still qualify for their homebound meal program.
• Getting coffee, filing papers, making phone calls, basic front desk duties. Doing research, going to other departments and seeing if they needed any help. Helping in any way to make things slightly easier for my supervisors.
• I was the sports marketing intern. In this position I was in charge of contacting organizations and individuals regarding the John R. Wooden Award. I would either try to sell tickets or get sponsors for the event.
• Answering phones, organizing phone sheets, script notes, transcriptions, daily office errands (deliveries to studio’s, bosses home), helping set up for meetings, writing sessions, pre-production on next feature film project.
• Varied weekly but included editing writings, contacting other schools about our current project, getting the word out about EcoMalibu and connecting them with Pepperdine.

2. What were your learning objectives and expectations?
• My learning objectives mostly dealt with learning how to create legal documents, because I am planning on pursuing a legal career. I also wanted to learn how to communicate with many different people in my team in order to get tasks completed.
• My own learning expectations were to learn what working at an agency would be like.
• I was hoping to learn more about the music industry in terms of backstage and maybe contractual elements to how decisions were made.
• I wanted to learn more about the sports marketing industry as well as how to put on a major sporting event.
• I wanted to get an understanding at what this job entailed and see if it was something I wanted to do as a career. I also wanted to gain more knowledge of the production industry and acquire better communication skills.
• Refine my writing skills, bridge the gap between EcoMalibu and Pepperdine

3. Were your learning objectives and expectations achieved?
• Yes, I feel a lot more prepared for law school; my supervisors did a really good job with teaching me how to write professionally. I also had to learn how to handle keeping on constant contact with several people at once.
• My expectations were met.
• To an extent yes. When ever I had any questions, I asked my supervisor and she answered them to her best knowledge.
• Through working with the company each week, I have learned a great amount about
  sports marketing and understand what goes on behind the scenes when organizing a
  significant award ceremony.
• Yes, I am continuing to work for the company through the summer during the
  production of the next feature film. I want to continue working for them as long as
  they would like me to and feel much more competent answering phones and knowing
  how to handle disagreements.
• Yes

4. Describe a day and the range of specific duties undertaken or the types of projects
  you would work on during a normal workday.
• Most days start out with me picking up the "When I Was 17" DVDs from the mailroom
  so I could vet them for copyright issues. On Tuesdays, our department had
  videoconferencing meetings with VH1 in New York about current issues.
• I would go and do a home visit and assess if they qualify for the homebound meal
  program. Then I would return to the agency and enter the data.
• Organizing nielson soundscan, research, sound out packages, organizing products,
  e.t.c.
• I would contact organizations and individuals in order to sell tickets or get
  sponsorships for the event. I updated a website called highrise and put in new contact
  information about past award winners and important sponsors or the ceremony.
• Answering phones all day unless I am running errands. Pick up lunch for people at the
  office. Often would go on the set for upcoming film and organize meetings. Organized
  office and prepared conference room for upcoming meetings.
• Most tasks were completed via email and we would meet once a month to discuss
  progress.

5. Is this internship more projects based or task oriented?
• Both. I had a lot of tasks to complete, but I worked on 2 or 3 projects for my supervisor
  during my time there.
• Task oriented
• A bit of both
• The internship was based on both projects and tasks. I was given several projects to
  prepare for our overall goal, which was a successful Wooden Award ceremony.
• It is more projects based. When we are working on a movie we focus a lot on all that
  needs to be done in order to get the production rolling and get everything set up
  properly.
• Both

6. What is the office environment like where you interned (professional/highly formal,
  laid back/casual)?
• It was a really laid back office. The office itself is really modern and casual, everyone dressed down in jeans, and hours were flexible. I always felt comfortable approaching top management.
• It was a professional environment and was also laid back.
• A laid back casual environment. Although everyone is busy, everyone is down to converse and share insightful ideas.
• A laid back casual environment. Although everyone is busy, everyone is down to converse and share insightful ideas.
• It is more laid back and casual. It is the production office of the producers of movies such as 'Knocked Up,' 'Anchorman,' 'Superbad,' so there are posters of the movies up and most of the people wear jeans and dress comfortably.
• Laid back

7. Please list 3 strengths and 3 weaknesses of your internship.
• I loved my supervisors, they were really passionate about their job and willing to take time out of their schedules to teach me how to write contracts, etc. However, there were days when I feel I could have been given more important work
• 1. Laid back atmosphere
  2. Great coworkers
  3. Successfully reaching out to the community
  weaknesses:
  1. Small office space
  2. Not a lot of money to help out clients (due to budget costs)
• Strengths: always interesting/never really boring, great social work environment, working under the vice president of Interscope Steve Berman, I get to see higher levels of decision making.
  Weaknesses: bigger projects need more time
• Strengths: Exposed to cold calls and sports marketing, helped put on a major sporting event, met important people within the industry.
  Weaknesses: Spent some days in an office rather than at events, sometimes worked by myself instead of with a team
• Strengths:
  1. Learned how to interact with people in the entertainment industry.
  2. Understand the stresses and time commitment involved in producing a major movie.
  3. Learned what it is going to be like in a real life job after college.
  4. Got a well
• Strengths:
  -flexible
  -useful
  -entertaining
  Weaknesses
  -information overload
  -sporadic
  -undeveloped
8. How has this experience affected your future education or career plans?
   • It made me more interested in entertainment law, and even is making me consider a job in production.
   • It helped me narrow down what path I will choose.
   • It has strongly effected it and I plan to stick with this internship as I ultimately plan to attend law school with the hopes of being an entertainment lawyer. With this internship I am getting a sort of head start into understanding the industry.
   • After working with the Los Angeles Athletic Club, I know know that I want my job to involve sports or event coordination. I had a lot of fun through the internship process, and would like my job to have a similar feel.
   • I look forward to working for them this summer and as long as I keep enjoying it and they will let me, I will work there. I already know I only want to work until I have kids and this would be a great job to do that.
   • Encouraged me to explore environmental communication further

9. Would you recommend this internship to other Pepperdine students (if yes, why; if no, why not)?
   • Yes, I loved the environment and the people. It was a fun experience that I got a lot out of.
   • Yes, because the workers here are amazing and you get to do more then just make copies and get coffee. You do actual field work.
   • Yes, it’s an awesome opportunity to put your foot out there, meet other awesome individuals with great ideas and a creative perspective to certain things one might relate to.
   • If the student is interested in sports marketing or event coordination, this internship provides great exposure to the industry. I had a wonderful experience with the organization and learned much about the sports marketing world.
   • Yes, but I don’t think they are looking for many students. My sister worked for this company as a personal assistant to the family and I was able to get this internship because of that connection. They are looking for people that they know and trust.
   • Yes, showed me what environmental nonprofit work looks like

10. What advice would you give to future interns? (optional)
    • Be nice! Be yourself! Be respectful and network network network!
    • Be open minded to different experiences.

**Employer Survey:**

Employer:

- Interscope Records
o Apatow Production

Student’s level of preparation for successful completion of assignments.
  o Excellent: 2
  o Acceptable: 0
  o Marginal: 0

Skills Comments:
  • *Student is a pleasure to have in the office. She consistently displays great attention to detail and a willingness to learn.*
  • *She always saw the "holes" in any assignment and asked the perfect questions in order to best complete assignments.*

Student’s effectiveness at communicating ideas and concerns to you and others.
  o Excellent: 2
  o Acceptable: 0
  o Marginal: 0

Communication Comments:
  • *Student is not afraid to offer new suggestions of doing things around the office.*

Student’s effectiveness at developing and maintaining personal relationships needed to complete assignments.
  o Excellent: 2
  o Acceptable: 0
  o Marginal: 0

Interaction Comments:
  • *Always willing to offer help to other offices when needed. She is also able to understand when to jump into a project and take the lead when necessary.*
  • *She got along very well with the office: always eager to offer help where needed, worked to understand personalities to most efficiently work with each person.*

Has he or she strived to gain a better understanding of the field?
Professional Development Comments:

- Always asks great questions that help her to understand the business a little bit better.
- Yes, absolutely - always very interested in any instruction - and remembered (evident by her later application) all that she was told.

Value of student's contribution and his or her ability to deal with the contingencies in your organization, allowing for obstacles, which are outside of the student’s control.

- Excellent: 2
- Acceptable: 0
- Marginal: 0

Contribution Comments:

- Student knows how to gauge when to jump into something, when to take a back seat and listen to problems being solved, and when to offer assistance.

Student’s overall experience. How has the student succeeded in completing the Learning Objectives?

- Excellent: 2
- Acceptable: 0
- Marginal: 0

Overall Performance Comments:

- Student has, for the second semester, displayed such an eagerness to learn and make the most out of her internship experience. I have no doubt that she will succeed in whatever she decides to throw herself into next.
- She learned very successfully who the "players" are in our movie making process and fielded calls very appropriately. She showed that she now has a very great macro understanding of the movie making process from script writing to pre-production to production.

Intern Behavior/ Final Comments:
• *Always arrives on time, willing to stay late in order to help out, has made contacts in our office, and has made her presence known in a great way.*

• *Hard worker, always volunteering and eager to help however she could. She could be a bit more bold in her phone interaction and trusting her instincts when it comes to dealing with 3rd parties that call into us*

**To Be Improved:**

• *Continue to be open and willing to learn and you will succeed.*

• *Continue to trust her instincts. .. She has good ones; there are times when don't need to be afraid to "own" her thoughts - put them out there and take initiative in answering her own questions. ... especially when told she is free to do so*

**Institutional SLO Alignment Map**

The following table demonstrates the alignment between the Interpersonal Communication Student Learning Outcomes and the overall Student Learning Outcomes of Pepperdine University.

**Table 6. Alignment of Interpersonal PLOs with Pepperdine SLOs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Describe and analyze the variety of important interpersonal communication theories and research (both quantitative and qualitative). | **Knowledge and Scholarship:** 
Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery. | | |
| 2. Explain the power of interpersonal relationships to influence | **Faith and Heritage:** 
Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, | **Knowledge and Scholarship:** 
Apply knowledge to real-world challenges | **Knowledge and Scholarship:** 
Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>people’s beliefs, attitudes, values and behavior.</th>
<th>learning, and practice.</th>
<th>and act with integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community and Global Understanding:</strong> Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Scholarship:</strong> Apply knowledge to real-world challenges</td>
<td><strong>Faith and Heritage:</strong> Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions to be informed by a value-centered life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Distinguish between constructive and destructive communication in various interpersonal settings—family, dating relationships, marriage, friendships and the workplace—and in situations involving diversity of gender, ethnicity, religion and culture.</td>
<td><strong>Community and Global Understanding:</strong> Develop and enact a personal and professional vision that values diversity</td>
<td><strong>Faith and Heritage:</strong> Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions to be informed by a value-centered life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Scholarship:</strong> Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Assess varied interpersonal communication interactions and create ethical, constructive strategies for improving the impact and success of those communication exchanges.

- **Knowledge and Scholarship:** Apply knowledge to real-world challenges
- **Faith and Heritage:** Respond to the call to serve others
- **Community and Global Understanding:** Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement

- **Knowledge and Scholarship:** Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity
- **Faith and Heritage:** Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions to be informed by a value-centered life
- **Community and Global Understanding:** Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice

---

**Program Quality**

**Student Profile**

Students in the interpersonal major, generally, have lower GPA’s than other communication division majors, however other indicators like ACT, SAT, and High School GPA’s remain similar to their Communication Division peers. Speculating on the reasons for the lower GPA, the following was considered:

1. The newness of the major may attract students who were not as successful in other majors, either in communication or in Seaver College more broadly.
2. The interpersonal major, unlike all other majors in the Communication Division, is relatively general and broad, lacking a specific industry or direction in which to target career goals. This is supported by the students’ expressed desire for advice on career trajectories and applicability. This lack of focus may imply lack of connection between academic performance and job/career goals attainment.
3. The lack of a faculty champion/coordinator means that there has been no associated faculty member or advocate in Seaver College at Pepperdine, so there is has been a lack of leadership and accountability with the program.

These factors will be monitored closely over the next few years, with expectation that the GPA will rise and be more on par with communication peers.

Table 7. Interpersonal Communication GPA’s and Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepp</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Verbal</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. COM Division Total GPA’s and Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pep</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Verbal</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Profile

Expertise of members of the interpersonal communication faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Daum</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Speech and Rhetoric; Interpersonal Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Clancy</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Debate; Speech and Rhetoric; Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Ballard</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>Interpersonal and Intercultural Communication; Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Lemley</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Speech; Communication Theory; Conflict and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanie Walker</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Interpersonal and Group Communication; Organizational Communication; Communication Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Chandler</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Shatzer</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Stone Watt</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>Debate and Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Brownlow</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Cal State Northridge</td>
<td>Speech and Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Andreas</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M</td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Leadership; Communication and Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Selby</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Leadership; Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Stoltzfus</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johny Garner</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum and Learning Environment

Because none of the peer or aspirational schools self-selected by Pepperdine University had interpersonal communication majors, a survey of universities with interpersonal communication majors was conducted for comparison. The schools selected were: Azusa Pacific University, Biola University, California State University-Fullerton, California State University – Los Angeles, Purdue University, University of Southern California, and Villanova University. Tables 9 and 10 provide an overview of the collected data and is included on subsequent pages. The following paragraphs provide a comparison of Pepperdine at a glance:

Seven schools were selected: 5 in the Los Angeles area (Azusa Pacific, Biola, CSU-Fullerton, CSU-LA, USC); 2 Private Christian (Azusa Pacific and Biola), 1 Private Catholic (Villanova), 3 public (CSU-Fullerton, CSU-LA, Purdue), and 1 non-sectarian private (USC). Four were over 30,000 in total enrollment (CSU-LA, Purdue, USC), three had 10,000 or less (Azusa Pacific, Biola, Villanova). Four were ranked in the U.S. News and World Report National Universities Rankings, where Pepperdine is currently ranked #55 (USC #23, Purdue #62, Azusa Pacific #170, Biola #170); CSU-Fullerton was ranked #33 in the west region, Villanova was ranked #1 in the north region, and CSU-LA was unranked in the west region.

In terms of the interpersonal communication itself, Pepperdine was one of the five schools that had interpersonal communication as either a concentration or option within a broader communication major (Azusa Pacific, Biola, CSU-Fullerton, USC, Villanova); two schools offered a distinct major program in interpersonal communication. (CSU-LA, Purdue). Of the three schools (Azusa Pacific, Biola, Villanova) who reported their interpersonal major enrollments to us, they averaged 308 students in the interpersonal major; the other five schools did not have breakdowns for the major or concentration, a telling statement about how well Pepperdine is tracking its majors. That Pepperdine only has a few interpersonal majors at this point is no cause for alarm given the relative newness of the program; rather, comparing to those that reported their enrollment is encouraging that at other private, Christian or religious based universities interest and enrollment in interpersonal communication is high and thriving.

Class sizes for all surveyed schools across their communication majors averaged 25 (with only USC not reporting); Pepperdine’s average class sizes for the interpersonal major is 18.

In terms of learning objectives, Pepperdine is the only university in the surveyed institutions with clear and dedicated language on the mission and program learning objectives for the interpersonal major. Other programs had only information pertaining to the whole communication major (3 schools: Azusa Pacific, Biola), mission statement for interpersonal program (3 schools: CSU-Fullerton, Purdue, Villanova), or a mission
statement as part of other concentrations or options of which the interpersonal communication major was combined (2 schools: CSU-LA, USC). Indeed, Pepperdine is the only university that had thought out program learning objectives at all. Additionally, Pepperdine is one of three universities to specifically indicate the importance of ethics in either is mission statement or learning objectives, with the other 2 Azusa Pacific and Biola, both also private Christian universities.

Related to required courses, Pepperdine is the only institution in this survey to two require two specifically dedicated interpersonal courses, one an introductory level and the other an advanced theory and capstone course. All surveyed schools required a core to connect interpersonal communication as a stand alone major or concentration to the broader communication discipline and Pepperdine is no different in this regard.

**Conclusion of program comparisons**

This survey of other institutions either geographically close or having interpersonal majors results in optimism for Pepperdine’s interpersonal major program. Pepperdine, although a new program, stands out in many ways, such as small class sizes and a dedicated mission statement and program learning objectives. Its primary comparable institutions are other private Christian institutions in the Southern California area, Azusa Christian and Biola.
Table 9: Comparison institutions for interpersonal communication programs – general data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>University Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Type</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Size</strong></th>
<th><strong>US News Rank</strong></th>
<th><strong>NCA 2004 Doctoral Rank</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Malibu, CA</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>7,539 (3,246 undergrad)</td>
<td>#55 in National Universities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa Pacific University</td>
<td>Azusa, CA</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>9,258 (4,708 undergrad)</td>
<td>#170 National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biola University</td>
<td>La Mirada, CA</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>6,250 (4,271 undergrad)</td>
<td>#170 National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Fullerton</td>
<td>Fullerton, CA</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>35,590 (29,962 undergrads)</td>
<td>#33 West Regional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>20,142 (16,098 undergrads)</td>
<td>Unranked West Regional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>West Lafayette, IN</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>39,697 (31,145 undergrads)</td>
<td>#62 National</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>38,000 (17,500 undergraduates)</td>
<td>#23 National</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova University</td>
<td>Villanova, PA</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>10,461 (6,352 undergrad)</td>
<td>#1 North Regional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Comparison institutions for interpersonal communication programs – interpersonal communication major data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Name of Major</th>
<th>Major enrollment</th>
<th>Average class size</th>
<th>Mission/Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Curriculum - Core, Track, and Electives listing out specific courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication Major (one of 9 Communication majors, but considered a concentration in the “human” communication area along with intercultural, organizational, and rhetoric and leadership)</td>
<td>521 (27 in interpersonal major)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mission: To provide students with the knowledge and skills to be effective and ethical communicators in a variety of personal and professional settings, and to prepare them for advanced study of communication in interpersonal relationships.</td>
<td>Core (4): Communication Theory, Introduction to Communication Research, Message Creation and Effects, Communication Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Describe and analyze the variety of important interpersonal communication theories and research (both quantitative and qualitative).</td>
<td>Electives (4): Communication in Organizations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Explain the power of interpersonal relationships to influence people’s beliefs, attitudes, values and behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Distinguish between constructive and destructive communication in various interpersonal settings—family, dating relationships, marriage, friendships and workplace--and in situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of Interpersonal and Organizational Communication</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission:</strong> The Department of Communication Studies offers undergraduate degree programs in communication studies and journalism, supports the university General Studies program through both required and elective course offerings, and is responsible for the forensics program, student publications, and campus radio station. Emphasis is placed upon the application of Christian truth and values to the study of communication theories and processes, consideration of ethical issues, and the mastery of current scholarship in each field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals:**
The Department of Communication Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication and Leadership, Seminar in Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Required (5):**
Small Group Communication, Conflict Management, Organizational Communication, Persuasion and Attitude Change, Journalism

**Electives (1):**
Choose from Intercollegiate Forensics, Presentational Speaking
prepares students who can:

1. Apply the basic concepts of communication theory and research to their life's work.

2. Incorporate individual and group communication styles that relate to the achievement of their personal and professional goals.

3. Utilize appropriate communication skills for solving problems, making decisions, managing conflict, executing change strategies, and promoting the intellectual, spiritual, and emotional growth of those with whom they live and work.

4. Understand the moral and ethical implications of the communicator's responsibilities in the construction of social worlds.

| Biola University | Concentration in Interpersonal Communication and Rhetorical Studies | 225 | 25 | The mission of the Communication Studies major is to produce committed Christian graduates of Biola University who are adept at constructing ethical written and oral messages. They should not only learn to write content, but also learn delivery and performance skills essential to present | Core (7): Communication Theories, Interpersonal Communication, Methods of Communication Research, Persuasive Communication, Forms of Public Communication, |
important messages. Our students should also be critical consumers of messages communicated by all forms of media, both popular and religious. These graduates are trained in both the theory and practice of communicative arts.

Learning Outcome for Interpersonal Communication, Rhetorical Studies, Speech/Drama and Interdisciplinary concentration students: They should learn to be critics of the messages inherent in public, political, and personal spheres of communication. Students in these concentrations learn to identify the voices of those who are marginalized so they may be able to advocate their cause and minister to them in a manner that is sensitive and biblical. Biola students and graduates should learn to advocate positions for social justice that are caring, compassionate, and constructive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Fullerton</td>
<td>Concentration of Interpersonal Communication from Speech Communication degree</td>
<td>No Estimate</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and human services. Success in these fields requires competencies in identifying, analyzing, and meeting the challenges of effective communication among individuals. Acquiring these competencies is the goal of the emphasis in Interpersonal Communication. The emphasis provides a basis for the pursuit of teaching credentials, and it provides an exceptional background of preparation for graduate studies in fields such as social work, counseling, and clinical psychology. An emphasis in Interpersonal Communication, combined with selected courses within the psychology minor, meets entrance requirements for most graduate programs in these fields. The selection of an emphasis in Interpersonal Communication suggests a special aptitude for and interest in human service careers, and the emphasis provides students with a unique and exceptionally strong background of theoretical as well as applied studies for graduate studies in the mental health professions.
<p>| California State University, Los Angeles | Major in Interpersonal Communication / Language and Social Interaction | No Estimate | 30 | Interpersonal Communication/Language and Social Interaction – Relationships impact every aspect of our daily lives, and students interested in this option will explore the dynamics of how perceptions, expectations, culture, gender, nonverbal behaviors and language all influence and affect our interpersonal interactions in both personal and professional contexts. | Core (11): Intro to Human Communication, Argumentation Intercultural Communication, Prosem: Exper Research, Communication Theory, Qualitative Methods in Communication, Intro to Rhetorical Studies, Performance Studies, Organizational Studies, Applied Writing in Communication Studies, Research Project in Communication Core for Interpersonal/Language &amp; Social Interaction (3): Relational Communication, Language and Communication Behavior, Nonverbal Communication OR Sex Roles in Communication |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purdue University</th>
<th>Major in Interpersonal Communication</th>
<th>No Estimate</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>Electives (5): Choose from 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Communication curriculum begins with a thorough introduction to the historical, philosophical, and theoretical foundations upon which all communication activity is based. Interpersonal communication - explores various dynamics of human inter-relationships; communication processes and effects; the nature, function, and outcomes of communication behavior in teams and small groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Option in Organizational and Interpersonal Communication for Comm Bachelor's</td>
<td>Not Listed/Did Not Know</td>
<td>Not Listed/Did Not Know</td>
<td><strong>Organizational and Interpersonal Communication Option:</strong> This option is most relevant to students interested in careers in business, management, human resources and development, corporate communication, and consulting, as well as advanced graduate study. Courses emphasize: interpersonal communication processes that affect and reflect personality, motives, beliefs, attitudes and values; communication's role in the development, maintenance and disintegration of social, family and intimate relationships; managing interpersonal conflict; communication between superiors and subordinates and in teams; communication's role in determining organizational culture; managing information in organizations; and the role Core (6): 4 from Communication as a Social Science, Communication as a Liberal Art, Introduction to Communication Technology, Introduction to Mass Communication Theory and Research or Communication and Culture, Methods Courses: 2 from Public Speaking, Empirical Research in Communication or Argumentation and Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova University: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Communication Major with Specialization in Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>400 (Largest Major of the School of Arts and Sciences)</td>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>This specialization studies the role of communication in the formation and negotiation of intimate relationships, families, and friendships. This specialization is great if you're interested in conflict mediation, counseling, intercultural training, or communication consulting!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choose from 6 Complementary Elective (1): Choose from another area

Research Elective (1): Choose from Qualitative Research or Quantitative Research

Capstone (1): Senior Project

---

**Faculty Profile**

Table 11. Expertise of members of the interpersonal communication faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Daum</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Speech and Rhetoric; Interpersonal Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Clancy</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Debate; Speech and Rhetoric; Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Ballard</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>Interpersonal and Intercultural Communication; Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Lemley</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Speech; Communication Theory; Conflict and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanie Walker</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Interpersonal and Group Communication; Organizational Communication; Communication Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Chandler</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Shatzer</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Stone Watt</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>Debate and Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Brownlow</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Cal State Northridge</td>
<td>Speech and Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Andreas</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M</td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Leadership; Communication and Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Selby</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Leadership; Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Stoltzfus</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johny Garner</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. List of courses offered and faculty members responsible for each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Offered</th>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Courses Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com 220</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>Daum, Baird, Clancy &amp; Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 483</td>
<td>Small Group Communication</td>
<td>Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 513</td>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>Chandler, Brownlow, Clancy, Ballard, Jones, Shatzer &amp; Stone Watt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 519</td>
<td>Communication and Conflict</td>
<td>Andreas &amp; Lemley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 530</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication Theory</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 595</td>
<td>Communication Internship</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 418</td>
<td>Communication in Organization</td>
<td>Andreas, Walker &amp; Stolzfus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 450</td>
<td>Communication and Leadership</td>
<td>Garner &amp; Selby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 590</td>
<td>Seminar in Communication</td>
<td>Ballard, Salas, Murrie, Selby &amp; Stone Watt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Program Quality and Future Goals**

This review has incorporated a variety of historical, direct, and indirect information from a variety of perspectives including faculty, staff, students, internship employers. Overall, it reveals promising and optimistic beginnings to the interpersonal communication major program at Pepperdine University. Students are learning important and key concepts related to interpersonal communication and are performing at high levels in terms of program learning outcomes. What is especially encouraging about this is that students have accomplished this without a faculty coordinator or champion for the past three years.

Now that there is a faculty coordinator, three primary goals need to be accomplished in the next five years.
1) More coordination and development of the interpersonal major program curriculum needs to occur.
   - As indicated from multiple data sources, there is a need to develop courses that are solely focused on interpersonal communication topics rather than integrated with subject areas like organizational or intercultural communication as well as a well-developed capstone course. Emphasis should integrate theory and praxis while also providing service-learning and research opportunities that will demonstrate tangible and visible accomplishments for students. Enhancing the curriculum in these ways should cultivate a distinct academic identity as well as raise the academic profile and GPAs of the major.

2) Develop sense of community among students and faculty in the program.
   - Students indicate a strong desire for increased community among and between faculty and other students, including but not limited to additional networking and social opportunities, disseminating information on careers, connecting and maintaining with program alumni, and more strongly connecting internship and professional experience with program curriculum. Doing so would also provide a stronger sense of connection, community, and identity for students and for the major on campus, which will help raise the profile of the major on campus.

3) Engage in continued and additional coordination with the other human communication majors like organizational communication, intercultural communication, and rhetoric and leadership to raise profile and awareness as well as ensure cohesion in curriculum.
   - The faculty coordinator of the interpersonal communication major needs to work closely with the other faculty coordinators from the other three programs to cultivate ways to integrate interpersonal communication concepts into their curriculums and vice versa in order for students to gain a broad understanding of the human (i.e., non-media, non-mass) communication in a variety of forms and contexts. It is equally important that the interpersonal communication major retain its distinctiveness so students understand how its theories, research, and knowledge are differentiated from other communication forms.

4) Implement sustained and formal assessment of program learning objectives for the interpersonal communication major.
   - More formal and organized assessment of program learning objectives needs to occur in order to gather more substantive and robust data, especially with the design and development of a dedicated interpersonal communication major capstone course.

Overall, given this information, Pepperdine University has the foundations for strong comparative growth in the interpersonal major program for the future with a strong performing student body, a need to grow the program, establish clear
curriculum and programmatic leadership, and perform assessment and other data gathering over the next five years to continue to track the growth and development of the major program.
Five-Year Assessment and Review of the Organizational Communication Program

Prepared by: Drs. Juanie Walker, associate professor of communication, and Dorothy Andreas, assistant professor of communication, with assistance from Kimberly Stoltzfus, visiting professor of communication.
Introduction and Overview

Narrative History

In 1980, an Organizational Communication sequence was established within the Communication major under the leadership of Warren Jones and Morris Womack with a focus on communication skills of small group public presentations, interviewing, and organizational communication theory. In 1985, under the direction of Dwayne VanRheenen, the program was further developed to include a greater emphasis on organizational communication analysis. Analysis and consulting became a more systematic part of the program in 1989 with curriculum changes designed by Angie Brenton that included adding organizational communication analysis in the field and training and development design as senior-year requirements. As designed by VanRheenen and Brenton and later including Garry Bailey, students conducted an in-depth organizational communication audit of one organizational client with the professor and designed and practiced training and development in a mock application.

Beginning in the early 1990s, the program gained a greater emphasis on experiential learning. Specifically, in 1994, Juanie Walker used dialogic theory and experiential learning including self-directed learning teams in a small group communication course and service learning research and actual implementation of training in the senior courses. In 1998, Bob Chandler joined the faculty and added an emphasis on adult learning models in the COM 521/COM 522 senior year capstone sequences. Together, Chandler and Walker adopted a field research method that combined experiential learning with service learning as the two courses worked with a single external organizational client during the two-course sequence. In 1999, they developed and assessed specific curriculum goals and objectives for each academic year in the form of student knowledge, skills, and abilities, and developed a team-teaching model for the final senior-year courses of COM 521 Organizational Communication Analysis and COM 522 (Now COM 422) Communication Training and Development. As part of an emphasis on strategic planning at Seaver College, Walker and Chandler worked together to align each year of coursework in the major toward senior-year requirements to better integrate theory and application. In 2001, J. D. Wallace was hired. With a background in computer-mediated communication and quantitative methods, Wallace added an emphasis on technology to the curriculum and began helping the Communication Division develop a more systematic plan for developing learning goals, objective, and methods to assess learning in courses across the division.
Much of this integration of theory and application (in the classroom then in the field) has been accomplished with emphasis on vocation and service learning. In 2002, Walker added readings and exploration in the meaning of work and vocation across the curriculum, including reflections in courses during sophomore, junior, and senior years and focus group research led by juniors who interviewed organizational communication alumni regarding vocational discernment. As part of a three-year Pepperdine Voyage Communication Division grant coordinated by Walker beginning in 2003, organizational communication majors have conducted focus group research with a broader population of communication alumni to explore vocational discernment and for several years managed event planning for a vocation conference entitled "Com Connection: Character, Calling, and Careers."

Changes in faculty resources shifted in Fall 2003 with Chandler taking on the new leadership position as Communication Division chairperson and in the Fall of 2004 with the departure of Wallace. Two visiting faculty members, Winfred Allen and Kathy Kelley, helped teach small group and organizational communication courses at that time. In 2006, Johny Garner was hired as a full-time faculty member. He taught COM 418 Communication in Organizations Spring semester of 2007 and COM 521 Organizational Communication Analysis the fall semesters of 2008 and 2009. Chandler left Pepperdine in 2009. Garner was instrumental in developing and proposing curriculum revision for the major (which took effect in 2009), including the development of COM 518 Advanced Organizational Communication, which he taught in 2008. In addition, he was very involved in teaching quantitative research methods to undergraduates and graduate students and served as advisor of the undergraduate honor society and as interim graduate program coordinator before leaving the university in the spring of 2010.

In the fall of 2010, Dorothy Andreas was hired. She has been very active in helping to develop learning objectives and assessment for the major, engaging majors as well as first-year seminar students in classroom research, and regularly teaches COM 519 Communication and Conflict, taught COM 418 in the Spring of 2010, and helped develop and taught COM 518 in the fall of 2011. Kim Stolfutz, who is completing her Ph.D. in organizational communication at the University of California at Santa Barbara, has taught the core research methods course as a visiting faculty member in the Communication Division for the past few years and this current semester is teaching COM 418.

**Enrollment trends (patterns of student enrollment)**

[Tables 1 and 2 on Courses/Sakai Com. Div. tab do not appear to include organizational communication double majors and minors although Program Review Data Report for Org. Com. (1/24/12) Sakai site does as well as the data that breaks down the number of org. com. majors each year by class rank. There’s a difference of 32 students out of 108 in the latter two charts not accounted for in Tables 1 and 2.]
Table 1: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005 to Fall 2010 (Students who are double-majoring may be counted twice in the Com Division totals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Org Com</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall trend shows a marked decline in the number of students choosing an emphasis in organizational communication reduced by about ½ in a five-year period, with a drop by 17% in 2008 and another 17% the following year, followed by a decrease of 24% in 2010. More specifically, students have traditionally selected the organizational communication emphasis during their junior or senior year, with eight or nine new students being added senior year each year in 2005 – 2007 and two added between sophomore and junior year in 2006. In 2008 there was also a significant decline between junior and senior years in which only two or three new students chose the emphasis. While the increase of students choosing the emphasis between the first and second years has held steady with two to four new students each year from 2005 - 2009, the number of students between their second and third year has ranged from +2 to -3. This drop off in 2008 may be a result of students choosing other majors such as Integrated Marketing Communication or newer human communication emphases of Rhetoric and Leadership (which increased by six new majors in 2008, 11 in 2009, and four in 2010) or Interpersonal Communication (which increased by 11 majors in 2008 and 12 in 2009). While the number of freshmen declaring the organizational communication emphasis has traditionally been low (ranging from 8 to 11 each year in 2005 – 2007), there was a particular decline in 2008 and 2009 of only four students declaring the emphasis their first year at Pepperdine, with only one declaring it as a freshman in 2010.

This marked decline along with comments from recent graduates (see Program Assessment 2012 Alumni Survey below) indicate a need to rebrand and advertise the
organizational communication emphasis. Based on alumni data about knowledge, skills, and attitudes they valued most from the program, possible names to be considered are Organizational Dialogue and Conflict Management or Organizational Dialogue and Change Management.

**Degrees Awarded**
Despite, the decline in the number of students declaring the emphasis of organizational communication, the number degrees conferred has held steady with a range of 10 – 17 graduates total per year. In particular, in 2008, the year of the first significant decline, the greatest number of students during the five year period posted their degrees.

**Mission of the Program**
In today’s environment, organizations face challenges of increasing reliance on technology, merging industries, issues of sustainability, and international globalization. This creates greater needs for organizational members to respond with creativity and learning, ethics and social responsibility, and balanced approaches to uncertainty and complexity. Organizational communication majors learn how to communicate effectively, creatively, and mindfully in this setting. They learn how to write clear business memos and reports, present persuasive corporate presentations, participate in and lead team discussion and decision making, manage organizational conflict, shape leadership initiatives, cultivate organizational culture, develop systems that fulfill mission statements, analyze communication effectiveness, conduct training and development, and create organizational change. Our focus at Pepperdine is to create people who will become positive change agents for every conceivable type of organization.

The organizational communication major equips students to become change agents in corporations as well as non-profits. As future change agents, students learn standards and processes for healthy, effective, and ethical communication in organizations. With this understanding, students develop skills in creating and shaping successful leadership and management, systems processing, organizational culture, team decision making, and conflict management. With these tools, students in the organizational communication major have the opportunity to serve as change agents for actual organizational clients in exciting projects that analyze and assess communication in organizations; make recommendations and provide training and development to managers and employees; and help organizations reframe “business as usual” in order to better fit their organization’s mission, adapt appropriately to changing environments, and become more socially responsible.

Graduates are equipped to serve in positions of leadership and service with the purpose of helping create meaningful change in a variety of organizations. Their positions include external consultants for business, human resources, and communication agencies; internal communication managers within organizations; human resources professionals; teachers and trainers; corporate managers; and non-profit and ministry leaders.

**Program Learning Outcomes**
An Organizational Communication graduate will:

1. Understand and compare theories and research in perspectives, background, and context of
organizational communication.
2. Demonstrate analytic and applied skills in organizational communication to work towards effective organizing processes.
3. Appreciate how different worldviews impact organizational communication and discern among those choices a wise and ethical path.

1. **Knowledge:** Understand and compare theories and research in perspectives, background, and context of organizational communication.
   
a. perspectives (functionalist, interpretivist, critical, and postmodern).
   
b. background (rhetoric, social science, and management theories).
   
c. contexts (public presentations, interpersonal relations, small groups, organizations, and society).

2. **Skills:** Demonstrate analytic and applied skills in organizational communication to work towards effective organizing processes.
   
a. analytic (social scientific research and qualitative research, academic and applied research).
   
b. applied (presentation skills, small group decision making and discussion, conflict management, organizational assessment, and training and development; effective oral and written organizational messages; effective interpersonal skills; and effective leadership and systems management skills).

3. **Values:** Appreciate how different worldviews impact organizational communication and discern among those choices a wise and ethical path (life skills, social responsibility, Christian vocation, and diversity).
**PLO matrix**

**THE MATRIX (or SLO Map) for Objectives**

I=Introduce   D=Develop   M=Master

Change Agent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com 200</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 300</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 301</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 400</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D, M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 220</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 418</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 422</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 450</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 483</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 518</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D, M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 519</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 521</td>
<td>D, M</td>
<td>D, M</td>
<td>D, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com 595</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 418</td>
<td>Communication in Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 483</td>
<td>Small Group Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 422</td>
<td>Development and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 518</td>
<td>Advanced Organizational Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 519</td>
<td>Communication and Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 521</td>
<td>Organizational Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Knowledge:**
   - Understand and compare theories and research in perspectives, background, and context of organizational communication.
   - a. perspectives/paradigms (functionalist, interpretivist, critical, and postmodern).
   - b. background (rhetoric, social science, and management theories).
   - c. contexts (public presentations, interpersonal relations, small groups, organizations, and society).

   - Understand and compare theories and research in perspectives, background, and context of organizational communication.
   - Explain and evaluate existing theories and research in small group communication and teamwork.
   - Demonstrate knowledge of traditional and contemporary training methods.
   - Describe and compare theories and research about how organizational communication impacts the individual working experience.
   - Understand and compare theories and research in conflict communication.
   - Develop specific knowledge of what a communicatio analysis is and how to conduct one. Master the ability to view communication in organizations from various organizational perspectives and learn to reframe metaphors and new ways of communicating and operating.
### 2. Skills:
Demonstrate analytic and applied skills in organizational communication to work towards effective organizing processes.

- **a.** analytic (social scientific research and qualitative research, academic and applied research).
- **b.** applied (presentation skills, small group decision making and discussion, conflict management, organizational assessment, and training and development; effective oral and written organizational messages; effective interpersonal skills; and effective leadership and systems management skills).

| Demonstrate analytic and applied skills in organizational communication to work towards effective organizing processes. | Develop competency in using small group formats common in personal life, work and public settings | Create and develop communication theory/research grounded training programs/packages. | Use organizational communication theories to analyze accounts and data of work experience. Use organizational communication theories and research as evidence to recommend effective practices that enhance the individual experience at work. | Distinguish between constructive and destructive communication in applied settings: interpersonal, organizational, intercultural, and public sphere. Construct effective and ethical messages that result in productive management of conflict. | Master presentation skills in public settings (academic and workplace settings). Master applied qualitative and quantitative organizational research methods. |

### 3. Values:
Appreciate how different worldviews impact organizational communication.

| Appreciate how different worldviews impact organizational communication | Appreciate how different approaches to dialogue impact outcomes and demonstrate | Apply multiple perspectives to an organization in order to help management choose an | Articulate reasons why some approaches to organizational communication | Construct effective and ethical messages that result in productive | Develop an appreciation for reframing organizational communication can negate |
| organizational communication and discern among those choices a wise and ethical path | and discern among those choices a wise and ethical path |
| ethereal small group communication | ethical approach to training. |
| n may be more ethical than others. |
| management of conflict. |
| meaningful work, socially responsible behaviors, and ethical leadership |

**Alignment with mission of Pepperdine**

The Organizational Communication Sequence within the B.A. in Communication is a liberal arts program applied to the context of organizations. This integration represents an ideal fit with the University mission and bold vision.

First, the programs liberal learning requires high levels of theoretical knowledge and critical thinking skills useful for understanding, assessing, and changing communication in a wide range of corporations, industries, service agencies, churches, or other social institutions. The program’s use of undergraduate research and self-directed learning, and its exploration of vocation, worldviews including Christianity, and ethics throughout the curriculum require students to examine the meaning of work and purpose of their lives. The first two- and-a-half years of the curriculum strategically develop student liberal arts knowledge, abilities, and skills through theoretical reasoning, analyzing, and conducting original research. This liberal learning approach and vocational exploration enable high levels of academic excellence and strengthening Christian roots.

Second, the program’s use of service learning, work teams, internship, and the exploration of social support and negotiation groups, and conflict management require that students use their knowledge for purposeful service and leadership. The last year-and-a-half of the curriculum requires learning in context as student consultants and trainers who apply theory and quantitative and qualitative research to assess communication then design and conduct training and development for an organization. Organizational clients in the past have been both not-for-profit agencies and corporations. Students assess emergent organizational needs and/or seek organizations concerned with meaning of work, ethics, and social responsibility. Contextual and experiential learning enables students to enact a vocational approach to their education involving purposeful identity, Christian service, and continuous learning. Students majoring in organizational communication graduate with knowledge, skills, and abilities that help them fulfill the University mission of leading lives of service, purpose, and leadership.
Program Quality

Student Profile

SAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Fall 05</th>
<th>Fall 06</th>
<th>Fall 07</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Fall 09</th>
<th>Fall 09</th>
<th>Fall 10</th>
<th>Fall 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>584.69</td>
<td>583.84</td>
<td>591.17</td>
<td>586.04</td>
<td>590.51</td>
<td>593.27</td>
<td>586.11</td>
<td>591.12</td>
<td>583.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>564.32</td>
<td>558.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>578.26</td>
<td>611.00</td>
<td>583.51</td>
<td>585.56</td>
<td>581.56</td>
<td>578.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our majors’ SAT scores tend to be stable within a range of 35 points over the years. They are mostly balanced between reading and math with reading scores ever so slightly higher. This is generally the same pattern for the COM major but the scores tend to be slightly lower than the COM average. Our students are predicted to be successful in both language and math skills during their first semester in college. However, since the students don’t tend to become active in the major until their junior year, this data is not necessarily predictive of their success in the major.

High School GPA

Table 3: High School GPA from Fall 2005—Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Org Com</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our students’ high school GPAs are just slightly lower than the COM major, except for Fall 2010, in which the GPA of organizational communication majors is slightly higher, compared to some of the COM majors (like IMC and media studies) who tend to attract students with high-level high school GPAs. For each year from 2005 to 2010, students majoring in organizational communication had GPAs at Pepperdine that were lower than those of their high school grades (ranging from -.37 to -.52).
**Faculty Profile**

Table 11. Expertise of members of the organizational communication faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Daum</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Speech and Rhetoric; Interpersonal Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Clancy</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Debate; Speech and Rhetoric; Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Ballard</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>Interpersonal and Intercultural Communication; Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Lemley</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Speech; Communication Theory; Conflict and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanie Walker</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Interpersonal and Group Communication; Organizational Communication; communication Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Chandler</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Shatzer</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Stone Watt</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>Debate and Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Brownlow</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Cal State Northridge</td>
<td>Speech and Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Andreas</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M</td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Leadership; Communication and Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Selby</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Leadership; Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Stoltzfus</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johny Garner</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placement Following Graduation

Alumni have been employed in consulting firms such as Communication Development Associates, Studio 8 Consulting, Internal/External Communication, Phillips and Associates, Leadership Consulting, Deloitte Consulting, and Anderson Consulting; as well as human resources consulting such as William Mercer, Robert Half, and The Culver Group. Alumni have found employment in media, public relations, education, and not-for-profit organizations, and self employment. A large number of alumni have also pursued master's and doctoral degrees in fields of communication, education, management, and psychology. More generally, after completing coursework in the major, students and alumni have commented that their personal sense of vocation and communication skills have been strengthened.

Response to 2004 – 2005 5-Year Review Goals

This five-year assessment of the organizational communication major begins by responding to the 2004 - 2005 five-year assessment of the sequence. The goals and challenges stated in the last five-year review are as follows:

Goals

1. Reevaluate the organizational communication analysis course to a more modest scope of organizational assessment and field research to better fit student interests and program goals.
2. Decrease the outside concentration requirement from 12 units to possibly three units, such as the model at Purdue University that requires students to choose a course outside the division from a macro- or micro- approach to organization studies;
3. Require an already existing course in communication skills such as COM 518 Managerial Communication or a similar course in writing/campaign development/integrated marketing.

Challenges (Develop the following)

1. Students’ middle-range abilities and skills for effective organizational communication such as business presentations, business communication writing, corporate communication, and human resources management.
2. Students’ understanding of the organizational communication sequence; its application, skills, and abilities.
3. Students’ confidence and sense of identity with their major.

A number of steps have been taken in the past five years to address these goals and challenges, but the farthest reaching of those steps was the curriculum revision developed during the summer and
fall of 2007 and passed through curriculum committees in 2008. This curriculum was implemented in the 2009 - 2010 catalog. The curriculum revision is based on an assumption that our division is offering a number of courses that would help provide students skills that they may need in future careers (critical challenge #1). The new Communication and Leadership class is an excellent example of a skills-based course important for our majors. Argumentation and Advocacy and Business & Professional Communication are now among a list of electives that students can choose (based on critical challenge #1 and part of goal #3). Also in response to Challenge #1, assignments in COM 418 Communication in Organizations are written in the form of corporate communication formats such as newsletters and press releases.

Advanced Organizational Communication (COM 518) is now required as one of the capstone classes to bring the major together and integrate the ideas from other classes, a move that addresses goal #3 and critical challenges #2 and 3. To accommodate these additional requirements, we have dropped the formal requirement of an outside concentration altogether (along the lines of goal #2) because of the richness of courses offered within our division, although advisors are still able to take students career aspirations into account and make appropriate substitutions when necessary. The Organizational Communication Analysis course was changed from 3 units to 4 units based on goal #1. Also part of that goal, students were encouraged to narrow the topic of analysis to fit both the organization’s need and students’ personal interests, to divide work among teams, and to write two brief documents—one proposal and one executive summary of findings—rather than the full academic research paper required in prior years.

Organizational Communication Program Assessment

In addition to affecting curriculum changes, these goals and challenges helped shape the research questions for the assessment reported here on program learning objectives during the past five years. The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1: How well does the organizational communication program meet PLOs?

RQ2: How well does the capstone course (traditionally COM 521) meet PLOs #1 – 3 to create understanding, skills, and ethical awareness of organizational communication?

RQ3: How well do organizational communication seniors use critical thinking applied to the organizational context?

RQ4: How well do students understand and identify with the purposes and uses of the sequence?

RQ1: Assessment of PLOs

2007 Multi-Method Assessment of Major

In response, to RQ1, a multi-method assessment of the major was conducted by 17 organizational communication students (15 seniors including two in the accelerated master’s communication program, and two full time master’s students) under the supervision of Dr. Walker. Students
worked in four teams with one master’s student or accelerated master’s student appointed to lead each group. Research areas of the four teams were: (1) an online survey that measured alumni satisfaction with the major; (2) focus groups with alumni regarding life application of the major; (3a) content analysis of course goals and objectives regarding target values and competencies as well as (3b) interviews with organizational communication division faculty about the major; and (4) narrative analysis of student vocational narratives for the impact of the major on discerning vocation.

Alumni Survey

A student team led by a master’s student conducted survey research using a 6-page questionnaire consisting of Likert scale items and a few open-ended items, administered through Survey Monkey (see Appendix). Of the 150 alumni who were invited via email to participate in the survey on line (using an email data base from Pepperdine’s Alumni Office), 40 organizational communication alumni participated (30 of whom were female and 10 male). The measure examined alumni satisfaction with: the desired three values (divided into 10 areas of knowledge) and five competencies (divided into 11 skills and abilities) of the major; and major courses. The students also drew items from a survey developed in 2006 by the Telecommunication faculty to assess alumni satisfaction with Communication Division resources, communication with the faculty and division, and with their current careers.

Values and Competencies. Results indicated mild to high levels of satisfaction with personal development of 20 of the 21 value and competency items (mean scores ranging from 3.5 to 4.5 out of 5 in which 3 is neutral, 4 is satisfied and 5 very satisfied). (See Table 1 for mean scores on all items.) Highest levels of satisfaction (4.0 and above) were (in descending rank order) with knowledge in six areas (communication in general and specifically in contexts of interpersonal relationships, small groups, organizations, public speaking, and organizational development); and skills and abilities in three areas (decision making, organizational communication analysis/assessment, organizational training/development). Other items with lower scores (approaching satisfaction, between 3.5 – 3.8) were knowledge and skills in social scientific research and theory. Closer to neutral (3.38) was satisfaction with understanding scientific and humanistic worldviews. These results demonstrate that alumni valued knowledge as well as skills and abilities but preferred those values and competencies with direct life application (rather than building theory and knowledge).

Courses. Alumni satisfaction with courses and teaching in the major ranged from 3.5 to 4.7 (in which 3 is neutral, 4 is satisfied and 5 very satisfied) with the greatest satisfaction with class size, interaction with other students, and courses in the major. (See Table 2 for mean scores.) They were satisfied (approximately 4.0) with the relevance of the coursework to their everyday lives, felt the major had career potential, would recommend the major to others, and would choose the major again if they were to do it over. Satisfaction with individual courses in the major was similar in level to those of the values and competencies (mean scores ranging from 3.5 to 4.3). Satisfaction was highest for middle-range and more applied major courses, followed by senior-level courses, then the core communication courses. Areas of dissatisfaction were with job and internship placement as well as computer services, which would generally be considered outside the curriculum.
Alumni Focus Groups

Led by a master’s student, a second team used focus group data to evaluate alumni perceptions of competencies learned in the major, that is, the perceived applicability of knowledge, skills, and abilities in work and personal life including vocation. As a comparative baseline for a focus group they conducted in 2007, the team read student reports from 2003 and 2004 that analyzed alumni focus group discussions regarding vocational discernment. Based on the findings of the 2003 and 2004 reports, the 2007 team concluded that personal ethics and Pepperdine’s influence “were equally important” in alumni being able to discern their vocation, that skills from the major were used for discernment, and that the concept of vocation should be integrated throughout the curriculum. The 2007 focus group was conducted with three organizational communication alumni specifically regarding their use of knowledge, skills, and abilities gained from the organizational communication major. Although these participants’ career fields varied from entertainment management to promoting Christian organizations to ministry in hospice and with the homeless, the alumni emphasized the everyday application of the skills and abilities of the degree as most important (especially communication competence in interpersonal relationships, small groups, and interviewing). As in the 2003 and 2004 studies, the values and competencies of the major were considered significant in helping to discern a spiritual calling and specifically to distinguish it from a professional calling. They emphasized that spiritual calling should not be defined by professional calling, and felt that their communication competence helped them separate their spiritual vocation from their professional careers.

In addition, Dr. Walker used findings about two organizational communication alumni who participated in focus group discussions regarding application of the communication major in the Spring of 2006 and 2007. The first of these was conducted by students in COM 418 Communication in Organizations and the second in SPE 483 Small Group Communication. In 2006, the organizational communication graduate described the importance of finding an occupation that matches personal lifestyle and gifts. In 2007, the alumnus described calling as using gifts for God’s service, regardless of the position, profession, or lack of support from family and friends. Taken together, these various alumni focus groups indicate that when learned in a context of vocational calling, values and abilities of the major helped alumni discern spiritual from professional elements of their calling.

Course Goals/Objectives

Drs. Walker and Garner designated desired values (knowledge) and competencies (skills and abilities) for each required course. Table 3 lists the desired values and competencies that each course should develop. Findings indicate that all courses (even the courses that focus on settings such as Small Group Communication and applied skills such as Communication & Conflict and Training & Development) are theoretical, seeking to develop at least two of the three knowledge goals. There are more competencies (skills or abilities) expected of the last four courses of the sequence—at least three of the five.

In addition to this faculty assessment of values and competencies represented in required major courses, a third student team led by a senior in the accelerated master’s program assessed
course goals and objectives in relation to the desired values (knowledge) and competencies (skills and abilities). Their data were representative syllabi from the 11 required major courses (one for each course that is used most frequently across sections). Students felt that courses appropriately met knowledge goals. Courses for which goals and objectives did not explicitly claim to develop skills and abilities were COM 200, COM 220, and COM 418. Triangulated, these data indicate that at least some of the lower-level courses focus on knowledge goals without explicitly develop skills and abilities.

Faculty Interviews

The same student team interviewed all full-time faculty members who teach any of the upper division organizational communication courses (a total of five participants) about how well they felt the major reflects the desired competencies and values. As a result of thematic analysis, the team discovered three themes: perception, identification, and application. Faculty described their perceptions of student concerns based on feedback they've heard in and out of class. They reported student dissatisfaction with too much theory and not enough application in courses, lack of understanding about the purpose and use of the major, and a feeling that the major itself is too “nebulous.”

The theme of identification represented how well students seem to identify with the major (feel that the major is well defined and that they are a coherent group) and how well they recognize the knowledge, skills, and abilities they are learning. Faculty perceived there to be a significant problem with students “knowing what they know” about the major and being able to identify those competencies with the major rather than their own tacit knowledge and abilities.

Faculty felt that although this seems to be a problem while students are at Pepperdine, this identification of major skills and abilities seems to come quickly in hindsight when graduates experience the uses and marketability of what they've learned in the major. Some professors indicated that alumni commented that in the job search process and after entering the job market that they realized that they had knowledge and abilities from the major that set them apart from their peers. According to the student team, alumni therefore appreciated the worth of the learning even more after graduation: “[S]everal professors commented that they have received e-mails from alumni of the program communicating that they wished they had paid attention to the core concepts from Organizational Communication [courses] now that they have seen how useful and effective it is.”

One faculty member felt that students use the values and competencies of the major in the many campus extracurricular activities they’re involved in but don’t identify these abilities with the major. This may indicate the need for more cocurricular activities linked with the major so students identify their skills with the major or otherwise developing student awareness of how they're tacit use of competencies from the major are different than their general tacit knowledge about communicating in everyday life. The theme of application was students’ ability to see and have opportunities for applying their competencies. The team reported that professors felt there was a lack of opportunity for application in lower division courses in the major. Perhaps developing greater application in majors would help students not only develop competencies but gain
confidence in "knowing what they know."

**Student Vocational Narratives**

A fourth team, led by a senior in the accelerated master's program, analyzed more than 70 vocational narratives written by students in COM 521 Organizational Communication Analysis between the years of 2000 and 2007. They used narrative analysis to examine how the organizational communication major helps students discern their vocational calling. The team concluded that because students wrote about their vocation before and after engaging in service with an organization (typically not-for-profit entities) and systematically analyzed their meaning of work and spiritual calling, they were better able to identify their skills and abilities in relation to both their individual passions and need to serve others. At the core of both spiritual and secular vocation accounts was a common theme of using faith and personal relationships to discern calling. In some cases, faith was a deep and profound relationship with God. In other narratives, it was a general belief and hope in goodness. Discerning vocation through faith and relationship demonstrated Value C that includes understanding the Christian World View and vocation as well as Competency E, analyzing and developing ethics and life preparation skills in relation to Christian vocation.

**2012 Survey**

A six-item survey was distributed to six current organizational communication seniors and eight alumni from the past five years for whom we had current email addresses. The survey consisted of two parts: 1) rating their satisfaction with learning related to the three organizational communication program goals of knowledge, skills, and ethics using both a Likert response five-point scale in which 1 indicated very unsatisfied and 5 represented very satisfied as well as open-ended comments describing how they have applied benefited from using this knowledge/skill/ethics in groups, organizations, family, and life more generally; 2) writing open-ended comments to assess what they feel are the greatest strengths of the program and the greatest weaknesses, and to explain their plans after graduation (in the case of seniors) or current roles in personal and professional areas of life.

As of February 2, 2012, nine completed surveys have been received. Three of the six current seniors submitted completed surveys and six of the ten graduates from last spring responded. The following findings were provided:

(Participant numbers appear in parentheses below each question and research summary, followed by numeric score on a scale of 1 to 5 in which 1 = highly dissatisfied and 5 = highly satisfied.)

1. Understand and compare **theories and research** in perspectives, background, and context of organizational communication.

   **Explain how you’ve applied this knowledge and how it’s benefited you (in career, family, life in general):**
The average response was 3.8 in which 4 = satisfied. Answers demonstrated that students use organizational communication knowledge as a way of thinking to analyze an organization in their job search and on the job, especially dealing with individuals from different departments or groups with diverse views and to help others at work reframe a situation.

(1) 5: As nerdy as this may sound, I feel as though every time I am in a communication situation (be it career, family, or life in general), I relate the process of communication happening to a theory I studied in my major classes. One specific example of how my ability to understand theory and research in the perspectives, background, and context of organizational communication involves my job hunt. In my core classes, much of my research involved a cultural approach to studying organizations. Therefore, upon graduating and beginning my career search, one of the key factors in determining whether or not I wanted to work for a specific company was what their culture was like. I truly do believe (as the cultural approach to organizations posits) that culture is not something an organization has, but rather is. The position I eventually accepted was with the company whose unique system of shared meanings I felt I fit into best.

(2) 4: Research is the ground work for future research and theories. By learning theories and research in my org comm degree I learned a basis on which to explore and grow. A great example of this was when we learned to reframe the thought process of those who had been previously considered homeless or in a time of crisis. Learning how others effectively reframed the minds of others gave me the confidence and understanding to help reframe the minds of those in my workplace, including myself, in how they viewed the work they accomplished and the way in which they interacted with clients and other staff.

(3) 4: When I search for a job I inquire about their management and communication styles. I tend to be drawn to companies that come from a certain management theory.

(4) 4: I apply this knowledge in my career in knowing how to deal with my coworkers and how to relate to clients that I am interacting with.

(5) 4: The theories that I studied as an organizational communication student have helped me make sense of interdepartmental communication in my organization. Specifically, researching and identifying the types of organizations (i.e. Classical, Human Resources, Cultural, etc.) has proven to be very beneficial to my post-graduate career.

(6) 5: One of the most important ways that I have utilized the theories of communication is how to best communicate with different people. Being in the hospitality industry, I interact with a variety of personalities on a daily basis. Through my Org Com degree, I am able to assess each individual communication style so I can best accommodate their personality. My co-workers have often asked me to communicate with guests on their behalf because they see that I am able to connect with them in a variety of situations. Also, when there is conflict, I am able to mediate in a fair and appropriate manner. Lastly, Org Com has also helped me to diplomatically oversee the people
underneath me in my position. Especially being able to communicate to them their chores, how to improve, etc.

2. Demonstrate analytic and applied **skills** in organizational communication to work towards effective organizing processes.

**Explain how you've applied this skill and how it's benefited you (in career, family, life in general):**

The average score was 4.67 in which 5 = very satisfied. Specific skills listed in order of frequency from most to least: conflict management at work and in personal life, adapting to different circumstances and communication styles, competent business writing and persuasive presentations, analytical decision making and team skills, and educating and training others.

(1) 5: The list of skills I learned in my organizational communication classes truly seems endless. I developed a writing style appropriate for business reports and other inter-office communication that has been noted by multiple employers. I can create and carry out persuasive presentations. I work well in teams as both a leader and participant. I know how to manage organizational conflict and strive to reach collaborative solutions rather than compromises. I can conduct training and development programs on a small scale and was able to take my core class work back into my daily life at home to help re-start a youth group for kindergarten through fifth-graders at my church. And I could continue to go on like this.

(2) 5: Communication might be one of the single most important parts of our social, physical and metaphysical lives. Because I was forced to stand up in front of powerful people to give presentations over and over again, I learned to calm myself on stage and communicate in an effective manner. I have given several speeches and presentations since my graduation, all of which have be very productive and enlightening to the subjects who were presented to.

Also, my ability to help my family members communicate with one another in a more productive loving way has proven to help our relationships within the family and move past circumstances that might have otherwise but the families relationship in jeopardy.

(3) 5: I use this daily at work! Everything and anything you do in your work environment affects you and your coworkers. When people practice wise communication skills, the organization functions better. I have seen firsthand how bad communication between two people in one department affects the rest of the people in the department. Practicing good communication skills through emails, or in person meetings will
allow a department or company to be much more effective and successful thus allowing the employees to be more satisfied.

(4) 4: Very important in my career because I work for a small company where I need to put on many different hats and play many different roles. Need to be able to analyze the difference in order to adapt to many different circumstances.

(5) 4: I believe that after becoming familiarized with different styles of organizational communication, the analytical skills become second nature. For example, I understand I will not receive a prompt response to an email from a certain department because their organizational culture does not necessarily respect the process of sending and receiving emails. Thus, I adapt my communication skills to fit with others’ needs.

(6) 5: Very similar to answer to #1. As for my career: I won employee of the month and am well known in my hotel of over 800 people. In life in general, many people (at work or socially) ask me for my opinion when there is a major decision that needs to be made because I am able to assess on a fair basis, will tell them bluntly, and have the analytical skills that they may be lacking at that certain time.

3. Appreciate how different worldviews impact organizational communication and discern among those choices a wise and ethical path.

**Explain how you’ve applied this appreciation of ethics and how it’s benefited you (in career, family, life in general):**

One person did not record a score (participant #2) although s/he made positive comments. The mean score among the 5 participants was 4.8 in which 5 = highly satisfied.

Teaching of ethics was attributed to Pepperdine’s mission, the required COM Communication Ethics core course, and the teaching in organizational communication of understanding multiple worldviews while knowing and maintaining one’s own. Answers reflected the following ethical views taught in COM 400: duties (based on a personal credo), character/virtues, and dialogic, especially from a Christian, biblical worldview.

(1) 5: I have used the personal credo for ethical communication that I developed in my Communication Ethics class as my gold standard for communicating in my life in every possible realm. I stand firm in my beliefs but also have a knowledge of contrasting ideas that helps me keep an open mind in communication with others. I do not waver when faced with ethical decisions, for the most part, and I personally feel stronger because of that class.
(2) Score left blank: The org comm major strengthened my moral compass by teaching me life skills like patience and persistence. It also taught be dedication to a cause and ownership of one’s work. The world is still a playground, only now it is a playground built on dirt instead of sand. By learning about various types of communication and ethics, I was, and still am able to build upon my understanding of the world in a way that enhances my life and those around me at the same time.

(3) 5: Ironically, I work at a Christian organization that consists of widely diverse beliefs. Although the organization’s foundation is Christian, the employees and participants in the organization have strong Buddhist, and Jewish backgrounds and beliefs. I have learned to appreciate other people’s religions and worldviews, but be able to maintain my own beliefs while at work. I have benefited from this because coworkers know I am respectful and caring of our differences and do not treat them differently because of them. At the same time, understanding that all organizations consist of multiple worldviews, I am not ashamed to live out mine in my job.

(4) 4: I am getting my MBA at a large public university and am constantly surrounded by diverse individuals. I am able to discern a wise path according to my beliefs and value system even though I can still appreciate the many different worldviews that others have around me.

(5) 5: An honest man can never be cheated.

(6) 5: I apply ethics to my job and life on a daily basis. At my hotel, employees steal things from guests and from the hotel, but I obviously know this is wrong (many people are fired due to this). Also, I realize that it is best not to lie to our guests while others tend to do so. Knowing what is right and wrong and being able to see this knowledge from the Bible and recollect from my Pepperdine days is one of the main reasons why so many people trust me. At work, one of my Directors asked me to work on a special project for him that is completely classified and I cannot tell anyone about, all because he found me trustworthy and an ethical person.

4. In your opinion, what are the greatest strengths of the organizational communication major?

There seemed to be a common theme of appreciating tacit yet complex work and life skills learned in classes and in experience with clients that enabled students to make good decisions, work well with others, and ask good questions. Because these are abilities that can be applied in various contexts rather than being a codified set of skills for a single position or profession, there's a sense that alumni may not identify or realize the full benefit of these aptitudes until after graduating. One participant (#3) states this explicitly and alludes to a potential source of frustration or confusion with theories and research as a
The organizational communication major’s greatest strengths are: the broad range of career possibilities it provides its students, the outside organizations and resources brought in to enhance classroom learning, and the comprehensive skill set it develops in students.

The greatest strength in the org comm major is the Senior Thesis Classes. Being able to work hands on with really problems and getting real results sets the stage for work ethic, real world scenarios, and the ability to accomplish multiple projects at once. A truly comprehensive major.

To be honest, during my study in this major, I did not have a true grasp on the benefits of studying this major. I did not see any relevance or use for my life outside of school. However, to my surprise, when I graduated and began looking for jobs, I inherently, without even trying, began interviewing with companies and drilling them with questions about their organizational communication, culture, styles, ethics, skills, etc. The greatest strengths of the major is that it allows you to know what type of organization or company you’ll want to work in. It also allowed me to know what type of role I’d be most comfortable working in – teams, individually, in a big company or small company etc. If I could tell students who are currently in the major one thing, I would tell them to look beyond the theories, and research and think practically – ask yourselves what type of company do you see yourself working in ...what type of communication do you like to use at work? This mentality will allow you to appreciate the curriculum and know it is useful for the rest of your life.

Learning how to effectively and positively interact with other individuals. Knowing the different communication styles that others use and being able to discern which are the most useful for each unique circumstance.

Sensitizing students to the communication needs of others
Making important communication skills second nature to students
Ability to work effectively in small groups

The hands on experience we learned. Being able to fully dive into an organization and dissect its most inner workings and fully understand and comprehend the process was something that helped me in my future at work. I felt competent that I could handle any situation and be able to understand any organization; just as long as I researched it and found the right questions to ask.

5. In your opinion, what are the greatest weaknesses of the organizational communication major? How can it be improved?
Although students see practical skills as the greatest strength (see answer above), several describe the need to develop the relevance, business examples, and experiential nature of the program to help students market themselves in the workplace. Another potential contradiction is the identification of actual client projects that required them to use complex thinking and deal with uncertainty, yet one student felt the greatest weakness was lack of a clear, potentially linear method of teaching. Although these alumni reflected greater satisfaction with application in courses, these contradictory statements seem to indicate that the perceived shortcomings of the program may lie more with branding or positioning the major, its outcomes and uses. Two participants (#1 and #2) seem to get at this with recommendations for better publicity, recruitment, and positioning as a major rather than a track or sequence to help raise awareness and the reputation of the major among new students and the university more generally.

(1) The only weakness I see in the major currently is its publicity. I feel lucky to have stumbled across it, and I wish I would have known it was a possibility from the beginning. The major has so much to offer, but is hidden among the long list of other communication concentrations. This could be improved through greater publicity to incoming students, whether during campus visits or in brochures of some sort.

(2) The greatest weaknesses of the org comm degree in my opinion would be the amount of resources that the degree has to offer its students. Org Comm is a very fast growing field, not to mention I use the principles that I was taught in almost every part of my life. This major not only has potential to grow at Pepperdine, but make a dramatic change in the way that faculty, students and community members view Pepperdine as a college, home and community.

(3) I alluded to the greatest weakness of the major in the previous question when I said I did not see any relevance to the major. I think the major, at least when I studied it, could use some more practical application beyond the projects and presentations. For example, a practical and relevant project of the major could be this: choose 5 companies that you are interested in and set up informational interviews with each. Go to the interview and ask them all about their organization (culture, communication style, management style, conflict management, training and development practices etc). Not only would this project give students interview practice, but it would really ingrain what the major is about.

(4) Needs to have more technical, concrete skills taught. A little bit more of a business structure would be helpful with a few business elements included in the major. Even just using more examples of businesses and how they use organizational communication would be helpful.
a.) Less theoretical – more experiential (i.e. internships and case studies outside of Pepperdine)
b.) There should be more discussion of org comm from a leadership perspective
c.) Students should be able to have a firm grasp of how to launch into the working world with their major

(6) One of the greatest weaknesses of the program for me, would be that many times I was confused on how to do various projects. Maybe only explain one section of the project at a time and then add on to it after that section is completed?

6. Please tell us a little about your journey since graduation:

All six of these graduates are employed (two at Pepperdine), which may have been one motivation to answer the survey; one of these is enrolled in a graduate program and one is engaged to be married this fall. All but one (#2) shared about specific roles and positions of church and community involvement.

a. Career (positions and fields):

(1) In January of 2012, I accepted my first full-time position as Executive Assistant to the national leadership team of a small nonprofit called Step Up Women’s Network in Los Angeles.

(2) Exercise Specialist and Director of Business Development and Marketing (Athletic Training and Conditioning)

(3) Following graduation I took a job at Pepperdine University Graduate School of Business and Management as the Alumni and Career Services Coordinator. I have been here for 5 months.

(4) I moved back to Houston, TX and started working as a Marketing/ Project Coordinator for an oil and gas company. I also do meeting planning and organize a few events within the industry.

(5) I work as an admission counselor for Pepperdine University (since summer 2011)

(6) After graduation, I began working at the Beverly Wilshire: A Four Seasons Hotel in Guest Relations and then the Spa (as well as a couple other departments) asked me to join them. So I am a full-time employee with 2 different positions: I work in Guest Relations for 2 days and as a Spa Coordinator for 3 days. I am moving full-time to the Spa in a couple weeks and my Director is going to start moving me up through the Spa to be a Director within 5-7 years.

b. Education (degree in progress/completed and field):

(1) B.A., Communication
I recently started an evening MBA program at University of Houston and am working full time and going to classes at night.

I plan to continue my education and receive a Master's Degree in Clinical Psychology with an emphasis in marriage and family therapy.

After graduation, I took an Italian class at the Santa Monica City College, but other than that, I have no plans to continue my academic career.

c. Ministry/civic/family (roles and involvement):
(1) After graduating in April of 2011, I spent the summer in Greece working as a counselor at a Greek Orthodox Christian camp.

(3) I started volunteering regularly at my church in the Nursery twice a month on Sundays. I AM ENGAGED!!! GETTING MARRIED [this fall]!

(4) Involved with Houston’s First Baptist Church going to bible study and church there. Also involved with a bible study at Grace Bible Church in Houston TX. I am still volunteering with Redeemed Ministries, a ministry that helps stop human trafficking. I am also blessed to be near my family and see them regularly.

I have continued to surf, skate, and do all that I can that is fun under the sun. I still also work as a Young Life leader in the Malibu Area. Further, I have teamed with an old friend and started writing children’s books. We have scheduled times in the future to volunteer and read in libraries to kids.

(6) I have found a church in my neighborhood where I live; it is a great church with a wonderful community. I am going to join a Bible study once I have my full-time schedule in the Spa. I am very close with my family; I live with my sister and speak with all family members at least once every day. It is important to me to hang out with friends and co-workers which I do multiple times during the week, but I still make sure to leave "me-time."

Seniors
1. Satisfaction with understanding theories and research in organizational communication: 4.3 (4 = satisfied).
   • An asset in graduate school preparation for personal written statement and preparation for various methods of research; allowed connections between classes, projects and internship.
   • Helped develop observation skills.
   • Able to formulate own ideas and theories of how organizations work and personal work and leadership style.
2. Satisfaction with analytic and applied skills in organizational communication that works toward effective processing: 4 (satisfied)
   • Apply skills to consulting with United Cerebral Palsy and in internship with a communication consulting firm; better able to understand organizations and have better attitude about group work and more confidence in dealing with change in groups, family and relationships.
   • Applied to group work and able to understand situations as a whole from a communication perspective.
   • Analyzed and provided consulting for nonprofit organization and gained critical conflict management skills that have helped in personal and professional roles.

3. Satisfaction with how the major has helped participants appreciate the way different worldviews impact organizational communication and discern among those a wise and ethical path: 4 (satisfied).
   • In COM 400 Ethics in Communication core course, beginning to learn ethical systems and gaining greater insight into others’ ethics.
   • Constantly put into practice daily with knowledge from class helping to better understand others’ views and challenge her/him to form a personal view.
   • More aware of the many facets of organizational events and what may not seem like an ethical matter to one person may result in an ethical dilemma for another; because of the major, has a better understanding of people and life in general, and when not understanding, a calmness with uncertainty.

4. Greatest Strengths:
   • “Professors are there for you 100% of the time with 100% support. I have had amazing relationships with all of my professors: I can tell they really care about me as an individual, want to see me succeed, and take pleasure in seeing my growth as a student.”
   • “Focused, specific, applied experience.”
   • “Variety of applicable skills in conjunction with theoretical knowledge; better understanding of one’s own role in an organization; increased complexity of thought when approaching organizational situations.”

5. Greatest Weaknesses:
   • Limited internships, especially for consulting.
   • Networking for jobs and internships.
   • “HIGH sense of ambiguity and lack of specific career options.”

6. Plans after graduation:
• Applied for communication graduate programs and later to be a human resources consultant and continue involvement in music.
• Work in consulting firm for a few years and then be a stay at home parent.
• Work for admissions or human resources at Pepperdine and later at a company with a strong human resources ethic.

**RQ2: Analysis of Capstone Courses**

**Organizational Communication Analysis Projects**

Drs. Walker and Garner analyzed the semester-long project from COM 521 for each of the years they taught the course during the five years following the 2004 – 2005 Program Review, from 2005 – 2009. The list of organizations analyzed by students appears below:

2005  New Horizons Habilitation Center for mentally challenged and The Westside Pregnancy Resource Center (WPRC) (Walker)
2006  Ventura County Habitat for Humanity (Walker)
2007  Pepperdine University Organizational Communication Major (Walker)
2008  (Garner)
2009  (Garner)

Prior to the analysis, we decided that "satisfactory” achievement in projects would demonstrate desired knowledge values at a level of at least 80% (the equivalent of a B-) and competency (skills and abilities) at a level of at least 70% (the equivalent of a C-). Outcomes seen at lower levels would be rated as “unsatisfactory,” while outcomes that are recognizable at a level of at least 90% would be rated as “outstanding” (the equivalent of an A-).

Each year, students work in teams to perform analyses of not-for-profit organizations using surveys, interviews, and direct observations (including volunteer hours). Students assess communication in these organizations and then present the results of their findings to liaisons from each organization at the end of the semester. The project constitutes approximately 50% of the class grade and peer evaluations constitute approximately 10%. [Johny is this true for your classes too?] A successful project would require students to use theory (value a) to develop research questions about communication processes (value b) that would then be examined in both scientific and humanistic approaches (value c). Executing this project would involve social scientific research (competency a) in an applied setting (competency c). Presenting the results emphasized public speaking (competency b).

Tables 4 - 8 report levels of values and competencies for each year’s projects from 2005 to 2009 and provide comments about each. Higher motivation and scores occurred when students
understood the purpose of the research and felt that they could help and were appreciated by the client. Lower motivation and scores occurred when students did not seem to take ownership of the projects (because they didn’t embrace the purpose or didn’t feel appreciated by the client). Projects that involved vocational and ethical relevance with not-for-profits motivated students to high levels of achievement (e.g., 2005 projects).

Table 4: 2005 New Horizons Habilitation Center & Westside Pregnancy Resource Center (WPRC)

Two student teams each conducted qualitative and quantitative research with a not-for-profit organization. Both teams seemed to feel that they could make a difference at the organizations they studied, became motivated to work for not-for-profit organizations in the future, and in fact, the majority expressed a change in their vocational calling as a result of the projects. Both teams achieved “A”s and demonstrated high levels of desired values and competencies but required considerable help from the professor with editing multiple versions of their research papers. (They resisted using a research paper format including a full literature review but did so by the end of the semester.) The team that worked with New Horizons was motivated by discovering that a paradox existed in the organization virtually running a sweatshop because the organization attempted to mix conflicting goals of financial profit and habilitation. This discovery motivated that integration of theory and research; however, students were frustrated that management was unwilling to make philosophical changes in the organization to confront the paradox. The team that worked with the pregnancy resource center was motivated by the strong sense of vocation among management and volunteers and being able to identify the emergent model of hope used in the organization, but they were frustrated with the constraint of the board’s corporate and bureaucratic mentality to run this grassroots organization. Learning life skills and helping organizational clients motivated members of both teams.

Table 5: 2006 Ventura County Habitat for Humanity

In 2006, students in this class joined with two other courses (one in advertising and one in the business division) to work with the Ventura County Habitat for Humanity (with partial funding from a grant secured by Professor Regan Schaffer). Unfortunately, the management office of the organization proved to be unresponsive as the semester progressed. As a result, both teams lacked motivation to complete the project. Nonetheless, the quantitative/survey team was still able to collect and analyze data but because of uncertainty with organizational rapport and ability to gather data, the team relied primarily on the master’s student leader to do the majority of the work. The project presented interesting findings about a perceived lack of support from management but the theoretical wording and explanation were unclear. The project demonstrated desired values and competencies (90%) but contributions were not equal. Grades were weighted with peer evaluations. The qualitative/organizational culture team felt defeated by the lack of interest and unwillingness of organization members to participate in their interviews. Dr. Walker suggested that they change the study design to study the actual culture of poor management (the management team left after the study) but students were too personally offended and uninterested to adapt the focus of their study. Because of the lack of cooperation from the organization, the percentage of the
course grade constituted by the paper for the qualitative research group was reduced from 55% to 41%. With adjustments in the weighting of the paper and peer evaluations, the master's student received an A and one student received a D, but the mean grade was a B.

Table 6: 2007 Pepperdine University Organizational Communication Major

The student assessment research reported in the first part of this report was successful and presented a very comprehensive project that demonstrated all values and competencies of the major (see Table 6). The percentages of achievement ranged from 80 to 93 for desired values (knowledge); and from 87 to 93 for competencies (skills and abilities) across the four student teams. The lowest scores were earned by the survey group. Although they worked independently from the professor and with great effort, team members didn’t understand that satisfaction with program knowledge, skills, and abilities was a different construct for alumni than for current students. That is, while alumni satisfaction with the major is likely to be relative to perceived utility of values and competencies, student satisfaction is more likely related to satisfaction with professors, classes, and applied not theoretic nature of assignments. Because these students viewed satisfaction among alumni and students as the same construct, in their analyses they expressed their skepticism about high satisfaction scores of alumni and their personal frustration with the major and perceived lack of personal voice in the assessment as students. They expressed frustration with being asked to do what they saw as the professors’ work of evaluating the major. Their lack of motivation affected their theoretical design and research. For instance, because they didn’t see the construct of satisfaction with the program as multidimensional, they didn’t run multivariate analyses to examine concepts although encouraged to do so by the professor (e.g., they could have run factor analyses to examine subconstructs of satisfaction, correlations between items or variable factors, and analyses of differences in group means).

Likewise, because students analyzing the alumni focus groups seemed to confuse focus group methods with discussion groups, they didn’t seem to treat their project as systematic research and therefore seemed less motivated to design their study and analyze data. In contrast to the two student teams who worked with alumni, the other two teams seemed to embrace their research analyzing artifacts and in the case of one team, interviewing faculty. Familiarity with student vocation statements and course syllabi seemed to help the students take more ownership of the projects and in fact conduct better research.
A. Hypothesis 1: In 2010, Drs. Johny Garner and Walker hypothesized for 2011 that “students will be better able to integrate theory and research if the client organizations share a similar mission that integrates their functions into a philosophical goal.” This appeared to be the case in the way students used and talked about theory differently in their organizational analyses (COM 521) and training and development (COM 422) for the same two clients throughout the year—Pepperdine University and a group of four “transformational” nonprofit organizations (Standing on Stone and the Kingdom Center organizations serving the homeless, Westside Pregnancy Clinic, and Alcoholics Anonymous). In the analysis and training for the transformational nonprofit organizations, students applied theories of paradox in a seamless way when making sense of these organizations’ missions and how the organizations seem to tacitly use paradoxical theory in breaking through binds that trap or stigmatize those who are suffering. Students demonstrated an integration of theoretical language not only in analysis reports in COM 521 and in proposed training in COM 422 but also in everyday class discussion.

In contrast, in a project examining views of diversity at Pepperdine, students used metalanguage involving four disparate organizational communication perspectives (classical/human relations, systems, cultural, and critical) in the fall COM 521 assessment project both to describe how Pepperdine strategically uses multiple motivations for implementing diversity and to critique Pepperdine’s lack of an overarching philosophical worldview related to its mission. This demonstrated their ability to use organizational communication theories as mental models:

- classical/human relations when reporting on attitudes of diversity;
- systems for strategizing utility of multiculturalism for each school;
- organizational culture for students who want to link diversity to the Pepperdine mission of preparing for lives of service, purpose, and leadership; and
- critical theory to examine oppression and hegemony embedded in written university discourse about diversity.

In addition, students were able to apply “paradoxical thinking” in COM 422 to propose that Pepperdine draw on its ecumenical Church of Christ roots and original mission statement of George Pepperdine to transcend these multiple organizational frameworks in concrete strategies. In their written report and oral presentation to diversity administrators, they advocated that Pepperdine:

- more clearly define diversity within the university’s ecumenical mission that inherently embraces paradoxes of practical advancement and preservation/restoration of core biblical beliefs;
- integrate activities throughout the culture in a program parallel to Step Forward Day and in a bible study that integrates people of different background through studying the bible in relation to the mission of service, purpose, and leadership rather than in an attempt to create interdenominational worship; and
- train diversity administrators to train upper administration to think paradoxically in strategic planning with concepts such as “affirming yet breaking through particularities” (Hughes) and “unified diversity.”
When diversity administrators responded favorably and passionately to paradoxical thinking in discussion portions of the oral presentation, students exhibited and talked more fluidly about paradoxical thinking as an alternative to the current organizational use of multiple mental models. However, when discussing their impressions of the inaugural Multicultural Graduation Celebration at Seaver, students admitted that they themselves were limited by a strategic mental model of diversity rather than a paradoxical view of embracing yet breaking through differences in unified diversity. They admitted to the diversity administrators their conclusion that this inclusive event was not intended for them personally unless they were minority status and otherwise involved on campus in advancing causes of multiculturalism. More than just theorizing about diversity, this discussion with Pepperdine diversity administrators seemed to help them more fully reframe diversity from multicultural inclusivity of groups to thinking from different perspectives in search of a greater, transcendent truth. Thus, their ability to integrate theory and research in their projects were enhanced when client organizations shared a similar mission that integrates their functions into a philosophical goal.

**B. Hypothesis 2:** In the 2010 assessment report, the second hypothesis for the 2010 – 2011 year was that "students will be better able to integrate persuasion and research if they receive greater training in adapting to contingencies of organizations and if they propose and present their research in a panel at an academic conference."

These preceding examples of students applying theory (and the skill of paradoxical thinking) when it resonates with a client organization's mission also provide support for the second hypothesis regarding student use of persuasion and research with training and opportunities for research presentations. By giving oral presentations and engaging in conversations with organizational clients, professional organizational consultants, and faculty members attending their conference presentations, students learned to adapt their research summaries and recommendations for proposed training in ways that adapted to respondents' comments. Specific outcomes included:
1. Revising research analyses and recommendations from COM 521 as a result of responses from Dr. Andreas and guest speaker consultants Amy Kawabori, Rebekah Dillingham, and Caroline Schwane Clavin.
   a. In her comments as panel respondent to the analysis of diversity at Pepperdine at the SCCUR conference in November, Dr. Andreas recommended that students’ analyses more fully apply the theoretical lens for each of the four organizational perspectives. Students revised their analyses and recommendations as part of their individual final exams in December and then subsequently in groups by writing up needs assessment for training in January in COM 422.
   b. As guest speaker consultants, Amy Kawabori (in COM 521) and Rebekah Dillingham and Caroline Schwane Clavin (in COM 422) critiqued student needs assessments and proposals for training about diversity at Pepperdine University and paradoxical thinking at transformational non-profit organizations from the perspective of corporate training. They recommended that students simplify training goals and training language while giving the value added of theory. Students took away the principle of using theory outside of class as long as they could define and operationalize it clearly.

2. Adapting persuasive strategies for needed training in response to client and academic audiences.
   a. In response to faculty members from other universities who attended the students’ panels at SCCUR and WSCA who commended students on their integration of theory to community involvement, students integrated theory and research into their presentations.
   b. In their critique of students’ proposed training about paradoxical thinking for nonprofit transformational organizations, Hollie Packman and Talitha Phillips (CEOs/presidents of nonprofit organizations and Pepperdine organizational communication alumni), however, recommended that students use much more simple language and practical concepts in their training. This seemed to stymie the students’ ability to be persuasive in this more applied meeting with organizational clients after their recent positive recognition for using research and theory at the academic conferences. Students expressed to me after the client meeting their confusion and disappointment of what they perceived as a criticism of their use of theory and research. This gave me the opportunity to help teach them the importance of translating relevant theory and research to applied contexts and the change agent goal of discerning if an organization is focused more on framing its theoretical lens/mission versus seeking to reframing an existing approach. (The academic audiences were more interested in reframing while the nonprofit clients were more interested in clarifying to their organization members the emergent framing that currently seems to be working well in their organizations.)

Fall 2011 Client Project: United Cerebral Palsy
The semester project this year was an organizational analysis of communication at the Santa Barbara/Ventura County/Los Angeles chapter of the United Cerebral Palsy. Students worked in two teams. Based on conversations with communication student Al Lai, an advocate for service learning at Pepperdine’s Volunteer Center who had previously worked as liaison with UCP, as well as meetings with Ron Weiss, the program director at UCP who works with volunteers, including Pepperdine Students, students worked in two teams to design and conduct separate studies of communication in the organization. One team used quantitative survey methods to examine employee satisfaction with management and communication and possible burnout. The other team used qualitative methods (interviews and participant observation) to examine how well the organization’s communication practices fit the organization’s mission. Based on their analyses, student teams presented findings and made recommendations to the client, myself and professor of public relations Dr. Denise Ferguson because of her experience with service learning in her courses.

The survey team concluded that while employees had high levels of satisfaction with their career choice of assisting those with disabilities, they experienced stress and low levels of satisfaction with management and communication at the organization. The interview team discovered two very different mental models of the mission used by managers of the facility that shape the way each communicates and operates the separate residential care facilities they run, which seems to limit the coordination of work processes and communication across houses and for the organizational overall.

Feedback was provided in the form of teammate peer evaluations, oral and written client response, Dr. Ferguson's oral response and written evaluation, and my oral response and written evaluation and grade. While Dr. Ferguson did not provide an overall letter grade, she evaluated research methods of each project. For the survey project, she agreed with the student recommendation that the organization focus on items resulting in a neutral scores but commented on the low response rate for an on-site survey and the needs to report more statistical analysis on the data. For the interview project, she commended the group on their interpretations of findings but called for more focus on research questions throughout the presentation and more willingness to make stronger recommendations to the client.

Based on meeting criteria of the project rubric for research, reasoning, and written and oral communication skills, I assessed group projects with an overall initial grades of A for the survey project and A- for the interview project (which was revised and regraded as an A). I then adjusted the project grade based on student peer evaluations of work contribution by each member. Adjusted grades for the survey project consisted of 2 Bs, an A- and an A (ranging from 83% to 95%); and those for the interview paper were one A- and two As after the revision (ranging from 91% to 93%). In his oral comments after the presentation and in more indepth written comments, the client representative was very positive toward the students work, confirming the relevance of resonance of the findings, and requested that students work with the organization this semester to provide training help improve the organization’s deliberate use of mental models, communication and management. The following is an excerpt from his letter:

I spoke to my Administrative staff regarding the presentation and they felt the quantitative
information was really helpful to see where the staff members felt in both homes. They liked knowing that the staff are satisfied with working at the facility due to their love of the clients, but would like to see improvements on how communication is done by management. The suggestion of increasing the interdependence between the homes will be looked at, along with further improving staff appreciation. ... Maybe with further consulting we could see discover different methods of conveying information.

The mental model was useful to see how the Behavioral/Program Management vs the Medical branch of the facility view & act upon the mission of the organization. Administration felt that if further "mental model analysis" was done for each person who holds a position in the management team, then we would have a better idea of how collaboration & communication is occurring at this time. This way we could see how, as a team, we are reaching the organizational goals and where the disconnect is. The Administrative staff felt the analysis was done very well, and it described how our individual personalities do show up in our professional roles, especially just from a short interview.

This feedback demonstrated his perceived worth and validity of the findings and that of upper management as well. Their interest in continuing to work with the students this term demonstrates their confidence in the students’ consulting abilities.

RQ3: Paradoxical Thinking among Seniors

As part of an assessment mini-grant to develop a measure of paradoxical thinking, organizational communication seniors (seven total) were given a pre-test and post-test consisting of a 6-page, 30-item instrument to assess their knowledge, skills, and abilities for paradoxical thinking in COM 521 during the fall of 2011. Paradoxical thinking has been described and operationalized by multiple researchers (Fletcher & Olwyler, Ingram, Lewis, Walker, Westenholz) as the ability to view organizations from multiple lenses to form a larger frame that encompasses rather than attempts to resolve organizational paradoxes (mutually exclusive contradictory truths), which in turn is used to solve problems in organizations.

Knowledge of paradoxical thinking was tested using forced-choice items (1 – 27). Because items 1 – 10 tested a positive attitude toward or acceptance of paradox, these items were disregarded in this analysis, leaving items 11 – 27 (17 items). The score on these items in the pretest was low with an average score of 45% (ranging from 32% to 65%). This low level is not surprising as the instrument tests for specific knowledge of nonlinear thinking and specific vocabulary. After instruction in concepts and training in skills of paradoxical thinking, post-test scores indicated an average score of 69% (ranging from 53% to 88%). This reflected an average increase of 24% (ranging from 12% to 39%) in knowledge about paradoxical thinking. Particular items missed varied in that there was no single item scored incorrectly by all students. Thus, although scores were low, increase in understanding was noteworthy. These results demonstrate that knowledge about paradoxical thinking can be learned, demonstrated, and improved. The following table shows percentages of correct answers on the pre-test and post-test for each student and increases in percentage of items
Ability to use paradoxical thinking was tested by asking students to respond to a case problem from Fletcher and Olwyler’s popular business press book *Paradoxical Thinking*, consisting of a multiple-choice item (#28) and an open-ended response that asked for specific actions a manager should take to reduce a negative oxymoron and increase a positive oxymoron (#29). While only one of the seven students selected the correct answer in the pre-test and post-test (a different student at each testing time), there was a pattern of findings among responses to the case study that demonstrated a movement for the majority of students from a single management frame (Human Relations/Resources) in the pre-test to a “both/and” or pluralistic type of thinking in the post-test (either Situational Leadership or Classical Leadership combined with Human Relations/Resources). In the pre-test, one student did not answer the item, another chose the correct (paradoxical thinking) response but did not complete the open-ended response that followed (#29), and five answered with a Human Relations/Resources approach. In the post-test, three answered with the Human Relations/Resources approach (one of which added reverting to Classical if needed), one with a Situational Leadership style (which alternates between Classical and HR styles as needed), two with a Classical view (implemented with an HR style), and one answered with three of the options by choosing both the Human Relations/Resources approach along with the correct (paradoxical thinking response) in Item #28 then adding in the open-ended response in Item #29 the choice of a third option from #28 (the option for the boss to complete the work for the employee). While the HR approach (the majority answer for the pretest) generally can be said to include Classical assumptions, the post-test reflected more of a hybrid “both-and” model with comments such as “acknowledge tensions” and “encourage trust while maintaining discipline.” This demonstrated that students had progressed from choosing a unitary management frame in problem solving style, yet they seemed to use more of an additive or situational approach rather than a true paradoxical approach of transcending traditional views to ask other, larger questions.
While knowledge and abilities of paradoxical thinking can seem particularly abstract and therefore harder to master and assess, students were most successful and interested in demonstrating paradoxical thinking skills applied directly to their individual lives. Paradoxical thinking skills were tested with an open-ended, six-part application (Item #30) that asked students to identify types of paradoxical tensions from theoretical literature (Lewis) relevant to them among the following list: harmony/discord, stability/change, control/flexibility, or autonomy/dependence. The remaining five parts of Item #30 presented and requested that students apply and follow Fletcher and Olwyler’s steps in identifying specific, positive and negative, paradoxes (oxymorons) in their own lives; and describing specific actions “to attain a more positive balance in [their] core oxymoron by working on [their] negative tendency and improving [their] positive tendency.”

While the completeness of Item # 30 in the pre-tests was variable, students did identify their personal paradoxes according to instructions. Students were asked to list traits about themselves that would be identified by those who are supportive of them as well as by those who are critical of them. Then choosing words for each list, they were asked to identify central paradoxes about their personalities, as well a positive or “high performance oxymoron” and a negative or “nightmare oxymoron.” In a class meeting that followed their individual completion of the survey, students posted and shared their positive and negative oxymorons to the class and gave each other feedback on specific wording and plotting of their paradoxes on Fletcher and Olwyler’s Pendulum. Post-tests represented a later iteration of their pre-test paradoxes. The following table displays student paradoxes (oxymorons) and classifies which of Lewis’ category of paradoxical tensions they fit. Each of Lewis’ four primary organizational paradoxes were represented in students’ paradoxes with the most common being control/flexibility or autonomy/dependence (two sets of two students for each). In addition to, I also added the dimensions of emotion versus rationality, which seemed to best describe the last set of oxymorons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Main Paradox/</th>
<th>High-Performance</th>
<th>Nightmare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of Tension</td>
<td>Oxymoron</td>
<td>Oxymoron</td>
<td>Oxymoron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control/</td>
<td>Malicious Leader</td>
<td>Loyal Includer</td>
<td>Impatient Jerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Active Procrastinator</td>
<td>Deliberator Creator</td>
<td>Indecisive Procrastinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/</td>
<td>Loyal Avoider</td>
<td>Dependable Friend</td>
<td>Closed-Minded Pushover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability/</td>
<td>Reserved Risktaker</td>
<td>Practical Adventurer</td>
<td>Unapproachable Rule Follower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While identifying these sets of oxymorons was challenging for students, they all developed some sort of goals for increasing their positive oxymoron and reducing their negative oxymoron (Item #30 part f). This final skill was perhaps the most concrete of all the paradoxical thinking assessment. Student goals reflected specific behaviors within their own control related to their personal paradoxical tensions that consider the context but that don’t depend on it. Analysis of student goals revealed the following common themes: requesting input from others about their paradoxical tendencies and taking responsibility for negative effects, setting and being accountable to incremental and precise goals, considering positive and negative oxymorons separately, drawing boundaries with other and self, using a rational plan to manage fears, and keeping focus on “the bigger picture.”

These themes reflect paradoxical understanding and ability to use multiple frames to understand a larger view to solve problems. More specifically, their use of multiple paradoxes in problem solving reflected important critical thinking skills of analysis and reflexivity significant to the major’s main goal of being a change agent that also aligns with the program goals of human communication majors and general education goals more generally. In addition, students seemed to feel a greater confidence about their major and their knowledge, skills, and abilities as a result of this instruction, especially following group discussion of the skills and sharing goals with each other.

During the Spring 2012 semester, I am working with a group of three students (2 master’s students and one undergraduate senior who has applied to attend graduate school elsewhere next year) to develop the skill application of this instrument (extending the case and personal oxymoron application primarily) into organizational training exercises for COM 422 Training and Development and to adapt Items 28 – 30 into a pre-test and post-test of Paradoxical Thinking skills. Our plan is to administer this training and assessment to organization members, perhaps students enrolled in the fully employed Bachelors of Business Administration and/or in the Master’s of Science in Organizational Development and/or a critical theory sample of managers involved in paradoxical thinking tasks such as those working as boundary spanners for multinational organizations or staff of an international adoption agency. The undergraduate senior on the team and I are also slated to present our findings at the ARC Conference of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in April 2012. In addition, I have been in conversation and will continue to
work with developing the full scale of paradoxical thinking with Dr. Amy Ingram, business school professor at Clemson University and former student of Dr. Marianne Lewis, business school professor at the University of Cincinnati.

**RQ4: Identity of Major**

**Fall 2011 Pre-Test/Post-Test**

In response to prior assessment results that suggest students’ lack of understanding about the major and its uses, more explanation about the major was given along with the course’s experiential learning in the field with a client in the COM 521 Organizational Communication Analysis in the Fall of 2011. Pre-tests and post-tests about the major and its uses were given at the beginning and end of class. Pre-tests demonstrated views of the major as learning knowledge about research and theory of organizational communication (more than skills) grouped according to specific courses, predominantly from the following upper division courses: COM 418 Communication in Organizations, COM 519 Communication and Conflict, and COM 483 Small Group Communication. This resulted in a common identity of themselves as learners rather than as active creators of inquiry or organizational practitioners, except for some who had outside concentrations/minors or work experience in applied areas (one in public relations and one in marketing).

Post-test results demonstrated a shift in views beyond learning about theories and research toward a more holistic vision of becoming positive change agents in organizations. They identified the following as being intended outcomes of the major:

- Ability to assess communication within an organization.
- Ability to implement effective changes to improve communication practices of an organization.
- Personal preparation for future work and life.
- Leadership decision making skills and ability to promote responsible behaviors within organizations.
- Ability to help organizations manage uncertainty and tensions in organizations.

They identified the following possible future jobs:

- Research analyst in organizational evaluation.
- Communication specialist or consultant in organizational development.
- Manager or leader.
- Project manager.
- Public relations, marketing, or advertising.
- Human resources.
- Conflict manager.
They identified knowledge learned in the following areas:

- Theory and research about communication in organizations.
- Communication practices within organizations through multiple lenses and approaches.
- Processes and practices in organizations.
- The role of communication in organizational management and structure.
- Efficiency and relational aspects of organizations.

They described acquired skills in the following areas:

- Research methods (quantitative and qualitative) to evaluate communication in organizations.
- Written and oral communication skills.
- Ability to work within a system of communication managers.
- Critical thinking.
- Relational skills.
- “Big picture” ideas.
- Problem solving skills.
- Change management skills (ability to assess need for change and knowledge and resources to know how to implement change).

Spring 2011: COM 418 Communication in Organizations Mental Models

While students still emphasized knowledge of theories and research in the post assessment, their descriptions at the end of the term included more identification of their own skills in communication competency, designing and conducting field research, critical thinking, problem solving, leadership, and ethical life and work skills. They demonstrated the ability to list their organizational analysis for the United Cerebral Palsy in language suitable for a resume entry.

In COM 418 Communication in Organizations, the junior-level course that presents theories of the major, Dr. Andreas administered a pretest to students in pairs to better understand class members’ mental models/frameworks of the organizational communication major and field. She asked 14 open-ended questions ranging from defining an organization, communication, the field of organizational communication. At the beginning of the semester, their definitions generally reflected an instrumental view of organizations used for efficiency, with a greater understanding of classical, human relations/resources, and systems perspective than the critical theory view. Based on course discussions and assignments, she felt that students gained a more holistic and “constitutive,” meaning-based view of organizations but still struggled with critical theory and feminist approaches to organizations. Additionally, students have improved their concepts of how organizational communication can make organizations effective, but they continue to struggle articulating their knowledge in specific and actionable recommendations.

In COM 422, which represented the last course of the major for 10 of the 11 students enrolled, Dr.
Walker compared answers from individual open-ended surveys taken first at the beginning of the class and the post-test at the end. Comparison revealed a progression from a general and more passive understanding of the degree as a cognitive study of communication techniques cumulatively learned throughout the major courses with utility in a corporate setting. The post-assessment revealed a more holistic, and specific understanding of the major as a process of interpreting and changing communication in organizations.

Other written reflections of students at the end of COM 422 and in their last semester at Pepperdine revealed an integration of worldview into career and life skills. Specific reflections commented on how the major integrates “spunk, grace, and thoughtfulness” in faith, scholarship, and life roles "like a family" whose projects involving paradoxical thinking “are lessons that are now embedded in us” and “motivated [them] to become better people of change.” These comments demonstrate the students’ understanding that the knowledge, skills, and values of the major help them to be agents of change in organizations and in life more generally.

**Student Projects from 2010 - 2011**

a. COM 521: Student website for Pepperdine Change Agents organizational communication seniors developed by Darren Becket; [http://students.pepperdine.edu/dgbecket/pcaweb/](http://students.pepperdine.edu/dgbecket/pcaweb/) developed Fall 2010.

b. COM 521: Four research papers regarding assessment of Pepperdine University diversity for Southern California Conference on Undergraduate Research, November 2010.

c. COM 521: Service learning with Pepperdine University; Standing on Stone and the Kingdom Center organizations serving the homeless, Westside Pregnancy Clinic, and Alcoholics Anonymous as a class; and several community organizations individually, see 5j below.

d. COM 521 & COM 422: Research paper regarding paradoxical thinking at transformational organizations presented at Western States Communication Association, Monterey, CA, February 2011 (attached).

e. COM 422: Needs assessment for training for Pepperdine University diversity presented to diversity administrators, January 2011 (attached).

f. COM 422: Training program for Pepperdine diversity, presented to diversity administrators, March 2011 (attached).

g. COM 422: Training program for paradoxical thinking at transformational organizations presented to nonprofit CEOs, April 2011 (attached).

h. Student internships with Towers Watson Human Resources Consulting and two with life coach Clark Souers, Life Revolution.

i. Job interviews with Mercer Consulting Human Resources Consulting and two with Pepperdine admissions; jobs with Academy of Country Music, Teach for America, and Ionian Village Camp.

j. Training with on-campus organizations (implemented by individual students for Campus Ministry and Residential Life) and proposed for campus life office regarding Greek life and stress management, Jumpstart, Moorpark Athletic Club, Little Gym of Calabasas,
Student diversity within the Program

In Communication Division overall, about 60% of the major is white and 40% are reporting some other ethnicity. The trend seems to be mostly stable over the years, however we are slightly increasing in diversity as evidenced in 2010 when enrollment of diverse races increased to 45% of the overall group. In last year’s graduating class as well as this year’s, two seniors are ethnic minorities.

Diversity as an area of study and ethic is integrated throughout the organizational communication curriculum and measured within SLO # 3: Appreciate how different worldviews impact organizational communication and discern among those choices a wise and ethical path. Courses include specific applications of diversity such as

1. A comparison between student partners about how their individual cultures have influenced their perceptions and identities in COM 220 Interpersonal Communication;
2. Claiming and exploring a personal worldview and gaining understanding of multiple alternate viewpoints in answering a question of value in a public panel discussion;
3. Use alternate models of conflict to understand and manage diverse views and concerns in COM 519 Communication and Conflict.
4. Using multiple organizational communication worldviews/paradigms to examine organizational communication in a movie in COM 418 Communication in Organizations and in consulting in COM 521.

In addition to these class methods, as mentioned previously, the content of this year's senior capstone courses was the culture of diversity in higher education at Pepperdine University (see attached reports). In the fall COM 521 course, students reviewed literature regarding university climate and culture of diversity in and out of the classroom, studies using statistical measures of diversity, theoretical models of diversity for higher education, theory and research on multicultural management, and specific readings about diversity at Pepperdine University. In addition, several students attended a field trip to the Museum of Tolerance with Drs. Walker and Andreas that involved writing out their reflections about tolerance and diversity at Pepperdine, and some attended a fall diversity fair on campus hosted by the Intercultural Affairs Office.

In four groups consisting of two to three members, students designed and conducted research on diversity at Pepperdine from the organizational communication perspectives of (1) classical management and human relations, (2) systems theory, (3) organizational culture lens, and (4) critical theory. Various methods across the teams consisted respectively of (1) developing and piloting a survey instrument of student views of diversity climate at Seaver College, (2) conducting a systems analysis of diversity programs across the university’s five schools using written public statements from each school's websites and written literature and interviews with respective diversity administrators, (3) focus groups with current undergraduate students, and (4) a critical
analysis of language used in written literature about diversity from administration and student on-campus organizations. At the end of the fall semester in COM 521, findings from these four studies were presented to professors Walker and Andreas, Pepperdine University diversity administrators, and on a panel for the Southern California Conference on Undergraduate Research at Pepperdine.

Based on these studies, the same students in the spring semester COM 422 discerned needs for training regarding diversity, developed written training materials and proposed and demonstrated a program for diversity administrators to help upper administration think paradoxically about diversity. Following the training proposal presentation, students engaged in a reflection exercise with diversity administrators about the meaning of diversity at Pepperdine. Over the course of the semester, diversity seemed to change from multicultural inclusivity of groups to being able to think from different perspectives in search of a greater, transcendent truth.

Curriculum and Learning Environment

Comparison with Peer Programs

According to the National Communication Association website (see www.natcom.org), there are more than 1,000 institutions across the United States that offer communication programs. While the association does not report reputational studies for undergraduate programs, it does provide results of doctoral programs in communication based on rankings by doctoral program faculty, non-doctoral granting programs, and evaluation by 45 experts. The following seven programs have traditionally offered a specialization or sequence in organization communication: Purdue, Michigan State, University of Texas at Austin, University of Southern California’s Annenberg School for Communication, Ohio University, University of Utah, and Arizona State University. Other programs offer courses in organizational communication but not a designated sequence or emphasis.

Some small programs like University of Wisconsin LaCrosse are a good example of promoting undergraduate research. They accomplish this with a carefully sequenced set of classes. (1) Students take the communication theory class and write the literature review section of a research proposal, (2) Students take the research methods class and write the methods section for the literature review they wrote in the previous class, and (3) In their senior year, students enroll in a capstone class in which they conduct the research project under supervision of a faculty member in their area of specialization. Admittedly this is a resource intensive approach to education, but it seems to work in LaCrosse and they aren’t any bigger than us.

Schools in a more comparable category to Pepperdine include Baylor, which has a general speech communication major, and Abilene Christian University, one of our Church of Christ sister schools that has a general communication major in which students can select tracks (including an organizational communication track). They do offer a training and development class but no special organizational assessment class.

Pepperdine’s requirements differ those of other program in its emphases on
ethics, service-learning, and required organizational assessment and intervention. Specifically, other programs do not appear to have the kind of service-learning and vocational emphases of our program. Instead, the other programs offered a greater choice of coursework than Pepperdine’s program among a range of classes consistently including the following electives:

**Curriculum and Learning Environment**

The field of organizational communication emerged from an intersection of rhetoric, mass communication, social science, and business when a coalition of academic professors, military, and business professionals came together following World War II. Different from a business paradigm, an organizational communication framework takes a macro view of communication as a constitutive process that creates organizational culture, systems, power and politics, strategies, and persuasion.

External demand for the organizational communication program is perhaps at its strongest level currently. In our information age and technological environment, business and managerial roles are considered to be predominantly communication functions, and communication (oral and written and information processing) is ranked as the most important skills needed in organizations (see DeWine, 2000). In addition, the need to approach the organization through vocation (the meaning of work, especially using a spiritual approach) in order to help rebuild employee trust in the break of confidence of management indiscretion scandals such as Enron is demonstrated in the surge of popular press books dealing with vocation (e.g., Fox, 1994; Gamst, 1995; Guevara, & Ord, 1996; Mahan, 2002; Mitroff, & Denton, 1999; Palmer, 1999).

Findings from the past five years indicate the following:

1. The number of students in the program has dropped by approximately half, coinciding with
   a. the addition of communication sequences of Interpersonal Communication and Rhetoric and Leadership, and prior to that, the creation of the Integrated Marketing and Communication major; and
   b. the elimination of the Organizational Communication outside concentration, which allowed students to take three to four courses in another division such as business, industrial psychology, sociology, nonprofit management, or religion.
2. Alumni and students perceived that major courses other than COM 422 Training and Development, 483 Small Group Communication, and 521 Organizational Communication Analysis lack direct practical application.
3. Understanding of the purposes and uses of Organizational Communication among students in the past two years has increased compared to peers from prior years
(between COM 418 Communication in Organizations and COM 521 Organizational Communication Analysis and COM 518 Advanced Organizational Communication)

a. Students demonstrated more complex understanding of organizations and their major, including understanding of more holistic paradigms (such as systems and cultural views and a critical lens for some) between junior and senior year.

b. Seniors demonstrated identification with fields of human resources, consulting, and nonprofit management.

c. Students have responded positively to the change agent metaphor of the program with increasingly diverse understanding of ways to improve organizations.

d. Seniors’ initial inability to apply different/reframe paradigms to address particular organizational issues abstractly but increased in their ability to apply such thinking to complexities and contradictions in their personal lives.

4. Alumni recognized the integrative and holistic benefit and strategic advantage of knowledge, skills, and abilities of the program for work, civic, and personal life.

5. Students and alumni perceived the program’s examination of vocational calling and ethics to be life enriching.

Teaching organizational communication paradigms as ways of thinking/mental models in COM 418 (Spring 2011) and in COM 518 (Fall 2012) and then reframing among these paradigms in COM 521 (Fall 2012) and COM 422 (Spring 2012) resulted in increased ability to use organizational communication paradigms as a way to understand and analyze organizations for students between junior and senior years. In fact, their ability seemed greater compared to their peers in prior years. Despite this increased ability, however, surveys with seniors revealed that they see these middle range courses as “more theory” rather than developing practical aptitudes useful for work or life.

To help them further connect knowledge and abilities to organizational communication skills, a greater connection is needed to bridge courses within the major; between the major and courses in other disciplines; and between the major and action in the community, life and career skills. Rather than simply apply a new marketing approach to our program, there seems to be a need to extend the integrative learning approach used in the traditional capstone courses of COM 521 Organizational Communication Analysis and COM 422 Training and Development and of COM 483 Small Group Communication throughout the organizational communication program to more fully integrate the change agent mission throughout the program. Specifically, developing an Integrative Learning approach to the program would allow further integration of the change agent metaphor throughout major courses, class exercises, action projects with the community, branding of the program, and connection with interdisciplinary courses.

As stated in *The Heart of Higher Education* by Parker Palmer and Arthur Zajonc (2010), “Integrative learning comes in many varieties: connecting skills and knowledge from
multiple sources and experiences; applying theory to practice in various settings; utilizing diverse and even contradictory points of view; and, understanding issues and positions contextually (p. 8).” It is a philosophy of education that draws on the full range of human capacities for knowing, teaching, and learning and that “attempts to bridge gaps between courses within the major; courses in the major and other courses beyond the major; and curricular and co-curricular activities, including community engagement” (p. 8). It attempts to “bring with it a deep and pervasive engagement with the questions of meaning and purpose” (p. 123). The rationale for integrative learning is to: “Educate our students as whole persons, and they will bring all of who they are to the demands of being human in private and public life. The present and future well-being of humankind asks nothing less of us” (p. 153). (See Figure of integrative learning concept map, Palmer & Zajonc, 2010, p. 9):

Integrative learning involves dialogue in the classroom and in conversations among faculty. Palmer and Zajonc (2010) advocate a dialogue that involves holistic, “third-loop” thinking that draws from quantum physics thinkers such as David Bohm and urges transformation and change. The view of knowledge extends beyond the traditional “socialized mind” approach to education to the “self-authoring mind, in which the individual can internalize divergent points of view and author his or her own independent one” (p. 103). It advocates an experiential approach to education that is mindful and includes a focus on meaning, purpose, values, and spirituality in higher education (p. 115).

COM 521 and COM 422, which have traditionally served as the capstone courses of the sequence, reflect this approach in their use of dialogic methods, analysis from multiple frameworks through paradoxical thinking, examination of meaning and spirituality, and community engagement/service learning research. These courses and COM 483 go beyond a “socialized mind” approach to education to the “self-authoring mind by using self-directed learning teams. Specifically, in COM 483 students learn to examine different ways of knowing through public conversations of various types of questions (of policy, value, and fact) and use semi-autonomous cross-functional work teams, a skill they build on in COM 521 and 422. Because several courses in the major curriculum recently have reflected a use of experiential applications including COM 418 Communication in Organizations and COM 518 Advanced Organizational Communication and COM 519 Communication and Conflict, they naturally fit into the integrative learning approach to various kinds of knowing.

More fully adapting an integrative approach to Organizational Communication would involve renaming the program with a frame such as Dialogue and Change Management. This rebranding would help portray the integrative goal of the major and help frame the sequence in more current language and contemporary interests. More fundamentally however, a more integrative approach to learning, would be reflected in objectives such as the following:
a. Understand and compare theories and research in perspectives, background, and context of organizational communication in relation to other fields of knowledge.

b. Demonstrate analytic and applied abilities and skills in organizational communication to work towards effective organizing processes and appropriate change.

c. Appreciate how different worldviews impact organizational communication and discern among those choices a wise and ethical path in community and society.

Fully adapting an integrative approach to learning to the program also suggests the benefit of the former outside concentration and the necessity to continue and perhaps integrate more community engagement throughout courses. As suggested by students and alumni, further developing the organizational communication internship program and client base for community engagement are ideal next steps for an integrative learning approach to the program.

Drs. Juanie Walker and Dorothy Andreas are well suited to teach such an integrated approach to learning with their training and emphases on meaning construction, dialogue, mental models, reframing, paradoxical thinking, ethics, and Christian worldview/theology of vocation. While their teaching assignments also in the Communication Division core and first year seminar are a benefit to helping themselves and Organizational Communication students stay connect to other courses outside the major and division, these commitments also require them to teach subjects other than Organizational Communication.

Because of her understanding of dialogic and experiential approaches, and professional experience as a researcher and practitioner in paradoxical thinking in organizations and in consulting, visiting professor Kim Stoltzfus is a wonderful asset to the Organizational Communication program. In addition to teaching COM 418 during Spring 2011 and Fall 2012, we hope that she will teach (regularly or in rotation with Dr. Andreas) that course in subsequent years as well as COM 422 Training and Development. While the Communication Division has relied on her teaching core courses in research methods and public speaking, we hope that with the imminent completion and defense of her Ph.D., anticipated this summer, that she’ll be able to contribute more fully to this integrative learning approach throughout the curriculum.
Five Year Program Review (2011-12)

Rhetoric and Leadership Emphasis

Prepared by: Gary S. Selby, Professor of Communication, in conjunction with the following faculty teaching in the Rhetoric and Leadership Program: John Jones, Professor of Communication, Steve Lemley, Associate Professor of Communication, Sarah Stone Watt, Assistant Professor of Communication, and Theresa De Los Santos, Adjunct Instructor of Communication.
Introduction and Overview

The Rhetoric and Leadership Program is one of four possible concentrations within the Communication Major, which is housed in the Communication Division of Seaver College. The program officially began in the fall of 2008 and, since then, has grown to almost 40 majors and minors. The Program has a robust and varied curriculum that combines theoretical and analytical approaches to leadership and persuasive public discourse with a strong emphasis on developing the communication abilities that students will need to take their place as leaders in organizations and society. Additionally, the Program’s faculty includes a group of who are excellent classroom teachers as well as scholars with an impressive record of publication and institutional leadership.

This document reports the result of our Five Year Program Review, divided into the following sections:

- The Program’s History
- Enrollment Trends
- Mission of the Program
- Program Student Learning Outcomes (with Curriculum Matrix and Institutional Student Outcome Alignment Matrix)
- Program Quality Indicators
- Future Goals

The Rhetoric and Leadership Program History

The 2004-2005 Speech Communication Program Review identified two critical goals for the future of the major: (1) the need to revise the curriculum to reflect a more up-to-date major, and (2) the need to develop clearer program goals or learning outcomes. The Review also noted the challenge of attracting more students to the major—a challenge that updating the curriculum will likely help to meet.

After two years of study, the Speech Communication faculty developed a proposal to eliminate the Speech Communication major altogether and replace it with a new sequence within the Communication major titled, “Rhetoric and Leadership,” which would consist of an updated and expanded curriculum more in line with exemplary programs elsewhere in the nation, with the needs and interests of students, and with the mission of Pepperdine University. The original proposal offered the following vision for this new program:

The “Rhetoric and Leadership” program will be intended to provide students the knowledge and communicative competencies that are essential for informed, engaged, democratic citizenship. In recent years, many observers of American society have lamented the decline in civic involvement, as evidenced by dramatic
declines in the number of Americans who vote, pay attention to news and public affairs, attend public meetings, and participate in voluntary or charitable organizations. In response, interest in communication and civic engagement has undergone a dramatic revival among colleges and universities across the US (reflected in such institutions as the Center for Political Communication and Civic Leadership at the University of Maryland, as well as centers for Civic Engagement at the Pennsylvania State University, the University of Richmond, the University of Texas at Brownsville, and Northern Kentucky University, to name a few). The need for such a program at Pepperdine was recently highlighted by the Student Government Association, which unanimously passed a resolution in January of this year to work with the administration in order to develop a leadership minor in the Seaver College of Arts and Sciences. Most importantly, we believe that this program embodies Pepperdine University’s mission of “strengthening lives for purpose, service, and leadership.”

More practically, we believe that developing a “Rhetoric and Leadership” program will

- Bring greater visibility to the Speech Communication curriculum by adding courses that have a wider range of appeal to students,
- Enhance the current curriculum by adding significant “content” courses to a curriculum that is currently weighted toward methods, theory, and “skills” courses;
- Bring our course offerings in line with other peer and “aspiration” schools;
- Provide expanded options for current graduate students, who typically face extremely limited course offerings when seeking to fulfill their concentration requirement (a problem that will become more acute with the increasing popularity of the accelerated masters program), and
- Encourage the development of interdisciplinary bridges with our colleagues in the Humanities division who have a strong interest in rhetorical studies.

The new Rhetoric and Leadership program was officially inaugurated in the fall of 2008. The 2008-2009 Seaver College Academic Catalog describes the program as follows:

The Rhetoric and Leadership sequence explores the dynamics of successful and ethical public leadership—the process through which individuals create visions for the future and communicate those visions to other people, inspiring and mobilizing them to work together to pursue common goals within organizations, communities, and society as a whole. It focuses specifically on the integral role that rhetoric, the use of language to influence the perceptions and actions of other people, plays in the process of leadership.

Because it emphasizes the crucial skills that potential employers look for in a college graduates, such as written and oral communication, leadership ability, and critical
thinking, the Rhetoric and Leadership sequence prepares students for careers in a variety of fields in the public and private sectors, as well as for law school, business school, and graduate school. Students develop practical skills related to professional communication, argumentation, and advocacy, while also developing the theoretical foundations they need to be effective communicators and critical consumers of public discourse and media messages. Classes also focus on the ways that rhetorical processes shape such issues as race and ethnicity, gender, religion, and politics.

In the four years since the Program has come online, we have developed and successfully offered the following courses re-developed from the original Speech Communication major:

- COM 380 Business and Professional Communication
- COM 385 Argumentation and Advocacy
- COM 507 Propaganda, Persuasion and Attitude Change

We have also successfully developed and offered the following new courses that represent our expanded curriculum:

- COM 450 Communication and Leadership
- COM 581 Contemporary Voices of Leadership
- COM 590 Rhetoric, Gender and Society
- COM 590 Rhetoric and Religion

Finally, we have been able to offer a new course taught within the English department, ENG 450 Rhetoric and Race, as a cross-listed COM 590 course for our students.

**Enrollment Trends**

The following tables and graphs report the enrollment trends in the Rhetoric and Leadership Program since its establishment in 2008. They document a steady rise in the number of students who choose to study in this program, beginning with only 4 majors and minors in 2008 to 38 majors and minors in 2011. Because the program is new, the numbers in the “Degrees Awarded” category are necessarily small, although we anticipate that these will increase as the students who are now in their 3rd and 4th year approach graduation.
Table 1: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005—Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>COMRL Majors</th>
<th>COMRL Minors</th>
<th>COMRL Total</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2056 (F05)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062 (Sp06)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066 (F06)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072 (Sp07)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076 (F07)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082 (Sp08)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086 (F08)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2092 (Sp09)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096 (F09)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102 (Sp10)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106 (F10)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112 (Sp11)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116 (F11)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Student Enrollment by Units Earned*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>COMRL Majors</th>
<th>COMRL Minors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Units earned is not necessarily an indication of when students will actually graduate.

Figure 1: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005—Fall 2011
Table 3: Capstone Course Undergraduate Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>COM 587 Rhetorical Theory</th>
<th>COM 588 Rhetorical Criticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Degrees Awarded from Fall 2005—Summer 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>COMRL</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2604</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2074</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>COMR</td>
<td>COM Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Degrees Awarded from Fall 2005—Summer 2011
### Rhetoric and Leadership Major Retention

**Fall 2008 to Fall 2011**

Declared Rhetoric and Leadership Initially: 1

Declared after one or more semesters: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued as an Rhetoric and Leadership major</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major within the Communication Division</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside of Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2009 to Fall 2011

Declared Rhetoric and Leadership Initially: 1

Declared after one or more semesters: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued as an Rhetoric and Leadership major</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major within the Communication Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside of Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2010 to Fall 2011

Declared Rhetoric and Leadership Initially: 4

Declared after one or more semesters: 1
Continued as an Rhetoric and Leadership major | 3
---|---
Changed to a major within the Communication Division | 0
Changed to a major outside of Communication | 1
Left Pepperdine | 0

**Mission of the Rhetoric and Leadership Program**

The Rhetoric and Leadership sequence emphasizes the power of persuasion in society. The program provides students with the tools they need to ethically and effectively communicate visions for the future and mobilize people to achieve common goals within organizations, communities, and society as a whole. By highlighting Christian values as foundational to effective and ethical leadership, the Rhetoric and Leadership Program seeks to fulfill Pepperdine's mission of “strengthening lives for purpose, service, and leadership.”

**Program Learning Outcomes**

Graduates of the Rhetoric and Leadership Program are able to

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the central role that rhetoric plays at all levels of social and cultural life;

2. Identify and explain the major periods, figures, developments, and conceptions of persuasion within the history of Western rhetorical theory;

3. Apply rhetorical theory and criticism to analyze persuasive public messages, particularly messages and develop ethical and effective persuasive presentations for diverse situations; and

4. Identify and explain characteristics and examples of effective ethical rhetorical leadership, including examples that address intersections between rhetoric and Christian faith.

**Rhetoric and Leadership Program Curriculum**
Rhetoric and Leadership Major (Total: 42-44 units)

Communication Core Courses: 12 units

COM 200 Communication Theory
COM 300 Introduction to Communication Research
COM 301 Message Creation and Effects
COM 400 Communication Ethics

Course Requirements:

COM 380 Business and Professional Communication
COM 385 Argumentation and Advocacy
COM 450 Communication and Leadership
COM 587 Rhetorical Theory
COM 588 Principles of Rhetorical Criticism
COM 595 Internship

Choose four courses from the following:

COM 507 Persuasion, Propaganda, and Attitude Change
COM 590 Seminar in Communication: Rhetoric, Gender, and Society
COM 590 Seminar in Communication: Rhetoric and Race
COM 590 Seminar in Communication: Rhetoric and Religion
COM 590 Seminar in Communication* (Special Topics)
COM 581 Contemporary Voices of Leadership
COM 519 Communication and Conflict

[*May be repeated when topics vary]
Rhetoric and Leadership Minor (Total: 22-24 units)

Course Requirements:

COM 200 Communication Theory
COM 301 Message Creation and Effects
COM 450 Communication and Leadership
COM 587 Rhetorical Theory

Choose either:
COM 380 Business and Professional Communication
COM 385 Argumentation and Advocacy

Choose two courses from the following:
COM 507 Persuasion, Propaganda, and Attitude Change
COM 590 Seminar in Communication: Rhetoric, Gender, and Society
COM 590 Seminar in Communication: Rhetoric and Race
COM 590 Seminar in Communication: Rhetoric and Religion
COM 590 Seminar in Communication* (Special Topics)
COM 581 Contemporary Voices of Leadership
COM 519 Communication and Conflict

[*May be repeated when topics vary]
**PLO Curriculum Matrix**

The following table reflects the alignment between our curriculum and our overall Student Learning Outcomes. (I=Introduce, D=Develop, M=Master)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>SLO #1 Demonstrate knowledge of the central role that rhetoric plays at all levels of social and cultural life</th>
<th>SLO #2 Identify and explain the major periods, figures, developments, and conceptions of persuasion within the history of Western rhetorical theory</th>
<th>SLO #3 Apply rhetorical theory and criticism to analyze persuasive public messages, particularly messages and develop ethical and effective persuasive presentations for diverse situations</th>
<th>SLO #4 Identify and explain characteristics and examples of effective ethical rhetorical leadership, including examples that address intersections between rhetoric and Christian faith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 180</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 200</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 301</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 380</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 450</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 507</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 581</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 587</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 588</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 590 (Gender)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 590 (Race)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 590 (Religion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional SLO Alignment Map

The following table demonstrates the alignment between the Rhetoric and Learning Student Learning Outcomes and the overall Student Learning Outcomes of Pepperdine University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Demonstrate knowledge of the central role that rhetoric plays at all levels of social and cultural life</td>
<td>Community and Global Understanding: Develop and enact a personal and professional vision that values diversity</td>
<td>Knowledge and Scholarship: Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Identify and explain the major periods, figures, developments, and conceptions of persuasion within the history of Western rhetorical theory;</td>
<td>Knowledge and Scholarship: Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery</td>
<td>Knowledge and Scholarship: Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Apply rhetorical theory and criticism to analyze persuasive public messages, particularly messages and develop ethical and effective persuasive presentations for diverse situations</td>
<td>Knowledge and Scholarship: Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery</td>
<td>Knowledge and Scholarship: Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Identify and explain characteristics and examples of effective</td>
<td>Faith and Heritage: Respond to the call to serve others</td>
<td>Knowledge and Scholarship: Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Faith and Heritage: Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions to be informed by a value-centered life | Community and Global Understanding: Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Rhetorical Leadership, Including Examples That Address Intersections Between Rhetoric and Christian Faith</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>World Challenges</th>
<th>Act with Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community and Global Understanding</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>Faith and Heritage</strong>: Develop and enact a personal and professional vision that values diversity</td>
<td>Respond to the call to serve others</td>
<td><strong>Faith and Heritage</strong>: Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions to be informed by a value-centered life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Global Understanding</strong>:</td>
<td>Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement</td>
<td><strong>Community and Global Understanding</strong>: Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Quality

Curriculum and Learning Environment

For curriculum benchmarking, we have chosen two programs, one at a peer institution (Calvin College) and one at an aspirational institution (Wake Forest University). Their curricular requirement are listed below:

Calvin College “Strategic Communication,” Rhetoric Track

Program Overview

The ability to communicate effectively is a marketable skill in today's world. The strategic communication program aims to graduate articulate Christians who can critique and create effective messages for specific audiences and situations. Choose a professional communication track or rhetoric track depending on your vocational goals.

• get training and experience in the core rhetorical faculties and skills, then choose a track and specialize your courses
• the professional communication track prepares students for jobs in advertising, public relations, fund raising and events planning
• the rhetoric track trains students for jobs in communication consulting, law, politics, ministry and academia

Overall requirement: 34-38 semester hours

One course from:
• Oral Rhetoric
• Visual Rhetoric

Advanced Oral Rhetoric
American Voices
Argumentation and Advocacy
Theory and Communication

Two courses from:
• Group Communication
• Interpersonal Communication
• Communication and Gender
• American Politics and Mass Media

Persuasion and Propaganda
Rhetorical Criticism

One course from:
• Communication Ethics
• Senior Seminar

Two courses from:
• Communication Arts and Sciences 300-level electives
• Internship in Communication

Wake Forest University, Communication Major, Rhetorical Studies Concentration

Program Overview

Students interested in a concentration in Rhetorical Studies in the Department of Communication will explore in coursework the critical, historical and theoretical study of public discourse. A concentration in Rhetorical Studies involves cultivating an appreciation of how speakers locate and use modes of persuasion in the interests of their communities, constituents, organizations, and institutions. “Rhetoric” is understood as the art of public speech in both theory and practice. Accordingly, the Rhetorical Studies concentration will link theory to practice throughout the curriculum.

Rhetorical practice encompasses such diverse forms of speech as public address, newspaper editorials, organizational handbooks, television programs, music, and film. Thus, a concentration in rhetorical studies explores a range of potential questions regarding the effects of public discourse: How can speech be assessed in terms of communication ethics? How does speech influence public opinion? How does speech manage public controversy? How does speech make space for (or close off) diversity of opinion? How can institutions or organizations alter their public images through public speech? How are cultural values and beliefs about race, class, gender, and religion shaped by public discourse? And what can rhetorical studies teach us about the basic character of our humanity?

Overall Requirement: 30 hours, at least 12 of which must be at the 300-level

Core Requirements:

COM 110 Public Speaking OR COM 102 Debate and Advocacy

COM 220 Empirical Research in Communication

COM 225 Historical/Critical Research in Communication

Choose Five:
COM 117 Writing for PR
COM 270 Special Seminar
COM 282 Debate I
COM 283 Debate II
Comparison of the Rhetoric and Leadership Program with Benchmark Programs

As might be expected, a comparison of the Rhetoric and Leadership Program to these and similar benchmark institutions reveals both similarities and differences. Although the curriculum of our program offers a smaller range of courses, owing to its size and age, it nevertheless follows what might be seen as the "standard" curriculum structure in similar programs, with courses that focus on (1) rhetorical theory, (2) rhetorical analysis and criticism, (3) rhetoric related to particular content areas such as public address, gender, race, and religion, and (4) rhetorical performance.

The program is unique, however, in the way that it strategically positions itself around an explicit professional and organizational leadership model. Whereas other programs tend to see their graduates pursuing a narrow range of professional options (e.g., law, ministry, corporate communication, etc.) the Rhetoric and Leadership Program seeks to provide students with the kinds of transferable knowledge and ability that will allow them to pursue professional opportunities in a variety of different business, organizational, and governmental careers. This goal is reflected in both the development of particular courses (e.g., COM 450 Communication and Leadership, and COM 581 Contemporary Voices of Leadership), as well as in the shaping of our general courses (e.g., the inclusion of a formal public presentation component in other "non-leadership specific" courses).

Faculty Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Terminal</th>
<th>Rank/Tenure</th>
<th>Research/Teachin</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lemley</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Tenure</td>
<td>Rhetoric, Communication Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 180 Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 200 Communication Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 513 Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 519 Communication and Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Professor, Tenure</td>
<td>Rhetorical Criticism; Rhetorical Theory; Presidential Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 180 Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 301 Message Creation and Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 400 Communication Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 518 Contemporary Voices of Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Selby</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Professor, Tenure</td>
<td>Rhetorical Theory and Criticism; Rhetoric and Religion, Rhetoric and Social Movements; Communication and Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 180 Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 450 Communication and Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 507 Persuasion, Propaganda, and Attitude Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 513 Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Name</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sarah Stone Watt  | PhD     | Assistant Professor, Pre-Tenure | COM 587 Rhetorical Theory  
COM 590 Rhetoric and Religion  
COM 630 Qualitative Research Methods |                                            |
| Theresa De Los Santos | PhD     | Adjunct Instructor     | COM 588 Rhetorical Criticism  
COM 512 Media Impact and US Minorities  
COM 513 Interpersonal Communication  
COM 590 Communication and Gender  
COM 630 Qualitative Research Methods |                                            |
| Josh House        | MA      | Adjunct Instructor     | COM 380 Business and Professional Communication                         |                                            |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>When to Assess</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis and Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Embedded exam</td>
<td>COM 587</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

Over the course of the previous two years, Rhetoric and Leadership faculty have undertaken an assessment of our Program Learning Outcomes according to the following schedule:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>questions from COM 450</th>
<th>Student Satisfaction Survey</th>
<th>Report/Program Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Embedded exam questions from COM 587</td>
<td>COM 587 Student Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>Annual Report/Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Student presentations, papers, 380; Final Papers, COM 588</td>
<td>Junior-Senior Survey</td>
<td>Annual Report/Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>COM 450 Personal Leadership Portfolio</td>
<td>Junior-Senior Survey</td>
<td>Dean's Executive Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Learning Outcome Assessment Data**

The results of our Program Learning Outcomes assessments are as follows:

1. **Program Learning Outcome #1: Demonstrate knowledge of the central role that rhetoric and communication play at all levels of social and cultural life.**

   **PLO #1 Direct Data Source**

   Two faculty reviewers rated student answers the following question from the COM 450 Final Exam:

   "This class is based upon the assumption that although effective leadership includes more than communication (e.g., knowledge and expertise about one’s area of business, strategic decision making, etc.), effective communication nevertheless plays a crucial role in good leadership. Below, list and briefly explain five examples from the course of how good leadership is carried out through communication processes."

   Reviewers were asked to rate each student’s answer using the following rubric:

   1. **Excellent**, as indicated by one or more of the following:
      - Student shows outstanding overall grasp of the importance of rhetoric and communication for effective leadership
      - Student can point to several different examples of the importance of rhetoric and communication for effective leadership
      - Student can point to concrete, practical examples of the importance of rhetoric and communication for effective leadership.

   2. **Acceptable** (student demonstrates that he/she grasps the importance of rhetoric and communication for effective leadership, but not as strongly as those in the “excellent” category)
3. **Unacceptable** (student is not able to articulate clearly or concretely importance of rhetoric and communication for effective leadership.)

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviewer Comments:**

Both reviewers noted that the students were almost universally able to demonstrate the central role that rhetoric and communication play in social and cultural life. One reviewer noted that the responses “revealed a very good working knowledge of the terminology and a strong theoretical foundation as well.”

Both noted that the question did not elicit as much depth as it might have (in some cases, the answers were simply lists without detailed explanation). One reviewer suggested that the question ask for students to provide and example that illustrates their responses (as, for example, one student did in commenting that the university president provides symbolic leadership by showing up at a basketball game in order to demonstrate that he cares about students).

**PLO #1 Indirect Data Source One**

One faculty reviewer was asked to review a Course Reflection survey completed by all students in COM 587, one of the Rhetoric and Leadership capstone courses. The survey does not measure this SLO directly but, instead, asks students to talk about what they now understand, what their biggest “AHA” was, how they were challenged to think differently, etc.

The reviewer rated each student’s overall survey using the following rubric:

1. **Strong Evidence**, indicated by one or more of the following:
   - Student seems passionate in his/her articulation of the importance of rhetoric/communication in contemporary social and cultural life;
   - The importance of rhetoric/communication in contemporary social and cultural life is a theme that appears in several of the student’s responses;
   - Student elaborates in some detail or with examples on the importance of rhetoric/communication in contemporary social and cultural life.
2. **Adequate Evidence** (student demonstrates that he/she grasps the importance of rhetoric/communication in contemporary social and cultural life, but not strongly or passionately as those in the "strong evidence" category)

3. **No Evidence** (student does not volunteer evidence that he/she grasps importance of rhetoric/communication in contemporary social and cultural life)

Results:

- Strong Evidence: 6
- Adequate Evidence: 2
- No Evidence: 5

**Reviewer Comments:**

The reviewer noted that the students whose responses rated “no evidence” seemed only to relate their study of rhetoric to their own personal awareness rather than “the central role rhetoric plays at all levels of social and cultural life.” They seemed to be saying that it was more important to themselves than they expected but didn’t see it in a larger context.

This may indicate a need to relate the theory students are learning to the broader social and cultural world; but it may also indicate the fact that the survey itself did not ask students to address this SLO explicitly, and so may simply reflect the need for a more precise assessment tool.

**PLO #1 Indirect Data Source Two**

PLO #1 was assessed using a “Student Satisfaction Survey” which included this question:

Please rate the degree to which you believe that the Rhetoric and Leadership Program is helping you to achieve the following outcomes:

Demonstrate knowledge of the central role that rhetoric plays at all levels of social and cultural life

- Extremely well
- Reasonable well
- Poorly
- Not at all

Results:

Results from senior majors in the Rhetoric and Leadership Program who completed the Student Satisfaction Survey on this question were as follows:

- Extremely well: 7
- Reasonable well: 2
- Poorly: 0
II. Program Learning Outcome #2: Identify and explain the major periods, figures, developments, and conceptions of persuasion within the history of Western rhetorical theory.

**PLO #2 Direct Data Source**

Two faculty reviewers rated student answers the following question from the COM 587 Final Exam:

In this course, we have divided the rhetorical tradition into seven major periods. For this question, do the following:

- List and give the general dates for each of the major periods.
- Describe (in bullet points) the major issues/problems/developments that happen in each period.
- List the major representative figures or “movements” that go with each period.

Reviewers rated each student’s response using the following rubric:

1. **Excellent**, as indicated by one or more of the following:
   - Student shows outstanding overall grasp of the major periods in the history of rhetoric
   - Student can identify important figures within each period and briefly summarize their contributions/ideas
   - Student can identify major issues within each period

2. **Acceptable** (student demonstrates that he/she can identify most of major periods, figures, and issues in the history of rhetoric, although not as strongly as those in the “excellent” category)

3. **Unacceptable** (student is not able to clearly or comprehensively identify major periods, figures, and issues in the history of rhetoric.)

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: 6</td>
<td>Excellent: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable: 6</td>
<td>Acceptable: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable: 1</td>
<td>Unacceptable: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviewer Comments:**

Both reviewers noted that the student were able to identify and explain the major periods, figures,
developments, and conceptions of persuasion within the history of Western rhetorical theory. The unacceptable response identified the major periods and figures but could not explain them. Most of them struggled with dates, and some forgot an important figure, issue, or contribution here or there. But all seemed to have a good understanding of the major periods in the tradition.

One reviewer noted that what seemed to distinguish the excellent responses from the acceptable responses was that the excellent group understood the periods as distinct based on contextual elements that contributed to shifts in ways of understanding rhetoric whereas the acceptable responses tended to rely more heavily on memorizing key thinkers and placing them within time periods. This reviewer also noted the need for students to have a better understanding of postmodernism. Students seemed to more consistently try to explain that period by individual thinker and pick up on random elements of the theorists’ ideas rather than the core element of the period and the theories.

**PLO #2 Indirect Data Source One**

All students in COM 587, one of the Rhetoric and Leadership Capstone Courses, complete a Course Reflection Survey at the end of the course that asks students to discuss how confident they feel in their ability to identify and explain the major periods, figures, developments, and conceptions of persuasion within the history of Western rhetorical theory.

One faculty reviewer rated each student’s response to this question using the following rubric, based on the student’s reported levels of confidence overall survey using the following rubric, based on the reviewer’s judgment about the level of evidence each student’s overall survey offers that the student has mastered SLO #1:

1. **Very Confident** (Student expresses unreserved and/or enthusiastic confidence in his/her ability to fulfill this SLO.)
2. **Somewhat Confident** (Student indicates confidence in his/her ability to fulfill this SLO, but with strong reservations.)
3. **Not Confident** (Student indicates little or no confidence in his/her ability to fulfill this SLO.)

**Results:**

Very Confident: 5
Somewhat Confident: 8
Not Confident: 0

**Reviewer Comments:**
The reviewer noted that on the whole, students saw themselves as confident in their ability to “explain the major periods, figures, developments, and conceptions of persuasion within the history of Western rhetorical theory.”

**PLO #2 Indirect Data Source Two**

PLO #2 was assessed using a “Student Satisfaction Survey” which included this question:

> Please rate the degree to which you believe that the Rhetoric and Leadership Program is helping you to achieve the following outcomes:

Identify and explain the major periods, figures, developments, and conceptions of persuasion within the history of Western rhetorical theory

- Extremely well
- Reasonable well
- Poorly
- Not at all

**Results:**

Results from senior majors in the Rhetoric and Leadership Program who completed the Student Satisfaction Survey on this question were as follows:

- Extremely well: 7
- Reasonable well: 2
- Poorly: 0
- Not at all: 0

**III. Program Learning Outcome #3: Apply rhetorical theory and criticism to analyze persuasive public messages, particularly messages and develop ethical and effective persuasive presentations for diverse situations.**

**PLO #3 Direct Data Source One**

One faculty reviewer and the course instructor rated student capstone research papers from the COM 588 Rhetorical Criticism Class, described in the course syllabus as follows:

**Papers** This class will focus on the development of a presentation or publication quality paper. To accomplish this, assignments center around a progressive paper—meaning, through the revision process you will edit your papers so that they contribute to one another and will eventually come together to serve as the foundation for the final paper. You will need to learn an appropriate academic citation format, APA or MLA, and will be expected to revise your work throughout the course of the semester. While the extensive peer review process in this class will help you make revisions, you are expected to proofread your own work and turn in the best draft possible at each due date. Each paper has a PAGE LIMIT which excludes your bibliography and will be rigorously enforced. You should work on making your writing clear and concise. A properly formatted bibliography must accompany each paper.
All papers should be submitted on Sakai before the class session in which they are due. You should also bring a hard copy to class for peer review. At the end of the semester you will turn in a binder with copies of every paper and peer review from the entire semester.

**Text Selection** (50) I suggest that you find a 5-10 page speech text or other public persuasive document. Although rhetorical techniques can be used on visual texts, texts that combine the visual and verbal, movies, advertisements, and longer written texts, I encourage you to find a short speech as that is the type of text this class will best prepare you to analyze. For beginning critics, it is best if you select a primarily verbal text. **Bring enough clean copies of your text so that all members of the class can each have our own copy. Due Jan. 27.**

Compose a five-page justification for studying the text you have chosen. Keep in mind that this paper will be revised to serve as the introduction for the final essay, as well as each of the essays to follow. The point of this paper is to offer an argument that convinces the reader your text is worthy of study. The paper should include:

- an introduction that situates the text within a larger historical context. This will require historical research and appropriate source citations.
- background on when, where, and to whom, this text was delivered. This will require historical research and appropriate source citations.
- a description of the rhetor. This will require historical research and appropriate source citations.
- a description of the text. You should provide a 1-2 paragraph summary of the text that identifies the main thesis, outlines the structure, and highlights substantive and stylistic elements.
- a review of relevant scholarly literature on the text. This will require research in the scholarly (peer reviewed) literature and appropriate source citations.
- an explanation of why the text is rhetorically interesting. This can be a combination of your assessment of the text along with commentary from other scholarly work that pertains to the text.
- a preview paragraph that outlines your research questions. This will transform into your thesis paragraph.

**Descriptive Analysis of the Text** (100) Compose an eight page descriptive analysis of your text using the methods outlined in Campbell & Burkholder and chapter five of the textbook. This paper expands on the short description provided in sub points b, c, and d, from the first paper. Questions that may be helpful in guiding your analysis are available under “paper resources” on Sakai—these are not meant to serve as an outline for the paper! This paper should provide a detailed description of the text's distinctive rhetorical choices, and whether they were fitting given the situation in which the text was delivered. This essay should make sense of the text in context. **Due Feb. 14.**

**Classical Interpretation** (120) in this twelve page paper you will focus on explaining the argument presented in the text and the audience reaction to the text. The paper also should identify the genre of the text and highlight any particularly noteworthy tropes. This paper develops sub points d & e from the first paper. Your paper ought to contain additional research regarding the way that people have responded to the text, both in the popular and scholarly press. You should also use the concepts presented in chapters 9 & 10 of the textbook. **Due March 7.**
**Dramatistic or Sociopolitical Interpretation** (130) Conduct a fifteen page criticism of your text using one of the interpretive models in chapters 11-16 of the textbook. This paper gives you a chance to expand upon sub point g from the first paper. This paper should focus on the more subtle ways in which rhetoric operates to persuade. It should speak to the broad ways in which all discourse participates in an ongoing social conversation, and is not an isolated event. **Due March 28.**

**Final Paper—Text Evaluation** (250) Using the work done in earlier papers, write a twenty page holistic evaluation of your text. The final paper should include additional research and may include additional arguments. If you have not yet used concepts from chapters 14-16, you may find them useful in providing an evaluation of the text. This paper should make an argument about how to read the text. What is rhetorically significant about the text? This paper draws on your previous work but should NOT be a patchwork of earlier papers. You should only use the parts of those papers that are relevant to your final analysis and make sense together. **Due at 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 27.** On this day you will also submit a binder with all of the papers and peer review documents from the semester.

The papers were rated using the following three-level rubric:

1. **Excellent**, as indicated by one or more of the following:
   - Student offers an exceptionally strong and insightful claim about the persuasive function or purpose of the discourse being analyzed;
   - Student provides remarkably convincing evidence for his or her claim about the discourse

2. **Acceptable**:
   - Student offers a basic claim about the persuasive function or purpose of the discourse being analyzed;
   - Student provides some evidence for his or her claim about the discourse

3. **Unacceptable**:
   - Student is not able to offer a basic claim about the persuasive function or purpose of the discourse being analyzed;
   - Student provides little or no evidence for his or her claim about the discourse

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Instructor</th>
<th>Faculty Reviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: 5</td>
<td>Excellent: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable: 4</td>
<td>Acceptable: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable: 0</td>
<td>Unacceptable: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reviewer Comments:

It seems clear that all of the students have at least a good basic understanding of a critical method for analyzing rhetoric. The majority proved themselves quite skilled at choosing the right method for their particular piece of rhetoric, justifying their choice of texts and critical methods, and conducting the analysis of the text. The papers were citation rich and claims were supported by evidence—in several cases, strong evidence.

PLO #3 Direct Data Source Two

One faculty reviewer and the course instructor rated student oral presentations from the COM 380 Business and Professional Communication Class, described in the course syllabus as follows:

The goal of this assignment is to help you develop the skills necessary to prepare and deliver a compelling argument for the support of a specific organizational change. To reach this goal, you are asked to structure a presentation that advocates a particular change in the organizational setting described in a case study that you identify. You will use the Problem-Solution-Action pattern to:

- Gain the audience’s attention
- Convince the audience of the need for change
- Present a proposed change
- Ask the audience to support the change

You will need to give us enough information that we understand what is currently happening for the organization, what change you are proposing and the benefits associated with the change. However, your speech should be given as if you were talking to people who are in the organization. Don’t start out by saying “Here is the situation.” You need to weave the details into your speech naturally.

The faculty reviewer rated the presentations using the following three-level rubric:

1. Excellent, as indicated by one or more of the following:
   - Student presentation has exceptionally strong content, a convincing claim and argument/evidence, and compelling language;
   - Student demonstrates outstanding public speaking mechanics—excellent organization, clear main points, smooth transitions, outstanding voice quality, gestures and eye contact, etc.
   - A truly persuasive presentation!

2. Acceptable:
   - Student presentation has acceptable content, claim and argument/evidence, and language;
   - Student demonstrates acceptable public speaking mechanics—good organization, main points, transitions, good voice quality, gestures and eye contact, etc.
   - An effective presentation!

3. Unacceptable:
   - Student presentation has major problems in the area of content, claim, or language
   - Student demonstrates major problems in the area of speaking mechanics.
The course instructor rated as “Excellent” scores of 88% or higher, as “Acceptable” scores in the 70-87% range and “Unacceptable” scores in the 69% range and below.

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Instructor</th>
<th>Faculty Reviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: 12</td>
<td>Excellent: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable: 6</td>
<td>Acceptable: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable: 0</td>
<td>Unacceptable: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviewer Comments:**

I do not think that this assignment adequately assesses the first portion of this program learning outcome. Perhaps the use of theory and criticism for analysis of messages ought to be evaluated separately from the ability to develop ethical and effective presentations. Alternatively, in the future, it might be better to use presentations from COM 587 and 588 to assess this combined learning outcome.

While I do not think this assignment is appropriate for evaluating their use of theory and criticism, I do think that it gives us insight into the students’ ability to craft ethical and effective persuasive presentations. All of the students performed at an acceptable level or higher on this task. However, the individual presentations reveal diverse approaches, strengths, and weaknesses.

All of the students appeared ethical in their presentations. They provided warrants to their arguments and, for the most part, cited the sources that they drew information from. However, in some cases, the information they provided was questionable in its credibility and appropriateness, revealing that while students know how to ethically present the information, they may not be as good at considering its effect. For example, one presenter shaped his criticism and recommendation regarding a particular GE class around a claim in GQ Magazine that the university as a whole is “douchey.” Not only is the reference inappropriate for this type of presentation, it bears no relevance to the subject of the presentation, and yet features prominently throughout the presentation.

Additionally, students varied in their presentation skills. The students that I rated excellent offered excellent research in a compelling style, making the presentation truly persuasive. The majority of students had excellent research, but lacked persuasive presentation skills. Still others had excellent presentation skills, but their research was inconsequential. Many were monotone, used “um” often, and relied heavily on ineffective PowerPoint presentations, often looking at the screen to read the presentation rather than talking to the audience. While we should recognize that some students will always struggle with presentations, and having all of them perform at an acceptable level or higher is an accomplishment, the fact that the majority of them are not as polished as we might hope indicates that we could be doing more. The presentations in this report appear to demonstrate that we may be
relying too heavily on students to develop and refine their own presentations skills, rather than offering them a more formal chance to practice in the classroom before presentation day. It is my recommendation that all courses in the Rhetoric and Leadership sequence require some opportunity for students to hone their persuasive presentation skills. Additionally, in COM 380, I would like to see more emphasis placed on the use of visual aids within a presentation.

Overall, I think that these presentations demonstrate that our students understand how to give a persuasive presentation. However, I would like to see their skills be more refined. Perhaps we could compare their progress in COM 380 to their progress in COM 587 or 588, which are ideally taken a year later.

**PLO #3 Indirect Data Source**

PLO #3 was assessed using a “Student Satisfaction Survey” which included this question:

Please rate the degree to which you believe that the Rhetoric and Leadership Program is helping you to achieve the following outcomes:

- Apply rhetorical theory and criticism to analyze persuasive public messages, particularly messages and develop ethical and effective persuasive presentations for diverse situations
  - Extremely well
  - Reasonable well
  - Poorly
  - Not at all

**Results:**

Results from senior majors in the Rhetoric and Leadership Program who completed the Student Satisfaction Survey on this question were as follows:

- Extremely well: 5
- Reasonable well: 4
- Poorly: 0
- Not at all: 0

**IV. Program Learning Outcome #4: Identify and explain characteristics and examples of effective ethical rhetorical leadership, including examples that address intersections between rhetoric and Christian faith.**

**PLO #4 Direct Data Source**

One faculty reviewer and the course instructor rated student "Leadership Portfolios” from the COM 450 Communication and Leadership Course. The Leadership Portfolio is described in the course syllabus as follows:
At the end of the course, you will complete a “Personal Leadership Portfolio” that analyzes and evaluates your own leadership, building on the material throughout the course. This portfolio will include four sections:

- A statement of your philosophy of leadership
- A description of the particular organizations or projects in which you have served as a leader, noting the specific contributions you have made to these organizations or projects
- A discussion of your predominant leadership style, as well as your strengths and weaknesses as a leader
- A plan for leadership further growth and development as a leader, noting the particular areas where you need to grow and identifying concrete strategies that you will use to develop in those areas.

Your Personal Leadership Portfolio is one of the capstone projects of the entire course, one that you should be developing throughout the course. The final portfolio will be between 10 and 12 pages, and will represent your absolutely best, most professional work.

The faculty reviewer used the following three-level rubric:

1. **Excellent**, as indicated by one or more of the following:
   - Student demonstrates an impressive grasp of leadership theory
   - Student is able to use leadership theory to offer exceptional and compelling insights about personal leadership
   - Student shows a remarkable commitment to approaching leadership out of an ethical and/or Christian perspective

2. **Acceptable**:
   - Student demonstrates an acceptable grasp of leadership theory
   - Student is able to use leadership theory to offer some insights about personal leadership
   - Student shows a basic commitment to approaching leadership out of an ethical and/or Christian perspective

3. **Unacceptable**:
   - Student shows very little grasp of leadership theory
   - Student is not able to use leadership theory to offer insights about personal leadership
   - Student shows little or no commitment to approaching leadership out of an ethical and/or Christian perspective

The course instructor rated as “Excellent” scores of 88% or higher, as “Acceptable” scores in the 70-87% range and “Unacceptable” scores in the 69% range and below.

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Instructor</th>
<th>Faculty Reviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: 15</td>
<td>Excellent: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable: 1</td>
<td>Acceptable: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unacceptable: 1

The faculty reviewer made this comment: Students seem to have a thorough grasp of the theories of leadership as discussed in class. Moreover, they have overall proven themselves quite capable of applying these theories to their own personal leadership philosophy. What is most encouraging, however, is the number of students who have integrated their faith, values and ethics into their personal approach to leadership. It appears that this class not only has a deep understanding of the qualities of good leadership, but also a solid moral, spiritual and ethical foundation.

**PLO #4 Indirect Data Source**

PLO #4 was assessed using a “Student Satisfaction Survey” which included this question:

Please rate the degree to which you believe that the Rhetoric and Leadership Program is helping you to achieve the following outcomes:

Identify and explain characteristics and examples of effective ethical rhetorical leadership, including examples that address intersections between rhetoric and Christian faith

- Extremely well
- Reasonable well
- Poorly
- Not at all

**Results:**

Results from senior majors in the Rhetoric and Leadership Program who completed the Student Satisfaction Survey on this question were as follows:

- Extremely well: 6
- Reasonable well: 2
- Poorly: 1
- Not at all: 0

**Student Satisfaction Survey Data**

In addition to assessing specific learning outcomes, we also conducted a survey of current Rhetoric and Leadership Program students in order to assess general perceptions of the strength of the Program. All 39 majors and minors in the program were invited to participate and 19, or 48.7%, responded. In addition to demographic data (year at Pepperdine and which “core courses” in the Rhetoric and Leadership Program students had taken) and questions regarding the specific Program Learning Outcomes, the survey asked a number of questions regarding student satisfaction. The results are as follows:

1. How satisfied are you overall with the quality of the classes that you have taken in the Rhetoric and Leadership Program?
   - Very satisfied: 16
   - Somewhat satisfied: 3
   - Neither satisfied or unsatisfied: 0
Not satisfied: 0

Comments:

- I still kind of lost within the minor. Maybe an intro class into what the major/minor is about or will be particularly focusing on would be helpful.
- I haven't taken any classes in my major yet.
- These classes have been THE most practical and applicable to real life, and also the ones I have grown the most in, personally and academically.
- I have yet to take anything but Com 180 and Com 200.
- AMAZING PROFESORS and valuable material.

2. What particular skills and knowledge do you believe you are gaining from the Rhetoric and Leadership Program?

- Better public speaking skills.
- I am gaining a better command of writing and understanding the art of rhetoric in the public arena. I understand how arguments work and are successfully and ethically developed.
- The ability to understand a situation and respond to that situation with an effective message.
- Written and verbal communication, empathy, an ability to critically analyze messages, people, and conflicts, ability to ethically and creatively solve problems.
- I am learning how people communicate and how to lead with sound mechanics.
- I now have the repertoire of several theoretical leadership frameworks that help me lead in the professional world. I also understand theories of persuasion and their practical applications that allow me to both create and critically consume persuasive messages.
- An understanding of strategies on how to be an effective speaker.
- Obviously, I am gaining public speaking skills from the Rhetoric and Leadership program, but I am gaining much more than that. I am gaining a knowledge of how to communicate, which goes far beyond public speaking. I am preparing myself to communicate with the "real world." It is preparing me for any and every vocation that I may have. It is giving me knowledge of how to categorize and assess communication. It is giving me knowledge of the development of communication throughout history. It is letting me more fully realize the power and importance of words and the way they are said.
- how to be effective in my persuasion without being manipulative. also how to not be manipulated by harmful persuasion.
- persuasion.
- Public speaking skills, presentation skills for both informal and professional settings, as well as the skills to examine messages critically.
- So far I have only taken basic GE courses and pre-reqs for the core classes of the Rhetoric and Leadership program. I have so far gained the knowledge of the importance rhetoric plays in society, and skills such as overcoming communication anxiety and speech writing.
- To think critically regarding public messages, and a history of the rhetorical tradition.
- Ability to become a rhetorical critic as well as the foundations of rhetorical theory.
Critical Thinking skills
The importance of using rhetoric ethically 2. How to discern, understand, and create messages effectively 3. How to present to an audience professionally and effectively 4. Honing clear writing skills 5. How to be a better communicator in all areas of life and everyday situations

3. How well do you believe that the Rhetoric and Leadership Program is preparing you to be successful in your career after you leave Pepperdine?
   - Extremely well: 10
   - Reasonable well: 9
   - Poorly: 0
   - Not at all: 0

4. What do you think are the key strengths of the Rhetoric and Leadership Program?
   - Great Professors and staff
   - The professors are absolutely outstanding and the skills learned are extremely important for the future.
   - The program prepares us to communicate in a variety of different situations.
   - I enjoy the breadth and range of classes that look at research methods to intercultural communication it is nice for someone like me who loves con but doesn't want to be pinned down into one field of study
   - The strengths are the ability to speak well as well as holding oneself well that will certainly translate into nearly any career that I choose to pursue.
   - It is very practical as well as philosophical so it encourages introspection and deep thinking as well critical and creative thinking that apply directly to the business world. It is also reading and writing intensive which is invaluable.
   - That we don't just learn how to speak well we analyze those in the past.
   - The professors I have had for this minor are a huge part of the program as they offer not only a curriculum but their own personal insight, advice, teaching methods, etc. The real-life application of what is learned in the Rhetoric and Leadership program is a huge strength. The wide range of uses for everything learned in the program is also a huge strength.
   - Strong focus on history of rhetoric and the emphasis on developing your own voice.
   - It is perfect
   - How to communicate effectively and appropriately, and most importantly- ethically.
   - I think the key strengths are that it is an in-depth look at rhetoric and formulating leadership and communication skills.
   - Small class sizes and an excellent faculty.
   - It's uniqueness as well as the almost ambiguous rationality of using leadership to umbrella the whole concept.
   - Equipping students with the skills to investigate and interpret
• Brilliant and caring professors 2. Wonderful classmates 2. Ethical teachings 3. Small class sizes (discussions are invaluable) 3. Insights of ancient and contemporary rhetoricians and philosophers 4. Hands-on presentations 5. Practical application of theory to real life

Experience

5. What subjects are skill areas do you believe are not being adequately covered in the Rhetoric and Leadership Program?

• No

• The program could emphasize more public speaking, such as more speeches and presentations.

• I think as a senior maybe some aspects of how to tackle the next step would be nice

• To put more of an emphasis on practicing leadership and having part of the requirement to have students hold leadership positions within our university.

• Not to my knowledge.

• Not to my knowledge I feel I each class I learn something new.

• No

• could put a little more emphasis on public speaking

• no

• How to transfer the skills you learn as a R+L major in to a career path. I hear it sets you up for a broad path, but I would like to learn about some specific jobs for post-undergrad

• No. I am not exactly fully sure what skill areas are suppose to be addressed yet.

• I would like to know more about how I can apply the skills I am learning to a future career.

• Definitely. A majority of the classes only render at most 2 opportunities to present a speech that help actualize the motive behind the major.

• Practical, daily application

• No. Excellent program and major. Not just saying that to say it! It really is.

6. What recommendations do you have for making the Rhetoric and Leadership Program more effective?

• Just more organization and communication between the division and professors with students in the major/minor.

• None - fantastic program - a great mix of theory and practical knowledge. Meeting on campus leaders and thinking critically about how we might construct arguments in an ethical and effective way are fantastic parts of this program

• The program is great. One of the best decisions of my life to add this minor.

• I recommend having Rhetoric and Leadership students Teacher Assistant's for COM 180 so as to put forth practice and mentor the future of the university.

• It would be cool if rhetoric and leadership majors were placed in small groups of other R and L majors an minors upon entering the major and the program could host breakfasts monthly for these small groups to meet and discuss their classes and it would also give these elite students a chance to make friends and know their small community a little better.
Overall Program Quality and Future Goals

Although it has been existence for three years, the Rhetoric and Leadership Program has generated a great deal of interest from students, with enrollment expanding dramatically to almost forty majors and minors in less than three years. Additionally, we have developed a well-balanced curriculum that helps students build a strong foundation in the traditional core elements of study in rhetoric, rhetorical theory and rhetorical criticism, that introduces them to the role that rhetoric plays in a wide range of social and political arenas, and the enables them to develop their skills in the areas of public speaking, argumentation, and leadership.

One particular strength of the Program is its explicit focus on leadership. Although Pepperdine as a whole emphasizes “purpose, service, and leadership” as its goal, we are one of the only programs explicitly devoted to the academic study of leadership. From student comments, this focus is attracted many of our students to the Program in the first place, and it has been a principal source of satisfaction with their experience as Rhetoric and Leadership majors.

In terms of enrollment, we are at the highest level in at least a decade, with 28 majors and 11 minors. Enrollment strength is also evidences in the population of individual courses. As an example, whereas just 6 years ago one of our capstone courses, COM 587, was in danger of being cancelled because of under enrollment, last fall it was oversubscribed by 5 students, with 17 undergraduate students and 3 graduate students for a total of 20. Additionally, our new courses continue to do well. Last fall's COM 450 Communication and Leadership course, taught for only the third time, had an enrollment of 17 students and the previous year’s enrollment was 18. This fall, we are offering our new "Rhetoric and Religion" course for the first time, with an enrollment of 18 students. As these figures indicate, both the major as a whole and the particular courses we offer are in high demand.

Analysis of student performance offers strong evidence that our students are achieving the Program Learning Outcomes, and that direct evidence is supported by students’ own perceptions of what they are learning. More generally, the Student Satisfaction Survey indicated that students are enthusiastic about the quality of the education that they are receiving, with 16/19 rating themselves as “very satisfied” and 3/19 as “somewhat satisfied.” They also believe that the major is preparing them for future career success (10/19 “extremely well” and 9/19 “reasonably well”).

Their comments highlighted several particular areas of strength:

- “Real world” applicability, especially in the areas of public communication and leadership
- An excellent faculty
- The enhancement of critical thinking
- A strong emphasis on ethical communication and leadership

Although it will be important to follow the progress of our current students as they graduate and go out into their professional lives, at this point they are enthusiastic about the educational “product” that they are receiving.

At the same time, our program review has revealed areas of growth and enhancement for the
future. These are as follows:

1. Continue to develop our curriculum in a way that fits the demand for course and the availability of faculty. To that end, we plan to offer a new course in the fall, COM 590 Rhetoric and Political Campaigns.

2. Transition of new course from the “COM 590 Special Topics” designation to permanent courses in the Seaver College Catalog.

3. Reexamine and possibly refine PLO #3. As it is currently framed, the PLO includes two separate but related elements of our discipline, rhetorical performance and rhetorical criticism. This dual focus may be confusing to students and is certainly difficult to assess.

4. Enhance the career/professional focus of the Program. Although this is currently one of the strengths of the Program, students clearly hope for an even greater professional focus. One possible enhancement in this area would be to do a better job of integrating the internship component of the major with the theoretical/academic dimension of the curriculum. A second would be to incorporate more formal public speaking opportunities into the courses that traditionally considered “non-performance” classes.

5. Establish a more intentional recruiting mechanism for the major. Although our current enrollment is strong, the majority of our current students have senior status (in terms of total units) and will graduate within the next two years. Unless they are replaced with an ongoing stream of potential students, the Program could easily lose its momentum toward being an academic unit that is both excellent and sustainable. One option for addressing this issue would be to develop a relationship with outstanding potential candidates for the Program from the current COM 180 Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis course, which is required of most students at Seaver College.
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Overview of Graduate Programs

History of Programs
In 1952, a "Master of Arts in Speech or Drama" was first offered at George Pepperdine College. Although this program had an exemplary term of service and produced many noteworthy alumni, the strategic plan during the late 1960s (anticipating the move from the Los Angeles to the Malibu campus) was to deliver only undergraduate education programs within the newly reorganized Seaver College of Arts and Sciences. The original M.A. in Speech or Drama was in essence "left behind" on the Los Angeles campus.

In a very short time after the move to the Malibu campus, student demand for graduate course work and master's level degree programs emerged. The MA in communication at Pepperdine University was reinvented in 1972-1974 on the Malibu campus. One driving force was the demand for an MA "service program" for law enforcement professionals. Dr. Morris Womack led the way for the initiation of the program with a government grant. However, the significant development of the MA program in communication came in 1985. Dr. Dwayne Van Rheenen revised the MA program into a more traditional graduate program and developed a theoretical and research-based curriculum, with a focus on preparation of students to transition from the BA to doctoral-level academic work. For the next two decades the students in the program moved on to advanced graduate-level programs in communication, law, education, and several other disciplines.

In the late 1990s, some of the students and faculty members in the graduate program began to shift their focus within the program toward more of a terminal degree with an emphasis on applied theory and research rather than preparation for doctoral work in communication studies. In 2001, Dr. David Lowry led a renewal effort that extended the program with the terminal MS degree while strengthening the traditional MA curriculum. Dr. Rodney Reynolds led the graduate program from 2004 to 2007, followed by Dr. Gary Selby from 2008 to fall 2011. Dr. Denise Ferguson, returning to Pepperdine in fall 2012, is now chair of the graduate programs in communication.

Support for University Mission, Curricular Diversity, and Pedagogy
Pepperdine University is distinctive because of our Christian heritage, in which there is a clear call to students to both service and academic excellence. Similarly, the graduate programs in communication at Pepperdine University are distinctive because they are two of the few Christ-centered communication graduate programs in the Southwest USA.

The MA and MS degrees in communication support the Christian mission of Seaver College and Pepperdine University in a number of ways. Effective and appropriate communication is central to living a Christian life. It is impressive the way that faculty members in communication can freely cite specific Bible verses that justify the study of communication. Fulfilling the Great Commission (Matthew 28:19-20) requires effective
and appropriate communication.

Communication is both one of the classic seven liberal arts and a core professional discipline precisely because of the importance of communication in the pursuit of purpose driven servant leadership (Mission Statement), and in the task of directing our "plurality of voices" into coherent "ongoing conversations" about our "common goals and aspirations" (Vision Statement). Creating change is in many ways a communication process. The graduate program in communication is an essential scholarly complement to the undergraduate programs in communication. Having a graduate program aids the communication division in the achievement of distinction and fidelity precisely by pointing the way to the highest standards of academic excellence.

**Programs Mission and Guiding Principles**

The graduate programs in communication at Pepperdine University have accomplished a great deal over the past 50 years. Take a look around campus and in the various church ministries connected to Pepperdine University and you will find current or former Communication Division graduate students in many of those offices. On Sunday morning you can find alumni, current students, faculty and former faculty of the program teaching bible classes, serving the church community, and preaching sermons. You can find alumni and former faculty from our graduate programs teaching in Christian colleges and universities all around the country. You can also find alumni sowing seeds of faith and service in many public universities and colleges. Five current faculty in the Communication Division received M.A. degrees in Communication from Pepperdine. In more ways than can be recounted here, the graduate programs in communication are answering the challenges laid out by George Pepperdine at the founding of the university.

The MA and MS degrees in communication serve an essential transition role. While we hold our own as accomplished graduate programs, many of our students and faculty come to us because they seek otherwise unavailable opportunities to make a change in their lives and in the lives of others. A significant number of our graduate students see our program as fulfillment of their desire from their undergraduate days to come and join the Pepperdine community. Some decide late in their undergraduate programs that they are genuinely interested in the rigors of advanced study, or even an academic career. Others want to shift from a vision of personal accomplishment to one of ethics, service, and ministry. The program also serves to transition our faculty and potential new faculty to focus more on advanced scholarship and research productivity. A significant number of our faculty report that the graduate program was a significant factor in their decision to come to Pepperdine University.

The program, moreover, brings many benefits to the Communication division and the University. The success of our program and the accomplishments of our graduates certainly add to the positive reputation that Pepperdine enjoys in the academic world. For the past few years, two to three of our graduate students have presented competitive research papers or served as panel members at prestigious conferences such as those of the National Communication Association. Having graduate students working among us
enhances the level of scholarship and research within our division, both through their participation in content courses alongside undergraduates, as well as through the ways that they challenge us as faculty as we guide them in their own research. Indeed, because of the growing number of MA students that we are attracting through our Accelerated MA program, we have begun systematically inviting colleagues from elsewhere in Seaver College to serve on MA thesis committees, a development that will engage others from the College in the cutting-edge research that our graduate students are doing. Finally, our graduate students play an integral role in the daily work of our division by assisting with or overseeing co-curricular programs (e.g., Speech Lab, The Graphic student newspaper, video production labs, and student-run television programs), serving as grading and research assistants, and traveling with our Debate and Forensic teams as coaches and chaperones.

**Degree Requirements**

Master of Arts. The Master of Arts in Communication is designed for graduate students desiring advanced academic training in further preparation for communication careers in higher education and for professionals seeking career enlargement and wider perspectives. The course work sequence provides a solid foundation in communication theory, research methods, and ethics. In addition, students are required to select a concentration in consultation with an advisor. The MA degree in communication requires a minimum of 31 units, consisting of four core courses, three carefully selected courses (three or four units each) appropriate to the student’s concentration, and a 6-unit thesis.

Accelerated Master of Arts. The Accelerated Master of Arts in Communication is designed so that a current Pepperdine communication student can complete both a bachelor of arts degree and a master of arts degree in communication in five years. It is designed for exceptional undergraduate students who have demonstrated a commitment to academic excellence and who know in their junior year that they wish to pursue a master’s degree.

Master of Science. The Master of Science in Communication provides students with additional advanced study in the field of communication to help prepare them for communication careers in business, industry, media, or education. It is also appropriate for professionals seeking career enlargement and wider perspectives. A course work sequence provides a solid foundation in communication theory, research methods, and ethics. In addition, students are required to select two areas of concentration in consultation with an advisor.

The following are the four core courses are required of all students:

- COM 610 Proseminar and Communication Theory........................ (4)
- COM 620 Quantitative Communication Research Methods............. (4)
- COM 630 Qualitative Communication Research Methods.............. (4)
- COM 640 Communication Ethics and Values................................ (4)

The existing concentrations within the communication MA and MS programs are intercultural communication, organizational communication, persuasion and social change, and mediated & mass communication. There are a number of initiatives in development for the future of the graduate program in communication, including the
launching of the MA in Media Production in fall 2012 (see proposal in Appendix).

New MA in Media Production. A new 32-unit Master of Arts (MA) in Media Production, proposed and approved by Seaver and University Academic Councils for launch in fall 2012, complements the existing MA and MS degrees in the Communication Division. The MA in Media Production will provide students with additional theoretical and ethical foundations and a professional quality exposure to a variety of different ways to tell stories meant to entertain, inform, persuade and educate. The program stresses storytelling across a variety of media platforms—film, television, the Internet, and handheld devices—and is intended for students considering careers in production, directing, and post-production.

The MA in Media Production was developed in response to demand from current graduate students and from students seeking admission to the program. According to Judith Tapper, graduate admissions coordinator for the Communication Division, nearly half of the prospective graduate students who have contacted her expected that our MA program in communication would allow them to take the many production and strategic communication classes now offered through our undergraduate program, and expressed interest in that kind of focused master’s degree. The proposal for the new MA in Media Production was developed in response to a December 2010 U.S. News and World Report listing of the 50 Best Careers for the next decade. Public relations specialists, film and video editors, and multimedia artists are presented as some of the professions that will experience “strong growth over the next decade.”

We believe our strongest competitive advantage is that there is not a quality Christian university in the United States offering a graduate degree blending theory, research and practice in the production of stories that can be told across all platforms. (Only Regent University in Virginia stresses Christian mission in its MFA programs, as the program provides a course in leadership issues in media, redemptive cinema, and producing for the 21st century.)

No Seaver College peer institution offers an MA or an MFA in a media-related area. Among aspirational schools, Notre Dame offers an MFA in Creative Writing, Baylor offers an MFA in Theatre Directing, and Wake Forest offers an MFA in Documentary Filmmaking. Carleton College does not offer graduate programs. Dozens of other schools offer traditional MFA programs in film and television.

Several Southern California universities offer MFA programs in film and television production and direction (Loyola, Chapman, USC, Cal State L.A., and Cal Arts). A few offer programs in Animation and Digital Arts (USC and Cal Arts) and Interactive Entertainment (USC). Biola University and California Lutheran University do not offer a Masters Degree in Media; Azusa Pacific offers an MFA in Visual Arts. Several local California State university campuses offer graduate degrees in communication, but none are focused on media production.

Two local schools provide substantial programs that initially appear to be similar to the proposed Pepperdine program—the University of Southern California School of Cinematic Arts and Chapman University’s Dodge College of Film and Media Arts. The programs do
have strong selective admissions standards, multi-million dollar facilities, and opportunities for students to attend law and business courses.

The new MA in Media Production prepares students for enhanced careers in media production as producers, directors, post-production experts, and professionals capable of negotiating the complex legal and financial requirements of today’s media industries. In addition, the program is focused widely, allowing students who want to produce commercials, create Internet advertising, lead social marketing efforts or produce documentaries to further hone their skills in a strong environment of faith and mentoring.

Program Requirements:

MA in Media Production students must complete a minimum of 29 units designed to provide the necessary background and context for their program. An additional one to three courses (3 to 12 units) may be taken from a selection of Communication Division courses offered at the 500- or 600-level. Students are required to complete a minimum two-unit internship, attend at least two semesters of a one-unit seminar course featuring advanced screenings and conversations with media producers and executives, and complete a capstone project that can be a narrative short, a documentary, a complex strategic communication campaign, a comprehensive Internet site, or a music video or live concert project. The final project will be presented to a jury of professionals and faculty. A substantial written explanation of the research, theory and process leading to the creation of the capstone project will also be required for final submission to the Dean’s office.

Required Courses: (29-39 units)

- MPRD 600 Stories that Matter (4)
- MPRD 602 Visual Design (4)
- MPRD 610 Media Production: Tools and Techniques (4)
- MPRD 612 Media Post-Production (4)
- COM 630 Qualitative Com. Research Methods (4)
- COM 640 Communication Ethics and Values (4)
- COM 692 Seminar in Communication Studies (2-4)
- COM 695 Graduate Internship and Fieldwork (2-4)
- COM 698 Graduate Project (1-6)

Electives (select 3 to 12 units from the list below)

Additional courses may be chosen, with consent of the student’s adviser, from:

MPRD 590 Topics in Media Production (2-4)

Topics may include Sports production, Music and Sound Recording, Live Video and Music Production, Advanced Studio Production, Advanced Cinematography and Lighting, Internet Creation and Development, Internet Advertising Creation and Metrics, Documentary Production, and Creating and Managing Social Media Campaigns

NOTE: Most of these courses are currently taught for undergraduates on a rotating basis.
ADV575 Advertising Campaign Management
ADV 561 Advertising Account Planning and Research
COM506 Media Worldwide
COM 507 Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Attitude Change
COM 512 Media Impact and U.S. Minorities
COM 519 Communication and Conflict
COM 570 Media Law
COM 590 Seminar in Communication
JOUR 590 Topics in Journalism
MPRD550 Entertainment Industry Strategies
MSCO 560 Philosophy and Effects of Mass Communication
PR505 Public Relations Management
PR555 Advanced Case Studies in Public Relations

With the combination of curriculum revisions over the past two years, and the new MA in Media Production, the three graduate programs in the Communication Division are posited for significant additions to the established contributions already made to Pepperdine University.

Size, Scope, and Productivity of the MA and MS Communication Programs
The MA and MS degrees in communication comprise the largest traditional graduate program in Seaver College, with an average of 65 applications and overall enrollment of 30-35 students per year. Our students regularly produce six or more advanced scholarly theses a year. A number of those theses have involved faculty from different divisions across Seaver College. Undergraduate students often participate in, discuss, and become inspired by the research involved in those theses. Many result in paper presentations at scholarly conferences; for example, in fall 2011 the three student papers submitted to the National Communication Association annual conference were accepted. A co-authored paper submitted by Pepperdine Communication Division graduate students to the Western States Communication Association annual conference was awarded top student paper. In addition, many of these conference papers eventually become scholarly publications.
Since MA and MS graduate students in communication must take anywhere from 9 to 24 units of 500-level courses, our graduate students regularly contribute to the substance and quality of our undergraduate curriculum and co-curricular programs. Thus, the graduate program in communication has a dramatic impact on the scholarship activity at Pepperdine University.

While 18 or more communication faculty members are involved with the MA and MS degrees in communication, the division deploys only one FTE each year for the program. All other elements of the program are met by faculty in undergraduate courses who willingly extending extra effort to include graduate students in some of their upper division undergraduate classes. In these 500-level courses, the faculty member must include a separate graduate component to the course syllabus that includes advanced-level theoretical readings, additional assignments, and opportunities for the graduate student to utilize his increasing depth of knowledge. The instructor also is
expected to assess graduate student learning using rubrics and standards that are more rigorous in nature. The student credit hours generated during 2011-2012 will be between 452 and 572. There are usually three or more graduate students completing the MA or MS degree in the summer and fall, and another seven or more who complete the MA or MS degree in the spring semester. A current focus for the faculty is to increase the number of students completing the degree each term.

Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program
The communication graduate programs currently have 13 first-year students and 13 second- and third- year students. First-year students in the program typically enroll in 16-20 units, and second- or third-year students typically take 15-20 units. Thus, at $1,266 per unit (2011-2012) in tuition paid by communication graduate students, the gross income per year is between $510,198 and $658,320. By the formula of 30% for financial aid and 40% of the remainder as a "tax" to the University, the graduate programs in communication produce a net income between $214,000 and $276,000 a year at current tuition rates.

Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program
Delivering the Communication MA and MS degree necessitates minimal expenses. It is difficult to disentangle these expenses from existing expenses required to operate the undergraduate programs in communication because, other than the dedicated core courses or thesis work, all graduate students take their elective courses with undergraduates. Salaries are limited to 1.0 FTE course release accompanied by a $2,000 stipend for faculty academic program management. All administrative duties including recruiting, application maintenance, record keeping and student/program liaison are carried out by a divisional staff member who holds a 32-hour per week "restricted" position. This position is currently funded from the divisional student employee budget, although the position is not held by a student employee. Current salary expenditure for this position is $27,705 annually, plus the budget burden for benefits. The Communication Division has currently assigned one shared office space for this staff person. The workload of this staff person is slated to increase considerably as a third Master’s program, that of an M.A. in Media Production, begins operating in the fall of 2012. Student applications are currently being received and a small class of students is expected in the inaugural class.

Graduate student assistants who receive scholarship funds and hourly wages are often assigned student work positions that otherwise would be covered by additional faculty, adjuncts, staff, or undergraduate students. The division has assigned one office space for graduate assistants to perform their duties. This space also doubles as a meeting place for graduate student study and research groups. The space serves an important function in the creation of cohesion among the graduate students.

It should be noted that the expenses for running the program are, at the most, far less than the income generated by the tuition paid by the graduate students enrolled in the programs. In addition, for the last two decades the Communication Division faculty members involved with teaching in the graduate programs continued to teach full loads and serve without compensation for directing theses, working on graduate student committees, or supervising graduate assistant work. The Division would be
benefitted by reassigning the current staff member position from a restricted position into the regular divisional staff budget with the accompanying increase to this budget line to allow for this new permanent position. This would guarantee the continued professional expectations and expertise that are expected for this position and that are commensurate with comparable positions throughout the university. By reassigning this position, the division would not need to justify the extension of the restricted position each year to the administration, nor would it have to consider how reasonable salary increases for this position could affect the division’s ability to utilize student workers as part-time office assistants.

The program has achieved increased efficiency by growing the MS (non-thesis) side so that the program generates higher income without increasing costs; we now regularly have almost twice as many MS students as MA students. Another way to achieve efficiencies would be with faculty success at bringing in research grant funding that would support graduate assistants and faculty release time. Several of the faculty members have expressed interest in such grant seeking activities.

Enrollment Trends

External and Internal Demand for the Program

U.S. Department of Education statistics indicate that from 2005 to 2009 (the most recent data available) the number of master’s degrees in communication awarded across the USA maintained a steady increase, with the exception of 2007 (see Table 1). The number of MA graduates nationally has quadrupled over the past three decades. Nationally, there is an increasing demand for graduate degrees in communication. The MA program in communication at Pepperdine University has held steady for many years. With our recent revisions, new MA in Media Production, and impressive facilities, the graduate programs in communication are now in position to grow at a steady and manageable rate.

Table 1: National Totals of Graduate Degrees in Communication Conferred, 2005-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Master’s Degrees Conferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7567 (2459 to men; 5108 women)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the 2009 DOE stats were broken down by sex and race, revealing that, in the field of communication, 2459 degrees were conferred to males and 5108 degrees were conferred to females. This is amply born out by our stats for both applicants and enrolled
students in Pepperdine’s graduate communication programs’ data, which indicate a 3-4 to 1 ratio of females to males. Communication has become an overwhelmingly female-dominated degree program. Students enrolling in the communication MA and MS programs at Pepperdine do so for a number of inter-related reasons. Most simply seek advanced study to build on their interest and knowledge levels from an undergraduate major (or minor) in communication. Many pursue a pre-professional curriculum for entry into media-related fields, public relations, education, legal, international relations, and business professions. Several each year seek to teach communication at the secondary, community college, or university levels. This includes a significant number who are seeking preparation for going on to doctoral studies in communication. Many have a strong desire to pursue advanced studies with specific communication professors known for scholarship in a certain area of communication. Another key reason is the belief that an advanced degree will make them more competitive in the job market; today bachelor’s degrees are expected as minimal qualification into the professional job market, making a master’s degree statistically similar to the competitive edge a holder of a bachelor’s degree had in the 1950s and 1960s.

Table 2: Communication Graduate Programs’ Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Communication Graduate Programs’ Enrollments, By Program
It is interesting to note that over the past few years there has been a decided shift from MA to MS, likely due to students’ apprehension about undertaking the research-based thesis. This is something the graduate committee will discuss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Accelerated MA Program Enrollment**

We currently have 22 graduate students who are at various stages of completing their course work and another 12 who are in the thesis stage, for a total of 34 active students. Since its addition, 17 students have been enrolled in the Accelerated MA program. Seven have successfully completed the program, 7 are in the process of completing their coursework or theses, and 3 decided against continuing in the program for personal reasons.

**Degrees Awarded**

Since 2005, 56 students have successfully completed either their MA or MS degree from our program. A number of our recent graduates have completed PhDs at some of the top doctoral programs in the country, among them Katherine Kelley, at the University of Oklahoma (an assistant professor at Fort Hays State University) Don Waisanen at USC (assistant professor at Baruch College, CUNY), Theresa De Los Santos at UCSB (assistant
professor at Pepperdine effective fall 2012), Jennifer Sandoval at the University of New Mexico (assistant professor at the University of Central Florida), and Aimee Rowe Carillo (University of Washington), now a distinguished debate coach and professor at the University of Iowa. Three recent graduates, Keri Thompson, at the University of Texas, Francesca Smith (USC) and Rachel Johnson (The Pennsylvania State University), are completing doctoral work this year. Additionally, Ms. Smith was one of three Rhodes scholarship finalists nationwide in 2008, and is currently a Provost’s Fellow. Margeaux Lippmann is in doctoral study at the University of Washington, and current grad student Jennifer Lewallen has been accepted in a doctoral program at the University of Missouri.

Table 5: Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Quality

Table 5: Average High School GPA, 2006-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLL TERM</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaver -Communication Division</td>
<td>AVG HIGH SCHOOL GPA</td>
<td>AVG HIGH SCHOOL GPA</td>
<td>AVG HIGH SCHOOL GPA</td>
<td>AVG HIGH SCHOOL GPA</td>
<td>AVG HIGH SCHOOL GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACOMM Communication</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCOMM Communication</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that the average high school GPA for enrolled MA students was higher in Fall 2010 than in the previous few years, and the converse, to a lesser extent, was true of the MS students.
Comparison with Benchmark and Aspirant Programs

The core curriculum for the communication MA and MS degrees is generally consistent with typical MA and MS degrees around the nation. The table below compares Pepperdine’s communication graduate programs with specific benchmark and aspirant programs. One benchmark institution, the University of Notre Dame, does not offer a graduate degree in communication. Pepperdine students take core courses in theory, research methods, and ethics. Students take one or two 3-course concentrations in specific areas of expertise. What distinguishes our MA/MS from other graduate programs in communication is our emphases on service and ethics.

While the faculty who teach in our program are accomplished at media technologies for delivery of course content, we pride ourselves more on individual student attention, one-on-one research experiences, and problem-based learning approaches where students must rise to the level of doing their own syntheses and applications of course content.

Pepperdine’s graduate programs in communication are maturing with a strong academic reputation. We have successfully competed with graduate communication programs at local public universities and from other private universities from around the nation. Excellent applicants who we previously lost to other universities are now giving Pepperdine University a second and a third look, however, we still lose applicants to programs that can offer more competitive funding. Doctoral program faculty members from around the country now regularly call on us to ask about our students who may be interested in moving on to doctoral-level work. Many of our graduate faculty members have substantial and growing reputations within the field.

Table 6: Comparision of Graduate Degree Programs in Communication at Pepperdine, Benchmark and Aspirant Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Graduate degrees</th>
<th>Units Required in Major for MA or MS degree</th>
<th>Theory/Principles</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Concentration/Electives</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>MA, MS in Communication (concentrations in intercultural communication, organizational communication, mediated &amp; mass communication, and persuasion &amp; social change)</td>
<td>31, 34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 (Thesis), additional courses and comprehensive exams</td>
<td>9-12 (MA), 18-24 (MS)</td>
<td>Partial tuition scholarships, debate coaching assistants, and research assistants; 6-20 hours per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>Additional Qualifications</td>
<td>Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>Com Mgmt (MCM-8 areas of focus) Global Com (MA, MS) Public Diplomacy (MPD) Journalism (MA) Strategic PR (MA)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 per week Teaching/Laboratory Assts Assistant Lecturers Research Assistants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State Univ</td>
<td>Comm Studies (MA)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Graduate Teaching Associate (tuition/fee waiver and stipend)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>Communication (MA)</td>
<td>27, 33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>Tuition scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistants, debate coaching assistants, and research assistants; carry tuition waivers and 12-15 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYU</td>
<td>Mass Communications (MA)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teaching and research assistants, along with some full- and half-tuition scholarships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor Univ</td>
<td>Communication Studies (MA, concentrations in rhetorical studies, media studies, interpersonal/organizational studies)</td>
<td>30, 33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thesis, 3 Project, or Internship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td>Communication (MA) 4 emphases:</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thesis or comprehensive exams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum and Learning Environment

Pepperdine’s graduate programs in communication are distinct from benchmark and aspirant programs with a dedicated course on communication ethics. Only the two (Pepperdine and BYU) of the three programs with an explicit faith mission requires such courses. There is a second distinctive that is less positive: Pepperdine’s graduate programs in communication offer fewer opportunities for financial aid and graduate assistantships. All of the benchmark and aspirant programs with information available (all except ACU) offer teaching assistantships, which provide valuable experience to graduate students who desire to later pursue a doctoral degree. Our MA program regularly loses top students who are offered this financial support and teaching experience by other institutions.

Other than these two areas, Pepperdine communication graduate programs require comparable numbers of credits for degrees, and similar numbers of units for theory and research courses, as well as for thesis and comprehensive exam requirements.

Faculty Profile
One full-time tenure-track faculty member, Dr. Denise Ferguson, directs the Accelerated MA, MA, & MS in Communication, and the Accelerated MA and MA in Media Production, which will be launched this fall. Judith Tapper is the 32-hour per week staff person who coordinates the application, registration, thesis completion, and comprehensive examination process.

Specialties of the following faculty are diverse enough to accommodate all of the curricula offered within the graduate programs: Dorothy Andreas, Assistant Professor of Communication; Robert (Bert) Ballard, Assistant Professor of Communication; Christine Clancy, Visiting Instructor of Communication & Debate; Craig Detweiler, Associate Professor of Communication; Steven Lemley, Associate Professor of Communication; John Jones, Blanche E. Seaver Professor of Communication; Michael Murrie, Professor of Telecommunications; Keli Myers, Assistant Professor of Communication; Gary Selby, Professor of Communication; Milt Shatzer, Professor of Communication; Don Shores, Professor of Broadcasting; Juanie Walker, Associate Professor of Communication; Sarah Stone Watt, Assistant Professor of Communication.

Eighteen communication division faculty members regularly serve the communication MA and MS programs by teaching 500- or 600 level classes, serving as advisors, directing theses, or supervising of graduate assistants. In addition, each year 3-6 faculty members from other parts of the University have cooperated with the communication division graduate program by serving on committees or giving the graduate students feedback on their work.
All of the faculty members who regularly participate in the graduate program have doctoral degrees. Most of our faculty members have significant programs of research. Several members of the faculty regularly serve as officers of professional or academic organizations, and serve as reviewers for communication research journals. The reputation of our faculty members has increased substantially in recent years. Some members are among the top 10 to 20 scholars in their particular area of expertise. The reputations and publication rates of our faculty are particularly strong in comparison to communication graduate programs at other Christian Universities.

Table 7: Graduate Courses Taught, By Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Taught Fall 2010</th>
<th>Faculty Who Taught the Courses in Spring or Summer 2011</th>
<th>Courses Taught in the Program in Spring or Summer 2011</th>
<th>Faculty Who Taught the Courses in Spring or Summer 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 512 Media Impact and US Minorities</td>
<td>Stone Watt</td>
<td>COM 506 Media Worldwide</td>
<td>Shatzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 514 International Communication and Negotiation</td>
<td>Shatzer Robert Lloyd (ISL)</td>
<td>COM 513 Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>Clancy Clancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 521 Organizational Communication Analysis</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>COM 514 International Communication and Negotiation</td>
<td>Clancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 581 Contemporary Voices of Leadership</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>COM 515 Intercultural Communication Case Studies</td>
<td>Shatzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 587 Rhetorical Theory</td>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>COM 519 Communication and Conflict</td>
<td>Andreas Ferguson (SII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 590 Rhetoric and Race</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>COM 588 Rhet. Criticism</td>
<td>Stone Watt Murrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 620 Quantitative Research Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 590 Influences on Media Content</td>
<td>Andreas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 630 Qualitative Research Methods</td>
<td>Stone Watt</td>
<td>COM 610 Proseminar and Communication Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Assessment Activities

2005. The most important lesson learned in the 2005 communication graduate programs assessment and review, led by Robert Chandler, then-chair of the Communication Division, and Rodney Reynolds, then-director of the graduate programs, was that a more formal set of procedures needed to be instituted for an on-going review of the program. The appendix to that report contained a proposal for just such a systematic review and assessment program (see Appendix). The following were considered critical issues and challenges for the graduate programs in communication in 2005.

Development. The faculty members in the program face competing demands for their time that could be devoted to graduate students and development of faculty expertise relevant to the graduate program. Faculty members repeatedly complained that the demands for reports, proposals and forms from the central administration has taken up so much more of their time in recent years that they have less and less time to devote to research and graduate student teaching. Faculty members need to be encouraged to attend workshops at scholarly conferences and to form alliances with like-minded researchers at other academic institutions. Serious attention needs to address the possibilities of reducing the number of forms and reports required of faculty, increase staff support for faculty, or release time for faculty working with graduate students.
Change in Response to Assessment. The burden on faculty required to operate the graduate programs in 2005 was alleviated somewhat by the creation of a 32-hour per week staff position responsible for administrative duties including recruiting, application maintenance, record keeping and student/program liaison. It is anticipated, however, that this position will need to be expanded due to administration of the new MA in Media Production degree.

Restoration of incentives. The program would benefit from the restoration of incentives to faculty for helping graduate students with theses and comprehensive exams. Apparently because of a series of budget cuts (within the University, the College, and the Division) over the years, the faculty members involved with the program are compelled to volunteer their time and energy to the graduate students. Some senior faculty members have essentially withdrawn from cooperation with the graduate program. Those aware of the situation with the cuts in the incentives fear that forcing the issue will only result in the elimination of the program. The university faculty handbook indicates that such compensations are supposed to be available. Unfortunately, the assumption of voluntary contribution of time has become so assumed that recent faculty additions have not even been made aware that their efforts are voluntary. Course release for working with a set number of graduate theses or committees seems to be the preferred form of compensation.

New faculty. As faculty positions come available, particular attention needs to be paid to the need for faculty members willing and able to work with graduate students. Many of the students entering our program are particularly interested in media related research and projects.

Graduate assistantship funding. The best applicants for our MA and MS program often withdraw after admission because they receive offers for graduate assistantships from competing programs. We stretch the limited funding for graduate assistants by only offering partial tuition support. The funds for stipends are drawn out of our Division student assistantship funds. In short, currently we cannot compete for the best students. A modest budget increase in assistantship funds could produce major differences in the overall quality of the MAIMS program. Such improvements would very likely have a trickle down effect on the undergraduate programs and on the faculty productivity.

In October 2011 Dr. Gary Selby and Dr. Denise Ferguson submitted an Experiential Learning Graduate Assistantship Funding Proposal to Dean Rick Marrs (see Appendix). The proposal presented a detailed explanation about how high-impact undergraduate programs and co-curricular organizations rely on graduate students for their successful maintenance. Specific Graduate Assistantships would allow us to recruit graduate student leader-mentors with the knowledge and skills needed for the following co-curricular
assignments, and to maintain the Communication Division’s experiential learning distinction. Five Experiential Learning Graduate Assistantships were requested to be established and funded to include both tuition remission and an appropriate cost of living stipend.

Debate Program Graduate Assistantships (2): These Graduate Assistantships would be used to recruit outstanding former debaters who would be charged with helping to coach and mentor our undergraduate debaters, as well as to assist in the ongoing management of the debate program. The students would mentor quality undergraduate research, serve as argument coaches, judge debates, and assist with transportation of students to and from tournaments.

Video Production Lab Graduate Assistantship (1): This Graduate Assistantship would be offered to a graduate student with professional video production experience and undergraduate coursework in video production who can help facilitate the lab component of the TC 270 Field Video Production course. This course, required of all undergraduate film and telecom students, takes approximately 35 students per semester through the basic concepts and processes of photography and video editing. Because of the intensive, hands-on nature of this course, this GA is essential to ensuring that TC 270 students receive the individual mentoring they need to master the foundational video production skills needed to advance in their field of study.

Television Newscast Graduate Assistantship (1): Each semester, approximately 60-70 students produce two live television newscasts per week transmitted to a potential audience of 15,000 households in the Malibu area. This Graduate Assistantship would be used to recruit a graduate student with an undergraduate background in journalism and professional television experience, and who can assist undergraduate students in the process of developing and producing our student newscasts.

Internship/Service Learning Graduate Assistantship (1): The division maintains a robust and highly marketed internship placement and supervision program with over 600 organization sites available to our students nationwide. This Graduate Assistant would assist with the heavy volume of emails with students regarding cover letters and resumes, interviews, and internship progress; in-person student meetings and training; emails, phone calls, and meetings with internship supervisors and human resources personnel; and on-site visits at internship placement organizations.

As of March 2012, there has been no further movement on this proposal.

Accelerated BA-MA program. The 2005 assessment identified the possibility of developing an Accelerated BA-MA program where advanced undergraduate students in the end of their third (junior) year can apply to take 500-level courses with increased requirements to meet the graduate student performance thresholds and, doing so satisfactorily would enable those
students to apply the 500-level course toward the concentration in the MA program. The emphasis of an Accelerated BA-MA program was anticipated to be on research; no Accelerated MS would be offered.

2009. As with any academic program, the Communication Graduate Program is constantly being assessed. Four changes discussed in the 2009 assessment report, led by then-director of the graduate programs, and made since the 2005 Program Review, are particularly noteworthy.

First, the major development since the last Program Review has been the implementation of the new Accelerated Masters Program. This program allows exceptional Pepperdine University students to complete both a Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts in Communication in five years. Designed as a small program that would transition no more than 4 outstanding undergraduate Communication Division students to an MA degree, the Accelerated Master of Arts Program in Communication was implemented with no additional expense to the university since courses and faculty were already in place to service the existing graduate programs. From the 2011-2012 Seaver academic catalog:

“The Accelerated Master of Arts Program in Communication is designed so that a student* can complete both a bachelor of arts degree and a master of arts degree in communication in five years. It is designed for exceptional undergraduate students who have demonstrated a commitment to academic excellence and who know in their junior year that they wish to pursue a master's degree” (p. 160).

The implementation of this program has presented students and faculty with a number of challenges related to the timing of the core theory and research courses, concentration courses, and the successful completion of the master’s thesis. In response to these challenges, the faculty have developed and published a detailed timeline for completion of the degree and the Graduate Chair now conducts two workshops per semester for the Accelerated MA students in order to provide them with guidance and mentoring and to ensure that they are completing their work in a timely fashion.

Second, during the past three years the graduate faculty responsible for the core theory and research methods courses have given special attention to ensuring that these courses truly represent graduate level educational experiences, and that they prepare MA students to complete the thesis portion of their degrees. In particular, the research methods courses have been designed to culminate in the production of a full research prospectus that is as close as possible to being ready for submission to a thesis committee.

Third, the Graduate Faculty reviewed the concentration requirements for the MA and MS programs. (In addition to a set of core courses in theory, research methods, and ethics, all graduate students complete courses in one or more disciplinary areas within the field of communication.) This review resulted in several changes to the concentration requirements that will better ensure that students receive adequate
content coverage and appropriate academic rigor.

**Communication Graduate Program Concentration Areas**

**A. Intercultural Communication** (Select at least 3 courses from the following. NOTE: At least one course must be COM 513 or COM 515)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 506</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Media Worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 512</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Media Impact US Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 513</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 514</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Communication and Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 515</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intercultural Communication: Case Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 590</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Appropriate course topic only; requires approval of Communication Graduate Chairperson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Organizational Communication** (select at least 3 courses from the following. NOTE: At least one course must be COM 518 or COM 521.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 518</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advanced Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 519</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication and Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 521</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organizational Communication Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 530</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 590</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Appropriate course topic only; requires approval of Communication Graduate Chairperson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following courses may be taken with special permission from the Communication Graduate Chairperson:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 422</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organizational Development and Training (Student will be registered in COM 692, Seminar in Communication Studies, attend COM 422 meetings and complete additional graduate requirements assigned by the professor.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 450</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication and Leadership (Student will be registered in COM 692, Seminar in Communication Studies, attend COM 450 meetings and complete additional graduate requirements assigned by the professor.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 483</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Group Communication (Student will be registered in COM 692, Seminar in Communication Students attend COM 483 meetings, and complete additional graduate requirements assigned by the professor.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Mediated & Mass Communication** (Select at least three courses from the following. NOTE: At least one course must be COM 506 or MSCO 560.)
ADV 561  (4)  Advanced Account Planning & Research
COM 506  (4)  Media Worldwide
COM 512  (4)  Media Impact US Minorities
COM 590  (4)  Appropriate course topic only; requires approval of Communication Graduate Chairperson
JOUR 561  (3)  Public Affairs Reporting
JOUR 592  (3-4)  Appropriate course topic only; requires approval of the Communication Graduate Chairperson.
MSCO 560  (4)  Philosophy & Effects of Mass Communication
MSCO 570  (4)  Mass Communication Law
PR 505  (4)  Public Relations Management
PR 555  (3)  Advanced Case Studies in Public Relations - consent of instructor
TC 550  (3)  Programs & Funding

The following courses may be taken in this concentration when the courses are offered:
MSCO 580  (4)  Mass Media Management
JOUR 565  (4)  News Communication Techniques Seminar

D. Persuasion and Social Change (Select at least 3 courses from the following. NOTE: At least one course must be COM 587 or COM 588.)

COM 507  (4)  Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Attitude Change
COM 514  (4)  International Communication and Negotiation
COM 519  (3)  Communication and Conflict
COM 530  (3)  Interpersonal Communication Theory
COM 581  (4)  Contemporary Voices of Leadership
COM 587  (3)  Rhetorical Theory
COM 588  (3)  Rhetorical Criticism
COM 590  (4)  Appropriate course topic only; requires approval of Communication Graduate Chairperson

The following courses may be taken with special permission from the Communication Graduate Chairperson:

COM 450  (4)  Communication and Leadership (Student will be registered in COM 692, Seminar in Communication Studies, attend COM 450 meetings and complete additional graduate requirements assigned by the professor.)
COM 483  (4)  Small Group Communication (Student will be registered in COM 692, Seminar in Communication Studies, attend COM 483 meetings, and complete additional graduate requirements assigned by the professor.)

Fourth, graduate faculty members have worked to standardize the Master's of Science
Comprehensive Exam process. This has entailed developing and publishing a set of protocols, with a timeline, for the MS Exams. In addition, the faculty members have developed an “MS Comprehensive Examination Core Curriculum Review Guide” that reflects a standardized set of learning outcomes and for the core Graduate Program curriculum (COM 610, 620, 630, and 640).

The 2009 Communication Graduate Programs Program Review also reported assessment data from COM 630, Qualitative Research Methods. The student learning outcome assessed states that, after completing the course, students will be able to Develop a research prospectus that identifies and establishes the relevance of a research question, contextualizes that research question within the literature, and proposes a methodology for gathering and analyzing data that will answer the research question. Data gathered through student work (course exams, research prospectus, thesis/comprehensive exam), responses to course reflection that students completed at the conclusion of their COM 630 Qualitative Research Methods course, and responses to an alumni survey provided evidence for mastering this student learning outcome. Nevertheless, responses to the alumni surveys suggest several recommendations that would further strengthen and enhance the research focus of the program:

- Involve graduate students (particularly those pursuing the MA degree who plan to pursue PhD work) in collaborative research projects with faculty and/or other students.
- Continue to encourage MA students to present research papers at national and regional conferences.

Additionally, the 2009 review process highlighted several broader recommendations for the graduate faculty to consider:

- Reevaluate “Student Learning Goals” from the previous Program Review in order to determine whether they meet the current needs of graduate students and revise them so that they express behavioral outcomes rather than broad areas of content; and
- Review the current graduate admission process. Historically, students have been admitted on a “rolling” basis, yielding a consistent incoming class of between 6 and 10 students. However, this year’s incoming class includes 18 students—an incoming number that will certainly tax the division’s available resources. Faculty members need to explore options for ensuring a more consistent and manageable number of incoming students.

Spring 2011. The 2010-2011 Graduate Program Annual Report, written by Dr. Gary Selby, focused on the initial development of a curriculum map and assessment plan.

As of Fall 2011, the MA and MS programs each had one PLO:

- Students who successfully complete the Master of Arts in Communication degree will demonstrate the mastery of research and theory in the Communication discipline sufficient to carry out original, scholarly research in the discipline, and write and orally defend a master’s thesis.
- Students who successfully complete the Master of Science in Communication degree will demonstrate mastery of the Communication discipline in the areas of (1) quantitative and qualitative research methods, (2) communication theory, (3) communication ethics, and two additional areas of disciplinary concentration.
Table 8: Spring 2011 Assessment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>When to Assess</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis and Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Each Year</td>
<td>MA Thesis Proposal/MA Thesis Defense</td>
<td>Annual Report/Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Each Year</td>
<td>MS Comprehensive Examination</td>
<td>Annual Report/Program Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO #1 (MA THESIS)
For their capstone project, MA students develop a formal Master’s Thesis Proposal under the guidance of a Graduate Advisor, which they present and defend before a three-member faculty committee chaired by their Graduate Advisor. When they have completed the research and writing, they present and defend the thesis before their committee. MA theses are graded on a letter-grade basis.

Below are the MA students who successfully completed the MA during the 2010-2011 academic year, along with the thesis title and names of their committee members:

Table 9: MA Theses and Committees, 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MA – Thesis</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curammeng, Faith “Media Exposure, Social Contact and Asian American Stereotypes”</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>Murrie</td>
<td>Shatzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Audrey “The Relationship between Communication in Workplace Meetings and Employee Job Satisfaction”</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Garner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resistance in New Media Feminist Texts”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McFadyen, Candice</th>
<th>May 2011</th>
<th>Stone Watt</th>
<th>Selby</th>
<th>Clancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In Prison, in Labor, in Shackles: The Rhetorical Strategies Used in the Anti-Shacking Bill Campaign of New York”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: MS Comprehensive Exams and Committees, 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS - Comprehensives</th>
<th>Posted</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clavin, Caroline</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Lemley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayman, Greg</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>Shatzer</td>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna, Colette</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Shatzer</td>
<td>Selby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majlessi, Sophia</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>Lemley</td>
<td>Shatzer</td>
<td>Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern, Lauren</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Shatzer</td>
<td>Clancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarenas, Kristina</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Lemley</td>
<td>Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troup, Samantha</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Kinsky</td>
<td>Andreas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waag, Jacqueline</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Shores</td>
<td>Stone Watt</td>
<td>Selby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in Response to Assessment. This review process led to six revision suggestions for the Graduate Program:
In the course of a previous review, the graduate faculty determined that students were not being exposed to the range of research methodologies in a timely enough fashion for students interested in the MA track to make an informed decision about their thesis
project. Consequently, the decision was made to alter the order of the core classes so that students will take both research methods courses (COM 620 and 630) in their first semester. The effectiveness of this change will be assessed over the following two years. Based on several cycles of guiding students through the thesis process, combined with a growing enrollment in the graduate program, it has become clear that not all graduate students are qualified in terms of their research and writing ability to complete the MA thesis. This has led to the development of an evaluation process undertaken at the completion of the student’s first semester that assesses the student’s writing and research potential and that guides the student toward either the MA or MS tracks. The effectiveness of this change will be assessed over the following two years.

Each year, students completing the MS examinations face a particular challenge of preparing for and completing their comprehensive examinations while also completing the work for their regular courses. One suggestion has been to alter the structure of the comprehensive examinations to a “take-home” format that the students would complete during the winter break. This will be a topic for further discussion among the graduate faculty in the fall 2011 semester.

Several of our MS students had difficulty demonstrating mastery of several core concepts in the quantitative research areas. This needs to be examined in order to determine what changes, if any, need to be made in the teaching or exam review process.

Although the MA thesis is currently graded on a letter-grade basis, a rubric has not been developed that faculty can use in order to assign grades to the final project; consequently, most end up receiving an “A.” This fails to distinguish between those that are marginal and those that are truly outstanding. Faculty need clearer guidelines and encouragement for using the range of available grades.

Traditionally, graduate faculty reviewers operate with wide latitude in determining when a student has “passed” his or her thesis or comprehensive examination requirement. The graduate faculty might consider developing more clearly defined rubrics that can be used in assessing a student achievement in these capstone experiences.

**Fall 2011.** The SALT team reviewed the 2010-2011 assessment report in fall 2011 and made several recommendations, including one that the two PLOs (one for each program) be separated into four to five more distinct outcomes. Dr. Denise Ferguson, new graduate programs in communication chair, led the graduate committee in revising the Program Learning Outcomes for both the MA and the MS in communication. PLOs are now formatted to make clear that there are multiple PLOs for each program. Both MA and MS programs continue to be included in a single assessment plan, given their common PLOs and assessment methods and dates.

**Revised MA Program Learning Outcomes**

Upon successful completion of the **Master of Arts in Communication**, students will be able to

1. Articulate mastery of knowledge in foundational communication theories
2. Synthesize strengths and applications of various general and specialized communication theories
3. Critically analyze ethical diversity issues, AND integration of faith related to application of communication theories
4. Demonstrate the mastery of research sufficient to carry out original, scholarly research in
the discipline, and write and orally defend a master's thesis.

Table 11. Master of Arts in Communication Program Learning Outcome Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>PLO #1: Articulate mastery of knowledge in foundational communication theories</th>
<th>PLO #2: Synthesize strengths and applications of various general and specialized communication theories</th>
<th>PLO #3: Critically analyze ethical diversity issues, AND integration of faith related to application of communication theories</th>
<th>PLO #4: Demonstrate the mastery of research sufficient to carry out original, scholarly research in the discipline, and write and orally defend a master’s thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 610</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 620</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 630</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 640</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 690</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised MS Program Learning Outcomes: Upon successful completion of the Master of Science in Communication, students will be able to

1. Demonstrate mastery of the Communication discipline in the areas of quantitative and qualitative research methods
2. Articulate mastery of knowledge in foundational communication theories
3. Synthesize strengths and applications of various general and specialized communication theories
4. Critically analyze ethical and diversity issues, and integration of faith related to application of communication theories
5. Articulate mastery of two additional areas of disciplinary concentration

Table 12. Master of Science in Communication Program Learning Outcome Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>PLO #1: Demonstrate mastery of the Communication discipline in the areas of quantitative and qualitative research</th>
<th>PLO #2: Articulate mastery of knowledge in foundational communication theories</th>
<th>PLO #3: Synthesize strengths and applications of various general and specialized communication theories</th>
<th>PLO #4: Critically analyze ethical and diversity issues, and integration of faith related to application of communication theories</th>
<th>PLO #5: Articulate mastery of two additional areas of disciplinary concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Because the MA thesis and the MS comprehensive examination cycles occur every year, the communication graduate programs have ongoing review processes built into their structures. These processes will continue in future years. Additionally, the faculty will gather enrollment and graduation data, data on rates of acceptance of our alumni into PhD granting institutions, and data from alumni satisfaction surveys, to be used in assessing the overall effectiveness of the Seaver College Graduate Programs in Communication.

Table 13 displays alignment of the learning outcomes identified by the graduate programs in communication with those outlined by Seaver College and the Communication Division. Graduate courses related to both sets of learning outcomes are listed on the right hand side of the table.

### Table 13. Spring 2012 Alignment Map of Learning Outcomes

**School: Seaver College/Communication Division**

**Graduate Programs: MA and MS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes from IEOs</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td>MA PLO #1, MS PLO #2: Articulate mastery of knowledge in foundational communication theories MA PLO #2, MS PLO #3: Synthesize strengths and applications of various general and specialized communication theories MA PLO #4: Demonstrate the mastery of research sufficient to carry out original, scholarly research in the discipline, and write and orally defend a master’s thesis</td>
<td>COM 610  COM 620  COM 630  COM 640  COM 690  GRCO 699  COM 506  COM 513  COM 514  COM 518  COM 521  COM 530  COM 599  ADV 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</td>
<td>MA PLO #3, MS PLO #4: Critically analyze ethical and diversity issues, and integration of faith related to application of communication theories</td>
<td>COM 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.</td>
<td>MA PLO #3, MS PLO #4: Critically analyze ethical and diversity issues, and integration of faith related to application of communication theories</td>
<td>COM 640, COM 506, COM 512, COM 513, COM 515, COM 519, COM 530, JOUR 561, PR 555, COM 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.</td>
<td>MA PLO #2, MS PLO #3: Synthesize strengths and applications of various general and specialized communication theories MA PLO #3, MS PLO #4: Critically analyze ethical and diversity issues, and integration of faith related to application of communication theories MS PLO #5: Articulate mastery of two additional areas of disciplinary concentration</td>
<td>COM 610, COM 620, COM 630, COM 640, COM 506, COM 507, COM 512, COM 513, COM 514, COM 515, COM 518, COM 519, COM 521, COM 530, COM 588, COM 599, ADV 561, COM 570, JOUR 561, MPRD 550, MSCO 560, PR 505, PR 555, MSCO 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the responsibility and call to use one’s talents in the service of others rather than merely for personal or material gain.</td>
<td>MA PLO #3, MS PLO #4: Critically analyze ethical and diversity issues, and integration of faith related to application of communication theories</td>
<td>COM 640, COM 507, COM 514, COM 519, COM 521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes

As mentioned above, the SALT assessment feedback included several recommendations for further developing an assessment plan for the graduate programs in communication. One was development of a curriculum map for both the MA and MS programs, which was developed (see above). The table below is an initial assessment plan, which will be further developed with input from the graduate committee. Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes that has already been accomplished is discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.</th>
<th>PLO #4:</th>
<th>JOUR 561 PR 555 COM 507 COM 581</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read widely, think critically, and communicate clearly.</td>
<td>MA PLO #2, MS PLO #3: Synthesize strengths and applications of various general and specialized communication theories MS PLO #5: Articulate mastery of two additional areas of disciplinary concentration</td>
<td>COM 610 COM 640 COM 512 COM 513 COM 514 COM 515 COM 519 COM 521 COM 588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.</td>
<td>MA PLO #3, MS PLO #4: Critically analyze ethical and diversity issues, and integration of faith related to application of communication theories</td>
<td>COM 640 COM 507 COM 512 COM 519 COM 521 COM 570 JOUR 561 MSCO 560 PR 505 PR 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.</td>
<td>MA PLO #3, MS PLO #4: Critically analyze ethical and diversity issues, and integration of faith related to application of communication theories</td>
<td>COM 640 COM 506 COM 570 COM 512 COM 514 COM 515 COM 519 COM 521 COM 581 PR 505 PR 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO</td>
<td>When to Assess</td>
<td>Direct Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA #1, MS #2: Articulate mastery of knowledge in foundational communication theories</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Class discussion; student presentation; research reflection papers; theory application paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA #2: Synthesize strengths and applications of various general and specialized communication theories</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Class discussion; research reflection papers; theory application paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA #3, MS #4: Critically analyze ethical diversity issues, AND integration of faith related to application of communication theories</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Reflection paper(s)—in core course(s), thesis process or completion, or as culmination of their program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA #4: Demonstrate the mastery of research sufficient to carry out original, scholarly research in the discipline, and</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>MA: Thesis—develop rubric to assess, and assign “competence” standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
write and orally defend a master’s thesis.

| MS #5: Articulate mastery of two additional areas of disciplinary concentration | 2012-2013 | MS: Oral and written comprehensive exams—develop rubric to assess, and assign “competence” standard | Reflection paper; Exit interview/survey | Annual report/program review |

MA Program Learning Outcome #1, MS Program Learning Outcome #2: Articulate mastery of knowledge in foundational communication theories

MA Program Learning Outcome #2, MS PLO #3: Synthesize strengths and applications of various general and specialized communication theories

These PLOs were assessed in Spring 2011 in COM 610, Proseminar and Communication Theory, taught by Dr. Dorothy Andreas.

COM 610 Student Learning Outcomes:

By the end of the semester, students taking this class will be able to:

1. Demonstrate competent working knowledge of theories that are used in the study of communication. You will demonstrate this through class discussion, ability to teach a theory, and metatheoretical comparisons.
2. Evaluate and compare communication theories based on metatheoretical assumptions (epistemology, ontology, axiology, and Christian worldview), strengths, weaknesses, and utility of theory for explaining and/or solving communication issues. You will demonstrate this through class discussion, comparison papers, the application paper, and the peer review.
3. Draw connections between theories by making quality arguments that draw on primary research. You will demonstrate this through your ability to take concepts from previous research and advocate for a connection between these concepts that creates something new. Additionally you will demonstrate this through your increasing ability to find and use primary research. You will practice these abilities in class discussions and demonstrate them through the writing assignments.
4. Argue for a theoretic position in the field of communication. You will demonstrate this through class discussions and your Comparison paper.
5. Apply established theory to communication issues. You will demonstrate this
through class discussions and your Theory Application paper.

Assessment Summary
Overall, students were able to learn the course outcome. Outcome #2 was the key emphasis of the course (and should be listed as the first outcome) and students clearly demonstrated developmental knowledge of this outcome. Students were also successful in demonstrating the other outcomes with the exception of Outcome #3. Students only had superficial discussions of connections among theories. Thus, future courses should develop this outcome more, perhaps with more prompting in class discussions and a theory creation assignment.

MA Program Learning Outcome #3; MS Program Learning Outcome #4: Critically analyze ethical and diversity issues, and integration of faith related to application of communication theories

Examples of diversity in the graduate curriculum include the following concentration or elective courses:

COM 581 Contemporary Voices of Leadership

This course focuses on a number of diverse examples of public leadership in the twentieth century and beyond, including prominent women and African American rhetors. As one example, students explore the rhetorical leadership of Martin Luther King, Jr., which involves reading and making presentations on the following works:

- A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.
- Gary Selby, Martin Luther King and the Rhetoric of Freedom.

COM 587 Rhetorical Theory

This course includes a number of readings and discussions that highlight diversity in contemporary rhetorical theory. These topics emphasize, for example, what discourse looks like from a female perspective, as well as the rhetoric of Black preaching as an alternative to the understandings of persuasion that would characterize more White cultural traditions. Finally, this class also emphasizes the role that discourse can play in creating oppressive social structures that would inhibit the appreciation of diversity, a discussion that is prompted by the reading of an essay by Michel Foucault. Examples of “diversity readings” for this course:

- Selby, Gary S. “Preaching as Mimesis: The Rhetoric of the African American Sermon.” In And the Word became Flesh: Studies in History, Communication and

COM 588 Rhetorical Criticism

This course incorporates readings from diverse perspectives. While units on feminist, ideological, and postmodern perspectives on criticism lend themselves most naturally to the incorporation of diverse voices, we read a variety of perspectives on everything from genre to ethos to narrative. The list below is representative of the journal articles that students in 588 have read over the past two years, which demonstrates a diversity of perspectives on race, sex, gender, sexual orientation, religion, and political ideology.

- Vail "The "Integrative" Rhetoric of Martin Luther King Jr.'s 'I Have a Dream' Speech."
- Wood “Living by Parental Narratives”
- Ott and Aoki. "The Politics of Negotiating Public Tragedy"
- Smith, "Fantasy Theme Analysis of Charles M. Sheldon’s In His Steps and his Jesus newspaper"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Co-author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Amanda</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>California Dreamin': Narrating the Angeleno Identity in <em>Los Angeles</em> and <em>Angeleno</em> Magazines</td>
<td>Lemley, S., StoneWatt, S., <strong>Lloyd, R.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curammeng, Faith</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Media Exposure, Social Contact and Asian American Stereotypes</td>
<td>Murrie, M., Shatzer, M., Shores, D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Audrey</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The Relationship Between Communication in Workplace Meetings and Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Myers, K., Garner, J., Lemley, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes, Jessica</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Alte(red): A Look at How Corporate Responsibility Amid Corporate Crisis Shapes Purchasing Intentions</td>
<td>Garner, J., Rosenkrans, G., <strong>Duta, A.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowen, Jacqueline</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Effects of Product Placement In Film on Liking, Parasocial Identification, Attitude Accessibility, and Efficacy</td>
<td>Rosenkrans, G., Shores, D., Garner, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallarde, Stacey</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Framing and Emotional Appeals in Motion Picture Anti-Piracy Public Service Announcements</td>
<td>Myers, K., Jones, J., Murrie, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung, Heather</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Telling Their Story: <em>Invisible Children</em>’s Use of Narrative as a Consciousness-Raising Strategy</td>
<td>Jones, J., Myers, K., Shores, D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez, Christina</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>It’s not Easy Being Green: Defining Green Consumers and Understanding Their Attitude-Behavior Gap</td>
<td>Myers, K., Rosenkrans, G., <strong>Conlin, R.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Elizabeth</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Where the Wild Things Are: A Look at Zoo Volunteers Through the Lens of Social Exchange Theory</td>
<td>Myers, K., Rosenkrans, G., Garner, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, Caitlin</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Fairy Tale Faith: Cinderella’s Power to Draw Young Women Toward an Internalization of Biblical Truths</td>
<td>Lemley, S., Myers, K., Garner, J.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Francesca</td>
<td>White Man's World, Black Woman's Power: Condoleezza Rice's Rhetorical Identity at the Intersection of Presidentiality, Gender, and Race</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Selby, G, Jones, J, StoneWatt, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield, Julie Robin</td>
<td>A Statement of Crisis: Presidential Responses to Terrorist Attacks</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Jones, J, Lemley, S, Selby, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieckmann, Lauren Gates</td>
<td>The Effects of Attitude, Subjective Norm, and Self-Efficacy on Communicating About Health Advocacy</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reynolds, R, Shores, D, Walker, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord, Joanna Lynn</td>
<td>Paradoxical Forces in a Predominantly Female Workplace</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Lemley, S, Walker, J, Selby, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Neill Dana Louise</td>
<td>Differences in Perceived Interational Justice in Caucus and Joint Session</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Lowry, D.; Reynolds, R.; Lowry, Randy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riter, Timothy L.</td>
<td>A Fantasy Theme Analysis of the Jesus Movement: How Jesus Freaks Transformed American Christianity</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Jones, J., Selby, G., Lemley, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Keri B.</td>
<td>Explaining the Audacity of Hope: The Rhetoric of Illinois Senator Barack Obama</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Jones, J., Selby, G., Holmes, D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew, Alisa</td>
<td>Face Threats in Moral Influence Messages</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Reynolds, R., Lowry, D., Shores, D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahall, Sarah L.</td>
<td>Adam, Eve, and Ethos: The Effect of Gender on Perceptions of Credibility</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Reynolds, R., Reynolds, L., Shores, D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Frank and McPhail "Barack Obama's Address to the 2004 Democratic National Convention"
- Demo "The Guerrilla Girls' Comic Politics of Subversion."
- Palczewski, "The Male Madonna and the Feminine Uncle Sam"
- Gunn “The Rhetoric of Exorcism”
- Mehltretter “Dorothy Day”
- Zaeske “Signatures of Citizenship”
COM 590 Rhetoric and Race

This course is currently taught in the Humanities Division and is cross-listed as an offering for graduate students in Communication. It explores the intersections between race and discourse, focusing both on the ways that dominant discourses construct and reinforce racial identities as well as on attending to marginalized voices in society.

COM 590 Rhetoric, Gender, and Society

This course is a regular part of the rotation of offerings for our grad program. It explores the ways that gender identities have been developed historically and in contemporary culture through communication processes.

MA Program Learning Outcome #4: Demonstrate the mastery of research sufficient to carry out original, scholarly research in the discipline, and write and orally defend a master’s thesis

Table 15: MA Theses and Committees, 2006-2011

Recommendations:

Several recommendations and “closing the loop” activities have been suggested in this summary of assessment activities during the past five years. These include:

1. Develop a rubric to apply to assessing the M.A. thesis, with an eye toward better understanding student learning outcomes as exhibited in this culminating event of the student’s education.

2. Coordinate the graduate program assessment plan with that of the undergraduate Communication programs to ensure a more unified assessment culture and environment within the Communication Division, and allow for a more unified understanding of student learning outcomes between courses taught for both undergraduates and graduates.

3. Seek continued dialogue with the Seaver College administration over the proposal to increase funding for student scholarships and fellowships. This will, over time, attract an ever higher quality of student, with even greater abilities to mentor undergraduate students involved in High
Impact programs (debate, student media, television and film production). Given that Communication Division professors do not receive compensation or release time for advising graduate students, mentoring and serving as faculty members on thesis committees, and administering and grading comprehensive exams, the addition of some funding for graduate students would at least compensate professors by the addition of a few students who could serve as research assistants for those professors.

4. Develop a sub-committee of the graduate committee to better communicate the benefits and advantages of the Communication Division program to university fundraisers and the community at large, with the hope of attracting increased external funding.

5. Request the central administration to ease its budgeting restrictions to allow the program to dialogue with Pepperdine graduate schools about increased educational opportunities for the Communication graduate students.

6. Move the part-time restricted staff position serving graduate students to a full-time permanent position, given the increased workload that will be generated from the new M.A. in Media Production.
Evaluation Report – Pepperdine School of Communication

Allan Louden, Ph. D.
Wake Forest University

Overall impressions:

I enjoyed the opportunity to visit with a majority of Pepperdine’s primary Communication teaching faculty. I used the sessions to explore how they viewed the mission, resources, and future expectations for the program. In part I hoped to gage the sense of well-being; fissures have a way of surfacing when confronted with specific probes. I’m pleased to relay my distinct impression was that the faculty is generally pleased, sharing a common sense of purpose, expressing enthusiasm for the Communication school, offerings, and tenure at Pepperdine. This impression is not tangential; it is an important measure of an improving program.

As with any program the faculty held opinions on specifics for improving the program; and, by inference, revealed evolving consensus of limitations and potential initiatives. These emergent themes helped inform the recommendations below.

This report attempts to avoid the temptation for over comment, focusing more narrowly on my impressions, often simplified to a few main points. It is organized into Faculty/Curricular, Specific Majors, the MA/MS Graduate Program, and the Debate program.

Faculty/Curricular Overview:

It is always about resources. These observations recognize there are constraints, and appreciates the astute manner in which the Communication school has balanced the demands presented by significant student numbers, extra-curricular offerings, graduate programs, and community expectations.

The curriculum has been recently renovated, is contemporary, and provides a diverse, focused, and broad representation of the discipline’s influence.

This report is not intended to critique the curricular choices; they appear sound, based on faculty, students, and contemporaneity. The observations below are intended provide some enquiries for future curricular discussion.
Ratios of full time adjunct faculty to tenured faculty should be revisited. The number of individuals positioned to carry the responsibilities reserved for tenured faculty seems proportionally low. I do not have the exact numbers but it appears that visiting and adjunct positions may be more than tenured lines.

The full-time visiting/adjunct position, while absorbing a heavy teaching load, cannot be expected to have the perspective, purpose, continuity, and sometimes expertise to undertake duties beyond the class. In a sense, over half of those teaching in communication are only half available for the duties expected of tenure line faculty.

The most obvious impact is with the four course Core Curriculum requisite of all majors. For three class requirements, non-tenured instructors cover from 50 to 70 percent of the classes. However necessary, disconnects develop over time and the best-of-intensions; not to mention an inherent unevenness of instruction.

In order to accommodate “part-time” instruction, ensure quality, and document competency, the tendency is to increase standardize content. Standardization has to serve many masters; the result often is “coverage” at the cost of depth and understanding. Ownership problems are magnified in theory survey courses: “too much” control from senior faculties who have to later accommodate the instructional product; and “too little” for those actually charged with teaching the class, who are understandably moderately connected to the institution and communication program. The resultant hybrid typically satisfies few.

I am sure most of these basic requirements are sincerely taught and of sufficient quality. Given the currently assumptions of core requirements and staffing this design is necessitated. The comparison point, however, is not if a given requirement, for example Theory Survey is or could be a good class. It can. The governing question should be compared to the opportunity costs of the curricular design.

Suppose, or a moment, some visiting lines were converted to tenure lines. The downside is obviously financially it could not be a one for one conversion, resulting in some number of fewer classes covered. If sections of the intro-core were larger, retaining the course, it would allow more upper division electives in the faculty specializations/interests, or if there were no Intro-Theory class and more full time faculty, the innovation could be considerable.

Is the cumulative acquisition of theory by separate applications more efficacious than a survey of a 25 theories tour? I don’t know, obviously a departmental call; but a happier faculty engaged in more cutting edge instruction, all the while contributing as full university citizens, appears to minimally deserve consideration, a choice point impossible when requirements dictate faculty placement and invite numerous visiting
positions.

In Summary, tenured faculty are:

1. Nearly tied down enacting the curriculum (Core, Majors, Graduate)
2. Are forced to teach outside their areas to meet required class demands, and
3. Have teaching loads higher than norm for research universities

Curricular Majors:

I was asked to review three majors: Rhetoric and Leadership, Interpersonal, and Intercultural. These majors are recently revised, including the requirements for each. All three majors have internal validity; the requirements make sense, serve in explicating the area.

Nonetheless I return to the argument regarding Core Curriculum above, and that is there may be too many requirements. Even as each class makes sense, having up to six requirements in addition to four Core courses can constrain student invention. Whether more options is positive or not certainly remains open to debate. Looking at the course offerings I would expect fewer requirements would not results in a markedly different set of classes for a majority of students.

Obviously some level of requirements, enough to define a major, is needed. The more subtle consequence of “too many” requirements is they constrain faculty class assignments. The point is the same as before, a trade off with innovation and flexibility inheres. The proper balance is obviously mysterious yet 10 requirements in a given major (core plus major) locks in chair and faculty choice. If there were fewer requirements I would guess the Core courses are the first place to interrogate.

I did not receive feedback critical of the particular classes, having visited with two student sections, obviously a good sign regarding student perceptions. There were a couple commentators who wanted more “leadership” in the Rhetoric and Leadership major, which may be an expectation effect, but could be a limited ability to teach very far beyond requirements.

Graduate Program

Pepperdine’s current academic graduate program was familiar, sharing size and basic mission with the program I direct at Wake Forest; 20-30 students, a portion of who pursue advanced degrees following the MA/MS. The program is solid and actively involved in self-assessment aimed at better achievement.

There are some issues that merit being included in the revision conversation. The following
comments are only for the MA and MS program; I did not review the New Media Production program.

The program has 4 requirements that function as stand-alone graduate seminars, essentially a theory overview, methods, and Pepperdine signature ethics course. For the remainder of classes, over half are “bridge classes,” reasonably large and shared with undergraduates. Bridge classes have a place in most MA programs but in proportion. It is more difficult for a combined class to contribute to graduate student identity or provide the rigor a graduate seminar asks.

The faculty are fully booked providing the basic 4 class requirements (and undergrad requirements). Moving beyond those offering into faculty specializations is relatively rare, at least as a distinct seminar. Staffing is, of course, always problematic, but the congestion makes offering thesis intense experience or research collaborations progressively problematic.

One avenue of innovating in curricular offering is to consider integration--at the graduate level only--the Pepperdine flagship course Communication Ethics and Values through other offerings, freeing up a slot for specialized seminars. I do not have an insider understanding, so mention this only in the spirit of finding ways to free-up graduate offerings that are stand-alone.

Each of the current graduate offerings has merit, carefully balancing needs and faculty availability. Nonetheless, whenever requirements are set there is also an opportunity cost – the question being, weighing a requirement versus what is not taught. Which best meets graduate needs (including identification) and mines faculty expertise? The judgment is comparative.

MA students could be more involved in research opportunities, and would welcome a more systematic expectation to move students through research to participation/presentations in professional conferences. Certainly some students share in expert activities but not most, contributing to fewer being retain in teaching and the academy.

There is also the four-person per year “Accelerated MA” that invites a fifth Pepperdine year. The option appears popular with students and faculty. It did not, however, look to contribute substantively to recruiting or programmatic financial considerations.

Some questions were raised that may warrant exploring: accreditation standards via proportion of stand-alone graduate classes and the revenue sharing agreement with university via program support and tuition generated.

**Debate Program:**
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The debate program is respected among national programs. The intense applied laboratory model, serves a particular type of student--high achievers who practice academic rigor as a matter of competitive survival—the class of students who Pepperdine hopes to attract among its best.

Expenses are often higher than other programs as measured on per capita basis, but it is also the model of what we would privilege if resources allowed; a manageable sized cohort dedicated to exploring research and ideas, boosted by a competitively honed sense of excellence.

The program is comparatively underfunded as measured by peer competitors and, more importantly, the resources necessary to shape a national presence. Doubling the debate budget would not be unreasonable to redress funding deficiencies.

Staffing is dedicated, capable, but with competition in Policy Debate (NDT/CEDA) and Parliamentary debate the task is much to ask. Additionally the faculty members seemingly carry curricular loads comparable to faculty without extra-curricular assignments. This could be addressed in a variety of ways.

One could expect less teaching or departmental involvement via the director role, but integration into the departmental functions, culture, and decision making is a high value long-term. Also it is not clear the curricular and graduate demands would accommodate traditional release time.

Additional faculty/professional staffing would be the ideal, but difficult to achieve with multiple departmental demands. Three full time faculty/staff is the norm in competitive debate programs.

Another option, best thought of as a complementary to release time and more professional slots, is developing funding for graduate assistants supported at standard stipend levels. The occasional person willingness to take on coaching/traveling/research/student responsibilities does not sustain a program. Much like other competitive venues, continuity and expertise matter.

I very much appreciated the hospitality during the Pepperdine visit; faculty and staff could not have been more accommodating. I departed convinced I learn far more than any contribution on my part.
Interpersonal Communication
By Bert Ballard

REACTION TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

The review by Professor Allan Louden of Wake Forest of the Communication Division and the Interpersonal Communication project was, overall, positive of the curriculum and the program as a whole. Specifically, that the curriculum has “internal validity” was encouraging, given the shared courses of the interpersonal program with the organizational communication and intercultural communication programs. Also, that no specific issues pertaining to the interpersonal program were mentioned given that it was introduced in 2008 was encouraging. However, the review noted the constraints related to resources, the core curriculum, and the additional requirements in major programs. The five-year self study and interpersonal student focus groups and surveys confirmed concerns over requirements as well as sense of identity and lack of distinct interpersonal communication courses. Some of these concerns are addressed in action items below.

PROPOSED QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

5) Action 1: More coordination and development of the interpersonal major program curriculum needs to occur.

Evidence to support action:
- External review
- Student focus groups and surveys
- Comparison of programs

Expected outcome:
- Development of at least two distinct interpersonal communication courses, such as family communication (was a success and had full enrollment in spring 2012), relational communication, interpersonal communication in the workplace, or interpersonal communication in church/ministry settings.
- More coordination of interpersonal major with organizational and intercultural majors (most closely aligned curriculum wise) and with core to ensure both integration and distinctiveness.

Timeline for action: 3 years
Type of action: _X_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (e.g., cost, resource implications, source of funds, other resources):

Resources are necessary if course development extends beyond current faculty expertise and if major continues to grow as indicated thus far by enrollment trends and/or interpersonal major grows whereby current faculty are shifted to focus on expertise areas and additional tenure-line faculty members are hired to address core curriculum deficiencies.

Action 2: Stronger integration of theory, research, effects, and ethics in individual courses and across the curriculum.

Evidence to support action:
- External review
- Student focus groups and surveys
- Comparison of programs
- Embedded examination questions/capstone class

Expected outcome:
- Clearer accountability, tracking, and documentation of how theory, research, communication effects, and ethics are integrated into the interpersonal communication curriculum
- Academic support through integration of theory, research, effects, and ethics to meet student success and vocational trajectory (interpersonal students already recognized for outstanding research and service)

Timeline for action: 2 years

Type of action: _X_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

Action 3: Implement sustained and formal assessment of program learning objectives for the interpersonal communication major.

Evidence to support action:
- Five year self study
- Comparison of programs
- Embedded examination questions/capstone class
Expected outcome:
- More data and assessment information to better gauge quality of learning
- More data and assessment information to better analyze current learning outcomes

Timeline for action: 4 years

Type of action: _X_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

---

**Action 4:** Develop sense of community among students and faculty in the program.

Evidence to support action:
- External review report
- Student focus groups and survey

Expected outcome:
- Students will have a sense of pride and connection with the interpersonal communication program and with communication major in general. Action closely associated with Action 5 below.

Timeline for action: 2 years

Type of action: _X_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

---

**Action 5:** Enhance quality and student performance of program.

Evidence to support action:
- Student focus groups and survey

Expected outcome:
- In addition to developing a distinctive community identity, the interpersonal major will be viewed as a “first choice” major and students will perform at high academic levels, raising the scholarly reputation of the program and overall communication major both on and off campus.

**Timeline for action:** 3 years

**Type of action:** _X_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

____________________________________

____________________________________

Program Director/Chair Date
Response to Evaluation Report – Pepperdine Seaver Graduate Programs in Communication by Allan Louden, Wake Forest University

**Graduate Program**

There are some issues that merit being included in the revision conversation. The following comments are only for the MA and MS program; I did not review the new Media Production program.

The program has 4 requirements that function as stand-alone graduate seminars, essentially a theory overview, methods, and Pepperdine signature ethics course. For the reminder of classes, over half are “bridge classes,” reasonably large and shared with undergraduates. Bridge classes have a place in most MA programs but in proportion. It is more difficult for a combined class to contribute to graduate student identity or provide the rigor a graduate seminar asks.

The graduate faculty agree with Dr. Louden that there is a lack of opportunities to build community or identity among the graduate students, and that the necessity of “bridge” courses (cross-listed as graduate and undergraduate courses) is a key factor. As Dr. Louden notes, the faculty are “fully booked providing the basic 4 class requirements” and that as a result, offering courses in faculty specializations as stand-alone graduate seminars is relatively rare, as is the “intense experience or research collaboration” with graduate faculty. This is unfortunate, however, our current faculty numbers and load constrain this kind of close scholarly mentoring.

A second vehicle for building identity and community that graduate faculty are agreed should be created is a graduate colloquium, a 0-1 unit weekly or bi-weekly experience for graduate students only. The colloquium will be a gathering to discuss varying topics of relevance to graduate students, and also will provide a means by which they can get to know graduate faculty and their research areas, and begin to be acculturated in an academic environment.

One avenue of innovating in curricular offering is to consider integration--at the graduate level only--the Pepperdine flagship course *Communication Ethics and Values* through other offerings, freeing up a slot for specialized seminars. I do not have an insider understanding, so mention this only in the spirit of finding ways to free-up graduate offerings that are stand-alone.

*It is unlikely that the graduate faculty will decide to drop the dedicated graduate ethics
course. As Dr. Louden notes, it is a “signature” course and distinguishes Pepperdine’s graduate programs in communication from other benchmark programs. And, it is directly supportive of Pepperdine’s mission statement.

Two anticipated changes that the graduate program will implement may open opportunities for students to take an additional specialized/special topics or 600-level graduate-only seminar class. First, graduate students have typically been advised to take only two courses, COM 620 Quantitative Methods and COM 630 Qualitative Methods their first semester in the program. Graduate faculty believe that students who have been evaluated as highly qualified for graduate work should be able to take a third course during their fall semester. Second, graduate faculty have agreed that the prescribed concentrations should be dropped. Instead, a cohesive concentration of courses in an area of specialization will be created in consultation with the student’s advisor. This, too, will allow an occasional course to be offered that previously would have been applicable to limited, approved concentrations.

MA students could be more involved in research opportunities, and would welcome a more systematic expectation to move students through research to participation/presentations in professional conferences.

There are a few graduate research assistantships with untenured faculty offered, however, our funding is limited and much of the funding is required to support co-curricular graduate assistantships. Without adequate funding and adequate graduate faculty to cover classes and advise students, there will continue to be limited opportunities for graduate students to collaborate with faculty on intense research projects.

There is also the four-person per year “Accelerated MA” that invites a fifth Pepperdine year. The option appears popular with students and faculty. It did not, however, look to contribute substantively to recruiting or programmatic financial considerations. Actually, there are significant financial considerations that accompany the Accelerated MA, because there seems to be an unofficial commitment to fund a significant portion of their year of full-time study. Faculty seem mixed on their perceptions of the effectiveness of this program. Faculty members who teach the 500-level courses that seniors take for later elective/concentration credit in their MA must develop additional graduate work (e.g., often additional reading and research papers) and devote additional time to providing guidance and grading for these requirements. Thus, some faculty are less than enthusiastic about this added expectation. And, many Accelerated MA students find that it is not feasible to fully complete their coursework AND their thesis within the additional year (as advertised); it would be more accurate and reasonable to describe the Accelerated MA as a three-semester program.

Some questions were raised that may warrant exploring: accreditation standards
via proportion of stand-alone graduate classes and the revenue sharing agreement with university via program support and tuition generated.

There was substantial discussion with the external reviewer about graduate student funding and the relationship between assistantship funding, lack of living stipend, and tuition revenue that the graduate programs in communication are generating for Seaver College. Each year, our program loses highly qualified students to graduate programs (e.g., USC and Loyola Marymount) that can offer greater numbers of graduate research and teaching assistantships, along with stipends for living expenses, which we are unable to offer due to limited funding. The communication graduate faculty have agreed that, beginning in fall 2013, fewer graduate assistantships will be offered, with higher funding, in hopes to secure some of the most highly qualified graduate applicants for our graduate and undergraduate co-curricular programs.

In addition, the ethos of Pepperdine prohibits graduate assistants from teaching, thus many desirable students who are following an academic path toward being professors choose a teaching assistantship in another program.
Proposed Quality Improvement Plan

Graduate Programs in Communication

Action 1: Expand division’s graduate orientation and develop a 0-1 unit graduate colloquium

Evidence to support action: External reviewer, 5-year program review, graduate student feedback, and graduate faculty report the lack of mechanisms for communicating relevant and important information, for building community and identity among graduate students, and for graduate students to get to know graduate faculty and their areas of research.

Expected outcome: Allows meeting graduate program learning outcomes and builds community with students. Supports student success, and improved strength and student perceptions of the program.

Timeline for action: Fall 2012

Type of action: _XX_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (e.g., cost, resource implications, source of funds, other resources:

Action 2: Establish more clearly defined descriptions and expectations for co-curricular graduate assistantships, and reduce the number of assistantships offered while increasing the amount for each to make them more competitive

Evidence to support action: External reviewer, 5-year program review, graduate student feedback, and graduate faculty agreement.

Expected outcome: Supports success of co-curricular programs, improves recruitment of top graduate applicants, and promotes responsibility and professionalism of graduate students.

Timeline for action: descriptions written by Aug. 2012; change in graduate assistantship
funding and offerings, Fall 2013

Type of action:  _XX_ Resource neutral       ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Action 3: Establish graduate faculty advisor for each graduate student, starting with their first semester, for primary advising and mentoring

Evidence to support action: External reviewer, 5-year program review, graduate student feedback, and graduate faculty report the lack of mechanisms for communicating relevant and important information, for building community and identity among graduate students, and for graduate students to get to know graduate faculty and their areas of research.

Expected outcome: Provides individual, customized advising for successful program completion. Allows opportunities for students to establish mentoring relationship with a faculty member in their area. Supports improved strength and student perceptions of the program.

Timeline for action: Fall 2012

Type of action:  _XX_ Resource neutral       ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Action 4: Revise comprehensive examination process and assessment methods

Evidence to support action: External reviewer, 5-year program review, graduate student feedback, and graduate faculty assessment of spring 2012 process

Expected outcome: Graduate faculty on a student’s committee will write examination questions, will revise examination scheduling and process, and develop rubrics for the core courses such to support program learning outcomes, effective and successful completion of comprehensive exams, and improved assessment.
Timeline for action: January 2013

Type of action: __XX__ Resource neutral __XX__ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

__________________________________________________________

Action 5: Seek funding for new Master of Arts in Media Production

Evidence to support action:
The final graduate committee of this academic year affirmed that scholarships and academic support for the new M.A. in Media Production are lacking. The cost of running the program was detailed in the Seaver and University Academic Council documents that were approved. The grad committee was under the impression that some funding would be given to the division by the university, in the same way that funding was given to the new MFA in writing for screen and television when it began. Our external reviewer suggested we not even begin the program until some funding was in place. We are beginning in good faith and will continue to seek some funding.

Expected outcome:
Either the M.A. in Media Production will be able to attract enough students with scholarships and graduate assistantships, or the program will be discontinued because it will either not attract enough students, or if the division spreads out its meager funds for its graduate program to include the MA in Media Production and all the grad programs will cease to attract students because we lack competitive funding.

Timeline for action: June 2012

Type of action: __XX__ Resource neutral __XX__ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Here is the UAC proposal portion dealing with funding:

| While the program does not need much initial funding, the following funds could help us move ahead more quickly. Budget for Fall 2011 |

__________________________________________________________
### Recruitment Funding Costs 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library materials (one-time)</td>
<td>2,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*These funds were not received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wish List Budget

(If we don’t have this, we can still offer the program as outlined in this proposal; however if this proposal is approved, we will ask the Central Administration for assistance consistent with the same courtesy they extended to the start up of the Humanities Division’s MFA.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-time Equipment purchase to complement existing cameras, software, servers, computers in CCB media production suites</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating Budget (honoraria, travel, recruiting, etc.)</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Adjunct Faculty pay</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Scholarship Assistance (1/2 tuition for 6 students)</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is the caveat the UAC also approved:

**Sunset Pledge:** If the program does not attract a sufficient number of students (minimum 8 per course) or does not raise sufficient donations or tuition funds to support the anticipated operating budget, adjunct pay and scholarship assistance (approximately $200,000 per year) after the first three years of existence, the Communication Division will ask the SAC to shut down the program.

---

Denise P. Ferguson_________________________ May 25, 2012________________
Program Director/Chair Date
REACTION TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE RHETORIC AND LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Prepared by Dr. John Jones and Dr. Gary Selby

May 25, 2012

The faculty who primarily teach in the rhetoric and leadership emphasis in the Communication major (Jones, Selby and Sarah Stone Watt) thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity to meet with Dr. Allan Louden from Wake Forest University. We found his insight into our particular emphasis, and our debate program, to be insightful and confirming. In general, we agree with his observations about the Communication major and the role that the rhetoric and leadership emphasis plays within that major.

In specific, we note:

1. Our entire division suffers from a lack of tenure track and tenured faculty. As a result our core courses, the “first touch” in our major, tend to be taught by excellent visiting faculty who are not fully integrated into the curriculum and scholarship issues of the major. Thus students aren’t being fully exposed to the program learning outcomes when they begin the major, and sometimes fail to see the coherency of the curriculum as they move from class to class.
2. We agree with Dr. Louden’s observations that we should explore cutting core courses and moving the theory and research components of Communication into major-specific classes. This will allow faculty to teach more courses in their area of expertise and scholarship and help students see more specifically how theory and research inform their majors. We will be part of this ongoing discussion with our peers during the coming years.
3. We plan to continue to create a series of courses, on a regular rotation, that better utilize faculty expertise. We have recently added several such courses as Com 590 courses and we may convert some of those to formal classes taught on a regular schedule.
4. Some students noted that they would like to learn more about leadership while they are learning about rhetoric. We plan to further explore this observation through
more exit interviews and alumni surveys to see if we can devise ways to better communicate the linkage between leadership and course studies. A course devoted to leadership and communication within our division is also a possibility for the future.
Proposed Quality Improvement Plan

Rhetoric and Leadership Major

Action 1: Explore the possible elimination of COM 200, the Communication Theory course, which currently is a core requirement for all Communication majors. In its place, the division should require a course which has a strong theoretical component for each major.

Evidence to support action: The external review submitted by Dr. Alan Louden noted that "there may be too many requirements" which “constraint[s] faculty and class assignments.” Louden believes that “tenured faculty are nearly tied down in enacting the curriculum (core, majors, graduate)” in its current form and that there should be a reduction in the number of requirements should be considered. If this reduction were to take place, Louden recommends that “the Core courses are the first place to interrogate.”

Expected outcome: Louden is convinced that such a move would result in “a happier faculty engaged in more cutting edge instruction” and “more upper division electives in the faculty specializations/interests.” Specifically, Louden predicts, “if there were no Intro-Theory class, the innovation could be considerable.”

Timeline for action: within the next two years.

Type of action: _X_ Resource neutral __ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (e.g., cost, resource implications, source of funds, other resources):

Action 2: Expanding the “leadership” component of the present “Rhetoric and Leadership” courses.

Evidence to support action: Based on his conversations with students who are majoring in Rhetoric and Leadership, Louden concluded that there was a desire for “more leadership in the Rhetoric and Leadership major.” Student feedback to individual faculty within the division seems to support Louden’s findings.
Expected outcome: Such a change likely would result in our students graduating with a deeper understanding of the theory and practice of leadership as well as the vital role that rhetoric plays in being an effective leader.

Timeline for action:

Type of action: _X_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Action 3: Continue to meet with other Communication major faculty to create a coherent list of upper division courses on a regular rotation that will benefit all of our majors.

Evidence to support action:
Dr. Louden’s suggestions and the outcome of our Five Year assessment report.

Expected outcome: Students will better understand how our program learning outcomes relate to the courses they take.

Timeline for action: Ongoing, but recommendations to the SAC could begin during the 2013 school year

Type of action: _XX_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Program Director/Chair Date
Pepperdine University: Organizational Communication Program Review

By: Deborah Dunn, Ph.D., Communication Studies, Westmont College

April 2012

Introduction

Overall, I would characterize this department as highly functional, collegial, and intellectually engaged. Meetings and social conversation over dinner never appeared strained. Student interactions with faculty displayed a mutual respect, but also a genuine enjoyment of one another and enthusiasm for the subject matter. While every college department has its share of challenges and differences to work through, I was struck by how much I enjoyed my visit because the faculty and students seemed to enjoy their work and one another. Students said, on multiple occasions, that the program and professors are "great" and that professors are very available. In addition, all administrators interviewed for this report seemed enthusiastic about the organizational communication program.

One thing that struck me in conducting this review is how very well matched the department is to the larger university. Beyond the specific questions raised by administrators and departmental members, I find it noteworthy that this department seems to embody the mission and spirit of Pepperdine University, "where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership" ("About" section http://www.pepperdine.edu/about/).

The questions posed by the organizational communication program were framed as research questions to guide their own rather impressive analysis of their program. I appreciated that they approached program review with the same seriousness of purpose and methodology they would use in their own research. The three Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the organizational communication program are broadly characterized as knowledge, skills, and values:

1) Understand and compare theories and research in perspectives, background, and context of organizational communication;

2) Demonstrate analytic and applied skills in organizational communication to work towards effective organizing processes; and

3) Appreciate how different worldviews impact organizational communication and discern among those choices a wise and ethical path.
Based upon their PLOs, the questions guiding their own analysis (and hence directing my own attention) were:

1. How well does the organizational communication program meet PLOs?

2. How well does the capstone course (traditionally COM 521) meet PLOs #1 – 3 to create understanding, skills, and ethical awareness of organizational communication?

3. How well do organizational communication seniors use critical thinking applied to the organizational context?

4. How well do students understand and identify with the purposes and uses of the sequence?

Some questions posed by the chair of the communication division (and they were truly "questions") included:

1) Does "paradox" and "paradoxical thinking" resonate with the students, and are Dorothy and Juanie on the same page?

2) Why have the numbers halved?

3) Should human communication majors be separate majors?

My inquiries, whether of administrators, students, or faculty members, were derived, in large part, from these four central questions posed in the review document submitted by the department. There were several sources that served as a foundation for the recommendations in this report.

Sources for Report and Recommendations

1. Pre-Visit:
   • Read the Organizational Communication Program Review Report (dated March 2012, including appendices and sample student papers).
   • Read relevant portions of the Communication Program Review Report (dated March 2012).

2) Visit March 2012:
   • Interviewed three faculty/administrators outside the department
   • Interviewed eight students studying organizational or interpersonal communication
   • Observed & interacted with three departmental faculty members over dinner, plus
additional interactions with faculty over breakfast and lunch.

• Held an informal focus group with students over lunch (eight students)

• Met with a fairly recent graduate and now adjunct professor.

• Toured departmental office area

Post-Visit:

• Read departmental and college-wide web pages.

Commendations

As mentioned previously, the department seems to be a well-functioning unit, a collegial team of colleagues working toward a common goal despite different teaching styles, personalities, and backgrounds. The CVs indicate that all are engaged in professional activities that complement their classroom instruction and presence. One of the highlights of my visit was having lunch and a long focus group session with several students, most of whom were juniors and seniors. They were delightful, inquisitive, articulate spokespersons for their major and their university. The major themes that emerged in terms of departmental strengths include: The upper division courses, especially, present interesting, varied, and challenging opportunities for student engagement with the material and the instructors. Students enthusiastically praise the amount of work that prepares them for the workplace, that gives them hands-on practice in consulting, and that gives them "real world" problems to solve. All of the instructors and faculty are liked and considered very intelligent.

Based on my observations and conversations on campus, I think the department is doing a fine job blending some very applied, practical coursework with highly theoretical and academically challenging social science research and discussion. Students love it, and are thriving on it and in it. This is made possible by a very well trained and continuously engaged faculty teaching in their areas of expertise and involvement.

Student Reports & Program Learning Outcomes

With regard to the first question, how well the organizational communication program accomplishes its desired outcomes, students not only state that they are learning a lot, they also evidence a depth of learning that is impressive for undergraduates in organizational communication. The discussions in the capstone course and the sample papers provided indicate that students are learning a great deal. The knowledge required to analyze an organization at a level both insightful and useful to the organization is not typically evidenced by undergraduate students (and sometimes not even by graduate students!). The depth of analysis was impressive. Some representative comments from
students about their learning include:

• "We do a lot of research and research presentations that really help us."

• "Every assignment has meaning."

• "The whole human com department stresses critical thinking, abstract thinking, and writing."

• "There are lots of parallels between the first year great books curriculum and the com curriculum."

• "Com teaches you how to think about things - ethics, worldviews, theories - they help us navigate life, not just work."

• "Students in communication seem a bit more engage critically than many other majors."

• "I like that I'm learning different things I can apply after college -- not just things to put on a test."

• "Learning different perspectives gives me more tools to work through conversations."

• "They train students to be really great consultants - they know how to code material and see what’s going on in an organization."

• "The knowledge we gain is fascinating and useful, very applicable. Courses are not easy, but they make sense. I appreciate the historical background in 418."

• "Not everyone shares the same worldview - that's okay - we're learning to work with others with very different backgrounds and learning and working styles."

• "When things happen, concepts are triggered. I've grown through this. Now I have more terms to understand how organizations work. And this knowledge helps me create a sense of identity, which is very important."

• "Dr. Andras gives us assignments that are great mental exercises in critical thinking."

• "The intellectual training I'm receiving will help me make a difference - I can confront situations, but being respectful. I know theories now of why it all goes wrong with people. Org com is a whole new box of knowledge."

While their knowledge of specific theories and approaches to organizational communication is impressive, there was an almost complete absence of any reference to communication as a discipline beyond organizational or interpersonal communication. They see themselves as very separate from rhetorical and humanities
approaches, and almost in competition with students in mass communication, media, marketing, and public relations. In the stated PLO regarding knowledge, the faculty express a desire to educate students such that the rich background of communication as a discipline is understood and appreciated. Nearly all of the students interviewed for this review, however, could not really speak with enthusiasm or specifically recall other aspects of communication beyond their immediate interests in gaining skill in interpersonal and organizational communication. In reading the PLOs and course syllabi provided, I see much more breadth. In talking with students, however, I hear an almost totalizing focus on their specific, declared programs.

Further, most of the glowing comments about who they are becoming intellectually came only with specific prompting. The vast majority of comments were about skills, internships, jobs, and status on campus. They are terribly appreciative of the skills they are developing and their preparation for life and careers beyond the classroom:

• "The exposure and hands-on experiences doing field-work, practicing what we're learning, these are valuable work skills. Every assignment has meaning. We don't have to worry about what the professor wants; we can focus on what is expected of us in the workplace."

• "I know how to brand myself."

• "Org com majors are more career-focused than other human com majors."

• "I like the utility of this major."

• "I like that this is very practitioner focused and that we are pressured to be very successful."

• "Partnerships with business is good - org com is business/corporate com."

• "I like the applicability of org com - I've had many 'aha' moments."

• "I'm learning different things I can apply after college -- not just things to put on a test."

• "The case studies on Google and airlines are very helpful. I also liked the mock meeting with employees and executives. We get good practice applying knowledge."

• "I like that Juanie Walker wants students to figure things out for themselves."

• "The best classes bring in real-world experience, outside people, alums. They train students to be really great consultants."

• "This is a useful major."
"We work more than other majors in com, but the workload is vital as it helps us understand and comprehend -- for our final project we did a campaign to help organizations with burn-out and stress - we took a therapeutic approach. Implementing and making it all practical was valuable. These courses are helpful for seniors transitioning to careers - how organizations work and how to create a sense of identity is very important."

"I like this major because it models real work environments. We use a lot of simulations and hypothetical situations."

Overall, my impression is that students seem very much focused (almost exclusively) on the utility of their majors to do particular jobs. When prompted, they speak highly of the intellectual progress they are making, and the work they are doing supports their sense of depth and mastery of knowledge. Still, I wonder if sharing a building/complex with business majors and communication majors focusing on journalism, public relations, and marketing lead them toward thinking that the "proper" way to speak of one's major is in terms of applied practice and career prospects. This may exist in tension with the stated program outcomes.

This leads in to the fourth question posed by the program -- about identification with the major and program. One thing that seemed troubling for the students is their perception of the wider understanding and appreciation for an "organizational communication major." They find that most of their friends have no idea what their major is about, and they worry that people hiring will not understand or appreciate their chosen major. This worries them. It came up in almost every interview. And while most students value being able to tell people that they are "organizational change agents" a small number said the focus on consulting was almost too much. Some majors not specializing in organizational communication said they didn't choose org com because the major was only about consulting and they prefer dialogue and relationships with people over business. Several students and one non-student said the department needs to do a better job branding itself. It may or may not be the case that the organizational communication program needs a branding campaign, but seems to certainly be the case that the dominant understanding of the program is that students train to be consultants. For those students who are not attracted to that career, they may self-select out of the organizational communication program. For those students who are attracted to a consulting career, they feel frustrated that others (whether peers or those hiring consultants) don't properly or fully understand the value and scope of their program. They love the organizational communication program, but wish that others valued and respected their body of knowledge and hands-on experiences.
As for the third question regarding the critical thinking abilities of the students, based on their oral reports of their research projects and the sample papers provided, it seems clear to me that they are developing very good critical thinking skills when it comes to understanding human organizational activity. I was envious that my students have not achieved this same depth in their ability to understand and apply theories and perspectives.

In terms of the second question, I must rely on the work done by the department in attempting to understand how sophisticated student understanding of various worldviews and philosophies and ethical streams are after completing the organizational communication sequence. Nevertheless, it is important to note that multiple students expressed appreciation for the focus on ethics and worldviews, especially in reference to the small group course.

As to the questions posed by the division chair, it does appear that the faculty are rowing together and that they are both appreciative of one another's work styles and pedagogical strategies. Still, given that one person is very new, they may want to revisit some aspects of the structure of the program. It also appears that all of the faculty and the students are appreciative of the paradoxical thinking exercises and focus.

As for the question regarding the numbers in the major -- it is possible that the courses now gaining in popularity that are outside of organizational communication (rhetoric and leadership, international communication and marketing in a separate program altogether) have drawn some students toward other majors and programs.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made based on some reading and a one-day visit. I hope they are helpful. I include my observations and unsolicited advice! Note that I don’t have any suggestions regarding curriculum, as the major does seem to make sense on paper, is valued by students, leads to high level research and application, and does not seem at issue for your faculty.

First, there is no doubt in my mind that you have a competent and engaged faculty. Most classes appear to be more than adequate and appropriate for undergraduate students. Students enthusiastically vouch for appropriateness, rigor, and engagement in their upper division coursework.

Students, are, however, discouraged that their friends perceive a lack of status in organizational communication. I wonder if this alone might account for a decrease in numbers during a recession. Since students in your building seem very much focused on skills training, job prospects, and internship opportunities, perhaps it is time to spend some
energy thinking this through. Should organizational communication be its own program? Is it possible to pursue more "prestigious" internship alliances and cross-over courses? Might organizational communication capitalize on the attraction that "leadership" and "international applications" hold for students? You might also do additional work (in addition to what you are already doing) to articulate exactly what the major is, what it does, how it fits within the larger discipline of communication, and where it "fits" in the world of career options. Give your students, a “story to tell” regarding their major. Albert Bandura has shown us the value of having a script at one’s disposal to increase one’s sense of self-efficacy. If students know how to answer questions posed by parents, peers, and prospective employers, they will help shift perceptions on and off campus. You might consider having a "showcase" course for organizational communication. What would the ideal, entry-level course for your major be? What would be covered? How could students receive a sort of basic training and tantalizing glimpse of what is to come? How could you show students, over the course of a semester, who you are?

Finally, I humbly offer a final suggestion, not based on questions raised by the department, but based on my conversations with faculty, students, and administrators during my visit. It appears to me that Pepperdine is in a season of discerning how best to claim its heritage while moving forward in a society and organizational culture that seems less and less interested in a Christian liberal arts perspective. It also appears to me that your department, along with Pepperdine generally, must continue to find that balance between being both unapologetically liberal arts and yet also focused on skills training and career preparation. As we discussed, it sometimes seems to me that you want both things – respect from colleagues and peers for your intellectual rigor and social scientific credentials – but you are also quite proud of your track record in hands-on training students and their marketability. It might be fun for you to fully explore your own department’s mission and ethos in which you explicitly name, for yourselves and for your students, how you see yourselves uniquely fulfilling both the ongoing mission of Pepperdine University and its rich heritage and tradition.
Reaction to External Reviewer Report about Organizational Communication Sequence

Prepared by Juanie Walker and Dorothy Andreas

We agree with Deborah Dunn’s overall observation of the tension between a desire for practical, “marketable” skills and a desire for critical thinking skills that are related to a tradition liberal arts program and angst students seem to feel over how their skills will translate to applied audiences. But rather than seeing this as a “gap” to be “bridged,” we recognize this as a fundamental paradox that has been long recognized in philosophy and pedagogy. Thus, consistent with our other intellectual commitments in the program, we embrace this tension and seek to pro-actively and creatively keep the poles of the tension alive in the design of curriculum and in daily instructional practice. We seek to de-emphasize a false divide between practical skills and liberal arts learning and instead teach students how to connect their critical thinking, liberal arts education with practical wisdom as a means to effectively work in organizations and society.

Just as Dunn encourages us to fully explore our own Communication Division ethos and how we see ourselves uniquely fulfilling the mission of Pepperdine University and give students a "script" to explain their major, we seek to develop a more deliberate framework grounded in liberal arts Christian learning. Rather than a business or mass communication framework, we seek to more fully develop a framework of organizational communication as practical wisdom, critical thinking skills, and social responsibility that is explored and demonstrated programmatically in dialogic community engagement and integrates more with other tracks in the human communication major. This would involve de-emphasizing the consulting framework and elevating critical thinking skills as practical theory and transformative practice. Components for developing this new framework are described in the four action items of the Proposed Quality Improvement Plan.

Our movement in this direction is consistent with the direction of the field of organizational communication that is moving progressively toward embracing the productive tension between theory and practice as is seen in the annual academic conference of Consortium of Engaged Scholars who reflect upon key principles and experience of embracing the theory/practice tension in Aspen, Colorado; consulting firms such as Conversant Consulting that embrace the theory/practice tension; and graduate education models such as Kensington Institute and Fielding Institute. More specifically, the thinking and scholarship of Steven Littlejohn, Robert Craig and Kevin Barge provide vocabulary and a possible conceptual map for us as we try to articulate the goals of the organizational communication track and helping students understand the wisdom that they gain by learning how to connect theory with practice. Specifically, Barge and Craig articulate three approaches to practical theory: mapping, engaged reflection, and
transformative practice. In Barge’s words from his 2001 essay, the mapping approach seeks to “map the puzzles, dilemmas, or challenges inherent to a practice and to describe the particular communicative strategies, moves, and structures that manage those problems.” We see this as using theory and liberal arts skills such as critical thinking to explain the processes of organizational communication. The engaged reflection approach immerses the researcher and the practitioner together in the organizational experience. It asks the researcher (in our case, the student) and the practitioner (in our case, the client) to draw equally upon the theoretical knowledge and lived experience in a reflexive manner. Finally, transformative practice is the intentional effort to reflexively use theory and lived experience to improve processes of organizing and at the same time re-shape and improve theory and knowledge.

In addition, the more systematic development of the organizational communication sequence into a program of community engagement is consistent with the emerging view of community engagement as inquiry (Cruz) and integrated learning (Palmer & Zajonc). In her recent visit to Pepperdine University, scholar in service learning and director of community engagement at Stanford University Nadinne Cruz described community engagement as high impact learning beyond K-12 volunteerism because it involves reflexive thinking that asks students to question their assumptions and learn ethical concepts such as “moral brilliance.” As Palmer and Zajonc argue, educating our students as whole persons requires integrative learning that involves “connecting skills and knowledge from multiple sources and experiences; applying theory to practice in various settings; utilizing diverse and even contradictory points of view; and, understanding issues and positions contextually.” It draws on the full range of human capacities for knowing across liberal arts and applied study and curricular and co-curricular activities, including community engagement that brings with it “a deep and pervasive engagement with the questions of meaning and purpose.”

Through these more integrated approaches to education, we believe that we can better articulate the logic of the organizational communication curriculum to prospective students and students in the instructional environment. And of course, ultimately help them arrive at the place in which they can relate the value of liberal arts skills and practical skills to processes of organizing.
Proposed Quality Improvement Plan

Organizational Communication Sequence

Action 1: Further integrate the organizational communication curriculum with liberal arts and the Christian mission of the university, and in so doing, integrate more with the other tracks in the human communication major.

Evidence to support action: Students demonstrate their competencies for critical thinking, research, and analytic writing and recognize and appreciate the relevance of these skills for practical success in career and life and for ethical and spiritual calling. Nonetheless, they tend to evaluate the worth of the program using marketing and mass communication terms. Students need a framework that transcends a false divide between practical skills and liberal arts knowledge and faith.

Expected outcome: By more fully developing a liberal arts frame of the major with concepts such as "practical wisdom," we would teach students how to connect their critical thinking, liberal arts education to effectively work in organizations in a way that transcends the false divide between practical skills and liberal arts learning.

Timeline for action: We are reading texts this summer regarding practical wisdom to more deliberately make a compelling argument for how a liberal arts approach to communication provides “marketable” skills. Our plan is to integrate this as a prevailing framework for the major and more directly into sections on theory in existing courses in the upcoming academic year.

Type of action: _X_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (e.g., cost, resource implications, source of funds, other resources):

Action 2: Reframe the outcomes of the program more as problem solving, decision making, strategizing, functional processes of organizing, and socially responsible processes of organizing.

Evidence to support action: In addition to teaching the framework of practical wisdom to
students, we would reframe the learning outcomes in terms of practical liberal arts skills rather than specific careers.

**Expected outcome:** By developing the language of problem solving, decision making, and strategizing, we can develop scripts as suggested by Dunn that can be used in explaining organizational communication to potential students and in providing a vocabulary of practice that current students can use to recognize how what they are learning in the classroom fits with lived experience. This would enable us to lose some of the current mental model of consulting and help us address some of the marketing concerns of the program while at the same time “elevate” liberal arts skills as having utility in the workplace.

**Timeline for action:** We are reading texts this summer regarding transcendent communication (Littlejohn) and language of practical theory (Barge) to more deliberately frame communication as transformative practice to improve organizations. Our plan is to integrate this language throughout courses in the upcoming academic year, especially when discussing organizational skills.

**Type of action:** _X_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

---

**Action 3:** Explore the possibility of developing community engagement projects as a model integrating liberal arts skills with practical skills.

**Evidence to support action:** Students have responded enthusiastically to applied projects such as service learning, guest speakers, and internships yet have seen these as too narrowly construed as consulting. A programmatic and tangible program associated with the liberal arts frame (Action Items 1 & 2) is needed.

**Expected outcome:** A communication approach to community engagement that integrates liberal arts and practical skills would help better identify with and enact an integrated approach to their major that is distinctly different from mass communication and business models. It would enable us to combine efforts for cultivating relationships with organizations for service learning as well as for internships and develop more engaged reflection and high impact learning without relying on a consulting framework. It could also enable us to more fully connect with Christian outreach goals and implementing socially responsible processes of organizing.
**Timeline for action:** An expected timeline for exploring such a model is three years in which to fully develop this model and its conditions (e.g., organizations or coalitions that struggle with moral conflict issues that would respond well to assistance with learning to use dialogue that transcends difference rather than mediation per se, see Littlejohn) and to cultivate relationships with select organizations for both community engagement work and internships. Based on concepts of community engagement as inquiry (Nadinne Cruz), integrated learning (Palmer and Zajonc) and dialogue projects in transcendence (Littlejohn) we have already begun conversations about the model and infrastructure needed.

**Type of action:** __ Resource neutral ___X_ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Faculty reassigned time and staffing, including perhaps master’s student assistance.

---

**Action 4:** Examine ways in which dialogue and organizing practices work in concert with other areas of human communication like leadership, rhetoric, intercultural, and interpersonal

**Evidence to support action:** The prior model for the organizational communication sequence was to provide recognizable skills to the major by linking the sequence with an outside concentration in other majors at Seaver College such as business administration, sociology, or psychology. More recently, the curriculum has replaced the outside concentration with courses within other courses in human communication, however, rather identify more with fields of rhetoric or intercultural communication, students differentiate themselves. As we explore more fully the liberal arts focus on organizing and dialogue in the form of community engagement (Actions 1-3), we will be open to ways other human communication majors are seeking greater integration.

**Expected outcome:** A greater integration of framing and programming among human communication majors could help students in all of these sequences find concrete and integrative ways to connect their critical thinking, liberal arts education with practical wisdom in meaningful organizational and civic involvement and attract more students to human communication.

**Timeline for action:** This is a long-term conversation to occur with the other tracks that
could explore a common focus on dialogue and leadership. In addition to such a common framework, if there is a common interest in community engagement with area organizations desiring assistance with engaging to learn ways to discuss moral conflict, our collective human communication faculty might pursue internal and external funding for such a program and perhaps even explore a kind of Center for Dialogue and Leadership. Until then, the organizational communication track will focus on processes of dialogue and organizing.

**Type of action:**    ___ Resource neutral    ___X_ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

As with Action #3, developing such a model and infrastructure with community organizations would involve faculty reassigned time and staffing, including perhaps master's student assistance.

____________________________________  __________________
Program Director/Chair                    Date
ADVERTISING PROGRAM REVIEW

Prepared by Ginger Rosenkrans, professor of advertising, with assistance from Debbie Wideroe, visiting professor of advertising.

Advertising Major Mission Statement

The advertising major equips students to attain the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values through a curriculum that combines advertising fundamentals with the theories and practice of multimedia design, campaign creation and execution, and management. Through case studies and hands-on campaigns working with high-profile clients nationwide, students explore ethical and leadership issues while gaining the needed skill set and competencies to launch into a career in the advertising and marketing field.

Advertising in Context

The Department of Advertising is within the Communication Division, which is one of the eight divisions in Seaver College at Pepperdine University. Advertising represents one of nine primary majors offered by the Communication Division, and students are required to take either an outside concentration or minor.

Curriculum

Students in the advertising major have benefited from core courses (i.e., Com 200, Com 300, Com 301, and Com 400) provided for Communication Division students. The advertising major complements the liberal arts courses and Seaver’s mission, which provide a good foundation for a career in advertising. Currently, Pepperdine’s advertising major requires eight courses:

1. MSCO 220: Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication
2. ADV 375: Advertising Media
3. ADV 475: Advertising Copywriting & Layout
4. ADV 561: Advertising Account Planning and Research
5. ADV 575: Advertising Campaign Management (capstone course)
6. ADV 595: Advertising Internship
(7) ADV 599: Advertising Directed Studies

(8) MSCO 371: Communication Graphics

(9) COM 570: Mass Communication Law

The curriculum also requires four communication core courses (i.e., COM 200, COM 300, COM 301, and Com 400) and 9-12 units of upper division courses for an outside concentration.

Program History and Changes

The Advertising program has a history of over 25 years. Its curriculum content was developed based on other institutions with similar programs and by related associations as more complete and rigorous. The program has a balance between academic theories and real-world application.

Changes that have occurred in the program since the last 5-year review include changing ADV 275 (Introduction to Advertising) to MSCO 292 (Introduction to Advertising and PR) to MSCO 220 (Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication).

Staffing Changes

Since the last 5-year review, staffing changes have changed in the Advertising Program. Five years ago the Ad Major Program had one tenured faculty member, one tenure-track faculty member, one instructor and adjunct faculty. Presently there are about 130 majors and enrollment peaked in 2007 to 206 majors. Dr. Kyu Chang, tenured Associate Professor of Advertising, left the University several years ago and his position has not been filled. Dr. Ginger Rosenkrans is the only tenured advertising faculty member. There are no tenure-track faculty members.

Professor Debbie Wideroe’s status changed from Instructor to Visiting Assistant Professor in Communication and she has taken the additional load of Director of Internships for the Communication Division. Additionally, Professor Dana Zurzolo’s Lecture position has changed to Visiting Assistant Professor of Graphics, a joint position with the Communication and Art Departments.

Since the last five year review, the following adjunct professors have been teaching in the advertising curriculum: Hong Kha, Brian Hemsworth, and Joe Huggins. All academic advising for the Advertising Major has gone to one tenured faculty member since there are no other tenured or tenure-track faculty members in the advertising Program. Professor Debbie Wideroe, Visiting Assistant Professor of Communication and Director of Internships, volunteers to advise students.
COMPARISON WITH PEER PROGRAMS

The following is an analysis of advertising and media related programs/majors/degrees at 23 universities in the United States. The table below lists the program names and universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College of Journalism and Communication</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>College of Communication</td>
<td>Cal State Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School of Communication</td>
<td>Northwestern University and Western Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Media</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Communication Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Mass Communication</td>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Design</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of journalism, Media Arts, Strategic Communication</td>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Communication and Information Science</td>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Communication and Information</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School of Journalism and Mass Communication</td>
<td>Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School of Mass Communication</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advertising Program Overview

Fourteen of the 23 universities analyzed offer an advertising major/program/degree. One of the 23 universities offers a BA in communication with an emphasis in advertising (California State University at Fullerton) and another university (University of Oregon) offers a journalism-advertising degree. One of the 23 universities analyzed offers an integrated marketing communications degree/program (Northwestern). Five of the universities analyzed did not offer an advertising degree; however, their programs include interactive/digital media. Lastly, one of the universities (Stanford) offers a communication degree with three tracks that also incorporate interactive media: Communication Technologies, Communication and Public Affairs, and Media Practices and Performance.

Department Titles for Advertising Degrees

Fourteen of the 23 schools analyzed have four different titles for their advertising programs. The University of Illinois, Michigan State University, University of Nebraska, Temple University, Southern Methodist University, and the University of Texas report their programs as the Department of Advertising. Four programs use titles that include Public Relations (University of Alabama, Florida International University, Penn State University, University of Tennessee—University of Tennessee name is reported as a “School”). The University of Missouri’s department uses Department of Strategic Communication, and Northwestern University bears the name Department of Integrated Marketing Communications. Two changes are at Texas Tech University where it is a self-standing Department of Advertising and the University of Kansas is the Strategic Communications Track.

History of Department Name Changes for Advertising (Ross and Richards, 2008)

Over 43 years there have been changes but the number of Departments of Advertising remains the most widely used name referring to an advertising program while the Department of Advertising and Public Relations have increased from one to four. The two most noted changes have been in advertising programs hearing titles of Strategic Communication and Integrated Marketing Communications.

Program Trendsetters in Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>School of Communications</th>
<th>Penn State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School of Humanities and Sciences</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School of Journalism</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School of the Arts</td>
<td>Southern Methodist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Name Undetermined</td>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an analysis of 23 universities that offer mass media programs/degrees, eight advertising degree programs are similar to Pepperdine’s and at least five advertising degree programs are leading edge: (1) University of Texas at Austin, (2) University of Florida, (3) Florida International University, (4) Michigan State University, and (5) University of Illinois. The University of Texas at Austin, Florida International University, and Michigan State University offer the most robust advertising programs. These Universities’ advertising programs offer advertising tracks and incorporate digital/interactive media in their program requirements. The University of Texas at Austin offers two tracks: Creative (includes interactive) and Media (includes interactive). Florida International University offers two tracks: Creative and Account Management. Michigan State University offers two tracks: Creative (includes interactive design) and Management and Media (includes interactive management and integrated strategy). Additionally, these three universities have a greater number of advertising faculty members compared to Pepperdine. For example, the University of Texas at Austin has 35 full-time advertising faculty members (http://advertising.utexas.edu/faculty). The University of Florida boasts it has one of the nation’s oldest advertising programs with 13 faculty teaching advertising. It offers a broader range of courses than Pepperdine, including retailing. It also has an Interactive Media Lab. The University of Illinois’ robust advertising program also has 13 faculty teaching advertising and requires two different consumer courses and an audience analysis course in addition to other required advertising course. All five of these universities are more leading edge in their advertising program than Pepperdine and require an introduction or principles to advertising, introduction to integrated communication, and/or introduction to integrated communication research strategy class. Pepperdine’s similar course is the MSCO 220 class: introduction to integrated marketing communication.

**Academic Advising**

Many universities that offer an advertising program/degree have appointed academic advisors that take care of student advising instead of faculty advising students. For example, the University of Texas at Austin’s 35 advertising faculty do not advise students; however, one person is appointed to advise students on course selection and degree planning; they also consult with students on specific issues, both academic and nonacademic.

**Centers, Labs and Institutes Comparisons**

Several universities have centers or labs for research. For example, Stanford University has a Communication Between Humans and Interactive Media (CHIME) Lab (http://chime.stanford.edu/), a Political Communication Lab, Virtual Human Interaction Lab (http://vhil.stanford.edu), a Communication between Humans and Interactive Media Lab, and a Center for Deliberative Democracy. The University of Texas at Austin’s Advertising Department has a Center for Brand Research. Florida International University’s School of Journalism and Mass Communication has a Scripps Howard Media Lab. The University of Florida’s College of Journalism and Communication has an Interactive Media Lab, Brechner Center for Freedom of Information, Marion Brechner, Citizen Access Project, Center for Media Innovation and Research, The Documentary Institute, and the Institute for Public Relations. The University of Illinois’ College of
Media has an Institute of Communications Research. Southern Methodist University has The Temerlin Advertising Institute.

**University Program Recaps and Links**

Cal State Fullerton College of Communications
http://communications.fullerton.edu/

BA in Communications with concentrations in one of the following: Advertising, Entertainment Studies, Journalism, Photocommunications, Public Relations. BA in Radio/TV/Film. Advertising concentration is similar to Pepperdine's. Offers principles of advertising (we offer intro to IMC), writing for advertising, ad media, ad creative, ad campaigns. The advertising program has seven advertising concentration faculty.

Florida International University School of Journalism and Mass Communication
http://journalism.fiu.edu/

Advertising, PR, Journalism majors. They have a more robust advertising program than Pepperdine. The School has two tracks (CREATIVE and ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT) with track requirements before entering the track. Requires integrated communications course in addition to the principles of advertising and principles of PR courses. Also requires a Radio/TV course. The School has a Scripps Howard Media Lab.

Louisiana State University Manship School of Mass Communication
http://appl003.lsu.edu/masscomm/mcweb.nsf/index

Advertising, Journalism, PR, Political Communication majors. They have a more robust advertising program than Pepperdine. Requires the similar courses we require and requires electronic media ad sales, ad problems, advertising theory and processes, issues in advertising, and direct response advertising and promotion (includes digital). It has only a principles of advertising course instead of what we offer as intro to integrated marketing communication.

Michigan State University College of Communication Arts and Sciences
http://adv.msu.edu/modules.php?name=Pages&sp_id=761

Advertising, PR, and Retailing majors/degrees. Michigan has a robust advertising program—more robust than Pepperdine’s. Two areas of concentration are offered for advertising majors: Creative or Management. Interactive advertising design is required for the creative concentration and interactive advertising management is required for the management concentration. Both
concentrations require consumer behavior, campaigns, principle of advertising courses (we have intro to IMC). The Management concentration also requires integrated strategy, international advertising, promotion, and courses our program requires.

Northwestern University School of Communication

Department of Integrated Marketing Communication
http://www.communication.northwestern.edu/
http://www.medill.northwestern.edu/imc/page.aspx?id=63021&ekmensel=c580fa7b_23_79_63021_4

Northwestern offers a degree in IMC through Medill. It is different from advertising and all other advertising programs/degrees. It closely resembles a marketing degree with required courses in Communications & Persuasive Messages; Consumer Insight, Marketing finance; Database Marketing and Analysis; Communities; Media Economics and Technology; Law, Policy and Ethics, Marketing Mix Analysis & Planning; Brand & Advertising Decisions (only ad class offered); Marketing Public Relations Management; Crisis Communication; Database Marketing; Digital Marketing; Consumer Loyalty; Segmentation and Lifetime Value; Quantitative Marketing Analysis; Managing the Integration Process; The Intuitive Marketer; Investor Relations Management; Asia Perspectives; Building Brand Equity; Entertainment Marketing; Global Communication; Marketing Measurement; and Negotiations. The department produces a Journal of Integrated Marketing Communications. The School of Communication does not offer majors in advertising, PR, or journalism. It does offer a program in TV/Film.

Penn State School of Communications
http://bulletins.psu.edu/bulletins/bluebook/college_campus_details.cfm?id=23
http://bulletins.psu.edu/bulletins/bluebook/college_campus_details.cfm?id=23&program=ad_pr.htm

Majors: Advertising/PR, Journalism, Media Studies, Telecommunications, Film/Video. Their advertising courses are similar to Pepperdine's and requires additional coursework in advertising and PR. Requires advertising in society, introduction to advertising (we have intro to IMC), research methods in advertising and PR, advertising creative strategies, advertising media planning, ad campaigns, advertising message strategy, international and intercultural communications, client/agency relations, mass media politics, advanced photography, media effects: theory and research, and ethics and regulation in advertising and PR.

San Jose State University
http://info.sjsu.edu/web-dbgen/catalog/degrees/all-degrees.html

Art and Design (digital media art, graphic design, animation, illustration, and more) Communication Studies Department offers a BA in Communication Studies.

Southern Methodist University School of the Arts
http://smu.edu/meadows
http://smu.edu/meadows/advertising

Majors: Advertising, Art, Art History, Arts Administration, Cinema-TV, Corporate Communications and Public Affairs, Dance, Journalism, Music, Theatre. The School of the Arts has The Temerlin Advertising Institute. It has a theoretical and practical curriculum and its courses are similar to Pepperdine’s. The program offers three tracks in advertising: General, Creative, and Media. The advertising degree program is supported by 13 advertising faculty.

Stanford University School of Humanities and Sciences
http://communication.stanford.edu/undergrad/index.html

Stanford has a Communication Department and Communication Major offers three tracks: Communication Technologies, Communication and Public Affairs, and Media Practices and Performance. Courses include both theory and practicum in media and society, technology, digital, journalism, and communication research. They require more digital classes than our communication division offers or requires. They have Research Groups/Centers: Communication between Humans and Interactive Media (CHIMe) Lab (http://chime.stanford.edu/), Political Communication Lab, Virtual Human Interaction Lab (http://vhil.stanford.edu), Communication between Humans and Interactive Media Lab, Center for Deliberative Democracy

Texas Tech University College of Mass Communication
http://www.depts.ttu.edu/masscom/
http://www.depts.ttu.edu/masscom/programs/

Advertising, Electronic Media & Communications, Journalism, and Public Relations degrees. Has a robust advertising program. Offers similar courses as we do and requires courses in electronic media, courses in business (statistics, marketing strategy, and more) and it requires a minor. It requires a principles in advertising course (we have intro to IMC), Principles of Advertising, Advertising Writing: Advertising Media Planning, Advertising Creative Strategy, Advertising Management and Account Planning, Advertising Campaigns: News Writing, Introduction to Mass Communications, Media Theories and Society, Mass Communications Law, and Mass Communications Research Methods.

University of Alabama: College of Communication and Information Science
http://www.cis.ua.edu/

Advertising and Public Relations Department, Communication Studies, Journalism, Library and Information Studies, Telecommunication and Film. The College has The Institute for Communication and Information Research (ICIR), a Center for Public TV and Radio, and The Plank Center for Leadership in Public Relations.

Did not find any curriculum/courses information online.

University of Florida College of Journalism and Communication
http://www.jou.ufl.edu/
http://www.jou.ufl.edu/academic/adv/default.asp
Advertising, PR, Journalism and Telecommunications majors/degrees. The College of Journalism and Communications' Department of Advertising boasts it is one of the nation's oldest. They have 13 faculty teaching advertising. Their advertising program is similar to ours but also requires courses in advertising strategy, elements of advertising (we have intro to IMC), copywriting and visualization, ad design and graphics, retail advertising (or other special topics offered in the semester), and marketing. The College of Journalism and Communication has several centers and institutes: Brechner Center for Freedom of Information, Marion Brechner, Citizen Access Project, Center for Media Innovation and Research, The Documentary Institute, Institute for Public Relations, Interactive Media Lab

University of Illinois College of Media
http://www.media.illinois.edu/programs/
http://www.media.illinois.edu/programs/#advertising
Majors/Degrees: Advertising, Journalism, Journalism: Broadcast, Journalism-News Editorial, Media Studies. Has Department of Advertising with 13 advertising faculty. Has a robust advertising program that requires intro to advertising (we have intro to IMC), ad research methods, consumer communications and the public, classic campaigns, advertising history, creative strategy and tactics, audience analysis, advertising management, social ad cult context of advertising, and persuasion consumer response. The College of Media has an Institute of Communications Research.

University of Minnesota College of Design
http://onestop2.umn.edu/programCatalog/viewCatalogSamplePlan.do?samplePlanID=12196&programID=57&programSeq=8187
BS in Graphic Design. Not much information was provided online other than pre-graphic design courses to be taken in order to be admitted to the program in full. Pre-graphic design classes: Introduction to Design Thinking, Foundations: Drawing and Design in Two and Three Dimensions, Foundations: Color and Design in Two and Three Dimensions, Foundations: The Graphic Studio

University of Missouri School of Journalism
http://journalism.missouri.edu/undergraduate/
Convergence, Magazine, Photojournalism, Print/Digital News, Radio/TV, Strategic Communication (advertising falls under this heading). Unable to locate curriculum for each of these programs.

University of Nebraska College of Journalism and Mass Communication
http://www.unl.edu/journalism/
Advertising, broadcasting, news editorial. No courses/curriculum information provided on the college site.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, College of Arts and Sciences
http://college.unc.edu/
Media studies program. Media studies/production offers courses in animation, film production, interactive media, communication and information technologies, and more. Please see document.

University of Oklahoma Gaylord College of Journalism, Media Arts, Strategic Communication
http://webapps.ou.edu/academics/default.cfm?Academic=1774375
http://www.ou.edu/gaylord/home/main/majors/advertising/2.html
Advertising, Broadcast and Electronic Media, Journalism. Professional Writing, and Public Relations majors/programs. The advertising major requires similar advertising courses that we require but also requires an additional nine elective course hours in typography and design, radio and TV, advanced copywriting, international advertising, and more. It requires Principles of Advertising (we have intro to IMC). It also requires two marketing classes.

University of Oregon School of Journalism and Communication
http://uoadmit.uoregon.edu/explore/majors#a5
Majors: Journalism, Journalism: Advertising, Journalism: Communication Studies, Journalism: Electronic Media, Journalism: Magazine, Journalism: News-Editorial, Journalism: PR. They offer courses in digital/electronic media. Unable to locate detailed information on curriculum. Did not see an advertising degree program; however, advertising was included in a journalism major.

University of Tennessee College of Communication and Information
School of Advertising and Public Relations
http://www.cci.utk.edu/
http://www.cci.utk.edu/advpr/syllabi
Majors: Advertising, Communication Studies, Journalism and Electronic Media, Public Relations. The University of Tennessee’s advertising major is similar to Pepperdine’s major. Courses include a principles to advertising (Pepperdine’s Ad Major has an intro to IMC), design, research, creative, media strategy, management, and campaigns. It has 16 faculty members who teach in the School of Advertising and PR and 12 Graduate Teaching Associates.

University of Texas at Austin College of Communication
http://communication.utexas.edu/
Majors: Advertising, PR, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Communication Studies, Journalism, Radio-TV-Film. Univ of Texas at Austin has a robust advertising program and offers two tracks: Creative and Media (both include interactive). They are leading and cutting-edge in offering courses in advertising. The Creative track has a course on nontraditional media concepts, introduction to creativity, non-traditional media concepts, portfolio classes, art direction, team brand building, copywriting, and more. The Media track requires digital media, advanced media planning, media alliances, media research, media sales, media show, online consumer research, integrated communication campaigns, digital media seminar, digital metrics, and online privacy. It offers for these tracks an Interactive Campaigns class and a digital media seminar class. It has an intro to integrated communication (we have intro to IMC). The Department of Advertising has 35
faculty members. The College of Communication also has The Center for Brand Research.

Wayne State University College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

http://www.comm.wayne.edu

The Department of Communication at Wayne State University offers majors in communication studies, dispute resolution, public relations, film, journalism, and media arts and studies. Did not see an advertising degree program.

Western Michigan University School of Communication

http://www.wmich.edu/communication/

Interpersonal, Journalism, PR, Telecommunications and Information Management degrees.

SEAVER'S ADVERTISING PROGRAM AND ADVERTISING TRENDS

Seaver’s Advertising Program’s Enrollment Trends

Between 2006 and 2011, the percentage of advertising majors in the department averaged about 27% of total enrollment within the Communication Division, and enrollment has remained steady in the last five years with a spike of 206 majors in 2007.

The following Table reflects the number of ad majors during the past five years. The percentage of advertising majors in the department averaged about 27% of total enrollment within the Communication Division.

Seaver’s Advertising Major Student Enrollment from Fall 2006-Spring 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Advertising</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 Fall</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Spring</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Fall</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following Figure shows the number of Ad Majors compared to the overall number of majors in the Communication Division. Ad Major enrollments have remained steady with a spike of advertising majors in 2007.

Seaver's Student Enrollment from Fall 2005-Spring 2011
The following Table shows that .28% of the communication division degrees came from ad majors in the past five years.

**Degrees Awarded from Fall 2005 - Spring 2011, Pepperdine University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Advertising</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2604</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2074</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2084</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2092</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2094</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2114</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following Figure shows the number of ad major degrees awarded in the Communication Division from 2005-2011. .28% of the Communication Division degrees came from ad majors in the past five years.

**Advertising Degrees Awarded from Fall 2005 - 2011, Pepperdine University**

The following is the Communication Division’s and Advertising Department’s SAT scores.

**SAT Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enroll Term</th>
<th>Fall 05 Math</th>
<th>Fall 06 Math</th>
<th>Fall 07 Reading</th>
<th>Fall 07 Math</th>
<th>Fall 08 Reading</th>
<th>Fall 08 Math</th>
<th>Fall 09 Reading</th>
<th>Fall 10 Reading</th>
<th>Fall 10 Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com Div Average</td>
<td>584.69</td>
<td>583.84</td>
<td>591.17</td>
<td>586.04</td>
<td>590.51</td>
<td>593.27</td>
<td>586.11</td>
<td>583.07</td>
<td>591.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table provides a snapshot of Ethnicity in the Communication Division.

### Ethnicity in the Communication Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>2,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more race</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>809</strong></td>
<td><strong>810</strong></td>
<td><strong>855</strong></td>
<td><strong>842</strong></td>
<td><strong>806</strong></td>
<td><strong>726</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,843</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pepperdine’s Ad Major Program

There is an ever-increasing external need from the advertising industry to equip more well-trained professionals with academic and character development. According to a November 30, 2011 Forbes article, ad agencies, public relations agencies, media buyers and other businesses that work in that space between advertisers and media owners have seen an average sales increase of more than 11 percent in 2011. Additionally, IBIS World indicates Advertising agencies’ revenues will increase beyond 2011. The 2011 report asserts that market conditions will continue to change in favor of the advertising industry as media expenditure, disposable income, consumer sentiment, and corporate profit are all projected to increase in 2012. Further, IBIS World’s October 2011 report by David Grimes purports that online advertising is among the fastest growing industries. Online and
social media popularity among consumers will drive growth.

In a September 13, 2011 Wall Street Journal article by Gregory Beyer, the most common majors for success in the advertising industry are Advertising and Marketing. In this article, advertising industry professionals purport that "Fifty-eight percent of respondents to a PayScale.com survey said that the skills they acquired while earning a degree in their particular major made a difference in their careers. Forty-five percent said they were satisfied with their careers, and 44% said they had received at least two promotions."

**Advertising/Marketing: Fastest Growing and Best Paying Jobs in Advertising/Marketing**

According to payscale.com (2011), the following jobs in Marketing/Advertising are the fastest growing, most satisfying, and best paying jobs within the field of marketing/advertising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Average Starting Pay</th>
<th>Average Pay (5 Years Out)</th>
<th>Job Growth (BLS 2008-2018)</th>
<th>Education Reimbursement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Marketing Manager</td>
<td>$33,300</td>
<td>$58,400</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Account Supervisor</td>
<td>$31,700</td>
<td>$62,900</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Marketing Coordinator</td>
<td>$30,100</td>
<td>$44,200</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Marketing Manager</td>
<td>$40,300</td>
<td>$55,500</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Consultant</td>
<td>$42,600</td>
<td>$56,300</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
<td>$34,300</td>
<td>$50,800</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Account Executive</td>
<td>$31,800</td>
<td>$42,600</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ad Agencies’ Revenue and Employment

The following Table reflects ad agencies’ revenue and employment since 2002 and its projections through 2016. This data shows steady ad agency revenue and employment growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Expend ($m)</th>
<th>Domestic Demand ($m)</th>
<th>Wages ($m)</th>
<th>Exports ($m)</th>
<th>Imports ($m)</th>
<th>Wages ($m)</th>
<th>Domestic Demand ($m)</th>
<th>Wages ($m)</th>
<th>Domestic Demand ($m)</th>
<th>Wages ($m)</th>
<th>Domestic Demand ($m)</th>
<th>Wages ($m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25,686.50</td>
<td>12,002</td>
<td>10,982</td>
<td>149,054</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,332.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>239.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>239.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>26,681.00</td>
<td>12,596</td>
<td>11,495</td>
<td>155,939</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,134.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>28,432.00</td>
<td>12,998</td>
<td>11,901</td>
<td>159,255</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,941.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>263.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>263.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>28,564.10</td>
<td>13,239</td>
<td>12,127</td>
<td>156,462</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,793.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>30,359.20</td>
<td>13,508</td>
<td>12,436</td>
<td>166,422</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,269.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>281.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>281.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>31,660.90</td>
<td>13,459</td>
<td>12,348</td>
<td>168,086</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,930.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>283.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>283.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>30,141.10</td>
<td>13,021</td>
<td>12,056</td>
<td>163,716</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,864.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28,031.30</td>
<td>12,597</td>
<td>11,773</td>
<td>154,057</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,894.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>241.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>241.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28,227.50</td>
<td>12,476</td>
<td>11,714</td>
<td>150,513</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,984.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>29,215.40</td>
<td>12,697</td>
<td>11,978</td>
<td>156,383</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,731.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>278.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>278.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30,530.10</td>
<td>12,517</td>
<td>11,757</td>
<td>161,231</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,043.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>294.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>294.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>31,659.80</td>
<td>12,955</td>
<td>12,154</td>
<td>165,101</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,405.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>309.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>309.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32,862.80</td>
<td>13,408</td>
<td>13,448</td>
<td>169,228</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,788.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>319.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>319.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>34,177.30</td>
<td>13,938</td>
<td>13,713</td>
<td>172,613</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,208.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>305.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>305.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>35,373.50</td>
<td>14,379</td>
<td>13,955</td>
<td>176,065</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,564.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>308.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>308.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online Advertising Revenues

A significant area of growth for the advertising industry involves online advertising. According to Emarketer, which includes daily research articles, analyst reports, and a database of e-business and online marketing statistics, aggregated and analyzed from over 2,800 sources, online ad revenues will increase through 2013. See Table below.

**US Online and Total Ad Revenues, 2009-2013**

*billions, % change and % of total*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total online ad revenues</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$22.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$26.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$31.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$36.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$41.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total ad revenues**

*$163.59 $170.90 $172.85 $177.81 $184.83 $

*% change* $-16% $4% $1% $3% $4% 

*Online % of total* $14% $15% $18% $21% $23%

*Note: 2009 and 2010 data from IAB/PwC
Source: Citigroup Investment Research, Dec 8, 2011*
Online Advertising Tactics

Within the area of online advertising, the following table shows the top online tactics that will be deployed in 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online Marketing Tactics for Which Spending Will Increase in 2012 According to US Ad Agencies and Public Relations Firms</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social engagement</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital content</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytics</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVES/GOALS OF PEPPERDINE’S ADVERTISING PROGRAM

The objectives and goals of the Advertising Program at Pepperdine University are to:

1) emphasize that a sense of vocation requires an integration of faith and training in a particular field of endeavor as well as the utilization of that vocation for a life of service;

2) equip students for the evolving world of advertising, including digital advertising;

3) teach critical thinking and the application of the advertising research;

4) provide training in the enterprise of science, including the design of a research project, the implementation of a campaign, the analysis and interpretation of data, and the presentation of ad campaigns to a real class client and professionals;

5) develop first-hand knowledge of ad campaigns;

6) provide access to undergraduate research activities under the direction of members of the advertising faculty, including the opportunity to design and implement an ad project;

7) foster understanding of ethical issues in advertising;

8) make students aware of the diverse career opportunities in the advertising field and provide guidance on how to find an internship before graduation and a job after graduation;

9) integrate diversity in course work

ADVERTISING PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOS)

Advertising Program’s PLOs

1. Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.

2. Design effective visual communication for various advertising approaches that combine the use of print, online and other multi-media communication.
3. Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

4. Develop advertising media buying and planning strategies.

5. Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s)

Table 1. Advertising Program Learning Outcome Matrix (I = introduced; D= Demonstrated; M = mastered)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PLO 1</th>
<th>PLO 2</th>
<th>PLO 3</th>
<th>PLO 4</th>
<th>PLO 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I/D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 475</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 561</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 575</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 371</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents an alignment map that relates learning outcomes identified by the Advertising Program with those outlined by Seaver College and the Communication Division. Advertising courses related to both sets of learning outcomes are listed on the right hand side of the table.

PLO#1 Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.

PLO#2: Design effective visual communication for various advertising approaches that combine the use of print, online and other multi-media communication.
PLO#3: Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

PLO#4: Develop advertising media buying and planning strategies.

PLO#5: Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s).

Table 2. Alignment Map of Learning Outcomes
School: Seaver College/Communication Division
Program: Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes from IEOs</th>
<th>Advertising Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery. | PLO #1: Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.  
PLO #2: Design effective visual communication for various advertising approaches that combine the use of print, online and other multi-media communication.  
PLO #3: Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).  
PLO #4: Develop advertising media buying and planning strategies.  
PLO #5: Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s). | MSCO 220  
MSCO 371  
ADV 575  
ADV 475  
ADV 375  
ADV 561 |
| Explore the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice. | PLO #1: Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication. | MSCO 220  
MSCO 371  
ADV 575  
ADV 595  
ADV 475  
ADV 375  
ADV 561 |
|---|---|---|
| Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity. | PLO #1: Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.  

PLO#5: Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s). | MSCO 220  
MSCO 371  
MSCO 475  
ASCO 575 |
| Apply knowledge to real-world challenges. | PLO#2: Design effective visual communication for various advertising approaches that combine the use of print, online and other multi-media communication.  

PLO#3: Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s). | MSCO 220  
ADV 575  
ADV 475  
ADV 595 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO#5: Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s).</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the responsibility and call to use one's talents in the service of others rather than merely for personal or material gain.</td>
<td>PLO#1 Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220 ADV 575 ADV 475 DV 595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.</td>
<td>PLO#1 Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220 ADV 575 ADV 475 ADV 595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Read widely, think critically, and communicate clearly. | PLO #1: Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.  
PLO #2: Design effective visual communication for various advertising approaches that combine the use of print, online and other multi-media communication.  
PLO #3: Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).  
PLO#5: Develop and integrate communication strategies in an |
| MSCO 371 ADV 575 ADV 475 ADV 561 ADV 375 |
Engage in responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.

PLO#3: Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

PLO#5: Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s).

MSCO 220
ADV 575
ADV 475

Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.

PLO#3: Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

PLO#5: Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s).

MSCO 220
ADV 575
ADV 475

PROGRAM QUALITY

Student Profile

Student recruitment focuses primarily on predictors of academic success, such as either SAT or ACT scores and high school GPA. The average high school GPA for the Advertising Program is almost the same average as for the Communication Division.

Table 3. High School GPA from Fall 2005 – Spring 2011
Table 4. High School GPA from Fall 2005 – Spring 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Advertising</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Advertising Majors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pep GPA</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Verbal</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Communication Division Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pep</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Verbal</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Profile

The Department of Advertising has one tenured faculty member; one full-time visting
faculty member, who also is Director of Internships; three adjunct faculty; and one part-time visiting faculty member who teaches in the Communication Division and Fine Arts Division; two men and four women; and in terms of ethnicity, five are classified as white and one is classified as Asian American. Currently, one member of the advertising faculty is tenured and there are no advertising faculty members on tenure track.

The list of faculty and their specific rank are as follows: Dr. Ginger Rosenkrans (Associate Professor), Debbie Wideroe (Visiting Assistant Professor and Director of Internships), Dana Zurzolo (Visiting Assistant Professor for the Communication and Fine Arts Divisions—part time with Communication Division), Brian Hemsworth (Adjunct Professor), Joe Huggins (Adjunct Professor), and Hong Kha (Adjunct Professor). Specialties of the faculty are diverse enough to accommodate the curriculum offered within the department. Table 5 shows a breakdown of each faculty member’s specialty, and Table 6 shows the courses taught by each member of the faculty.

Note: Matt McKissick (Adjunct Professor) and Makenzie Rasmussen (Adjunct Professor) will teach MSCO 371 beginning Spring 2012.
Table 7. Expertise of Members of the Advertising Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ginger Rosenkrans</td>
<td>PhD, 2001</td>
<td>Nova Southeastern University</td>
<td>Digital Advertising (online, mobile, tablet, social media, emerging digital advertising)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Wideroe</td>
<td>EdM, 1983</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Marketing and Branding, Entertainment Licensing and Merchandising, Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Hemsworth</td>
<td>MBA, 2002</td>
<td>California Lutheran University</td>
<td>Media Planning, Brand Development, Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kha</td>
<td>MA, 2002</td>
<td>California State University, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Education Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Huggins</td>
<td>MA, MBA</td>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>Marketing of entrepreneurial service ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Zurzolo</td>
<td>MA, 2001</td>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Graphic Design, Typography, Fiber Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. List of courses offered and faculty members responsible for each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Offered</th>
<th>Courses Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV 599: Advertising Directed Studies</td>
<td>Rosenkrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 595: Advertising Internship</td>
<td>Rosenkrans, Wideroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 575: Advertising Campaign</td>
<td>Wideroe, Rosenkrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 475: Copy and Layout</td>
<td>Rosenkrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 561: Advertising Research and Planning</td>
<td>Wideroe, Rosenkrans, Huggins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 375: Advertising Media</td>
<td>Hemsworth, Wideroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 371: Communication Graphics</td>
<td>Rosenkrans, Zurzolo, Kha, McKissick*, Rasmussen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220: Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication</td>
<td>Rosenkrans, Wideroe, Furtney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Begin in Spring 2012

**ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR THE AD PROGRAM**

Learning Outcome 1:

Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.

This learning outcome is assessed in ADV 575, ADV 475, ADV 561, MSCO 371, and MSCO 220.
In each of the courses assessment is done by the depth of understanding through exams, portfolios, and/or projects. Students master this learning outcome in ADV 575 by developing an individual ad campaign project; students demonstrate this outcome in ADV 475 through a creative ad campaign group project; students demonstrate this in ADV 561 through the use of assignments; students in MSCO 371 are introduced to this learning outcome through individual projects and a progressive portfolio; and in MSCO 220 students are introduced to this outcome through use exams and a group project.

Examples of Evidence of Student Learning Outcome that aligns with this Program Learning Outcome

ADV 575

ADV 575 is the Ad Major’s capstone course. The following charts demonstrate that the past 5 years students are demonstrating mastery in this Program Learning Outcome. Evidence is based on rankings of 1-5 by internal and external reviewers, with the average of 4.25 over the past five years. Improvement can be made in the digital/online area of the ad campaign (execution of online/digital). Please see the appendix on the rubrics used to assess this program learning outcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- **Q1**: Mastery in visual communication that combines the use of print, online, and other multi-media communication
- **Q2**: Mastery in the ability to defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign
- **Q3**: Mastery in the ability to develop ad media planning strategies
- **Q4**: Mastery in the ability to develop and integrate communication strategies into a creative ad campaign
- **Q5**: Mastery in the ability to describe any research theories, practice, legal, and ethical challenges

**ADV 561**

ADV 561 student learning outcomes regarding SLO 1 are aligned with this program learning outcome.

**Student Learning Outcomes**
1) Field Specific Knowledge and Experience: Students will be expected to reflect a knowledge of the critical concepts of Advertising, Account Planning and Research based on Consumer Behavior theory drawn from sound traditional principles and supported by current, challenging examples. The level of knowledge gained will be measured through two examinations based on the text, class presentations and handout material.

2) Critical Thinking Skills: Students will develop the ability and the perspective necessary for successfully applying consumer behavior marketing concepts. An ongoing review of pertinent current events will provide a model for students to apply consumer behavior theory from various perspectives they progress through the course.

3) Written Communication Skills: Students are required to submit a professionally written project paper / presentation that reflects a clear, interesting and effective communications style with relevant insights and examples. The project / term report and two essay examinations are assigned to measure the application of effective, clear written communications skills.

The following table provides information on how various forms of assessment contribute to the student learning outcomes as highlighted above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Assessment</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance and Participation in Sessions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Discussion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Exam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence shows students are achieving the student learning outcomes as well as program learning outcomes in ADV 561. For example, nearly all students adequately answered two of several final exam questions that show students are learning theories relevant to advertising.

Example of two final exam questions:
1. As the recession’s impact on employment and consumer spending lingers, marketers must monitor the situation and alter their marketing strategies to respond to current economic conditions and consumer’s resources. Identify and describe strategies that companies can implement to adjust their product design, pricing, promotion or distribution in response to these changing dynamics.

2. What three key concepts did you find most useful in understanding customer behavior? Why are they important to you?

ADV 475

In ADV 475, evidence shows during the past five years that students are analyzing and demonstrating the use of theories, ethical applications, legal applications, and diversity in their creative ad campaigns. An average ranking of 4.0 (out of 5) from internal and external reviewers were given for this Program Learning Outcome. The following is a sample from the Fall 2011 Butterfly Twists ad campaign’s pint ad draft reflecting diversity.

MSCO 371

Over the past five years, students have been introduced to the theories, diversity, legal and ethical issues in advertising. Students’ work and questions embedded in exams reflect their understanding in these areas.

Assessment Techniques
- Direct and Indirect Assessment: Pre- and post-test terms and survey
- Direct Assessment: Rubrics to evaluate hands-on exercises
- Direct Assessment: Rubrics to evaluate print designs
- Direct Assessment: Rubrics to evaluate website design
- Direct Assessment: Rubrics to evaluate portfolio
- Direct Assessment: Midterm
- Indirect Assessment: Course survey

MSCO 220

In the past five years, MCO 220 has undergone several changes. It was originally a course designed for ADV 275: Principles of Advertising. The course then changed to MSCO 292: Introduction to Advertising and PR and then changed to MSCO 220: Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication. With a
A culture of assessment in the Ad Major Program, assessment of student learning in MSCO is in progress.

Advertising and PR faculty have been working together to assess this course. The goals of the course are to equip students with the ability to critically examine advertising as a means of communication, an economic and social institution, a tool of marketing and public relations, and an influence on consumer buying decisions and behavior. This includes the exploration of terminology used in the advertising, marketing, and PR industries that provide them with the ability to produce an advertising and PR project (e.g., branding strategy, lifecycle stage, target audience, media choices/media planning relative to target audience, appeals used in ads, slogans and logos, ad copy, design principles, research employed, news releases, PR and marketing in all media).

MSCO 220: Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

A student who successfully completes this course should be able to:

1. Articulate an understanding of important advertising, integrated marketing communication, and public relations theories, terms, and concepts
2. Critically assess advertising as a means of communication, an economic and social institution, a tool for marketing and public relations, and an influence on consumer buying decisions and behavior
3. Differentiate the influence and role of public relations in society, its value to organizations in building mutually beneficial relationships with internal and external publics, its value to publics in contributing to their ability to make informed decisions, and its use as a tool for marketing and advertising
4. Identify various communication formats and the media planning and buying strategies used to deploy them
5. Demonstrate competent oral and written communication skills
6. Critically evaluate public relations, IMC, and advertising messages and ethical behavior that communicates with diverse groups in a sensitive manner

MSCO 220’s Student Learning Outcomes support the Advertising, Integrated Marketing Communication, and Public Relations Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) by introducing students to relevant theories, visual communication, media planning and buying strategies, research, philosophies, ethics, diversity, and practices in these professions and allowing them to demonstrate that understanding through a major project

Assessment techniques
Direct Assessment: Pre-Post test terms
Indirect Assessment: Pre-class survey
Direct Assessment: Rubrics to evaluate Advertising and Public Relations written project
Direct Assessment: Rubrics to evaluate project presentation
Direct Assessment: Rubrics to evaluate class assignments
Direct Assessment: Midterm
Direct Assessment: Final exam
Indirect Assessment: Post-class survey

**Learning Outcome 2:**

**Design effective visual communication for various advertising approaches that combine the use of print, online and other multi-media communication.**

This learning outcome is assesses in ADV 575, ADV 475, ADV 561, MSCO 371, and MSCO 220.

One of the primary goals is to assess student learning through exams, portfolios, and/or projects. In ADV 575 students demonstrate mastery of this outcome through an individual ad campaign project that is then presented to external and internal reviewers who evaluate the campaign; in ADV 475 students demonstrate this outcome through a creative ad campaign group project that is presented to multiple external and internal judges that evaluate the campaign; in ADV 561 students demonstrate this outcome through assignments; in MSCO 371 students demonstrate this outcome through individual projects and a progressive portfolio; and in MSCO 220 students are introduced to this outcome through exams and a group project.

**Examples of Evidence of Student Learning Outcome that aligns with this Program Learning Outcome**

**ADV 575**

ADV 575 is the Ad Major’s capstone course. The following charts demonstrate that the past 5 years students are demonstrating mastery in this Program Learning Outcome. Evidence is based on rankings of 1-5, with the average of 4.08 over the past five years. Improvement can be made in the digital/online area of the ad campaign (execution of online/digital). Please see the appendix on the rubrics used to assess this program learning outcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Mastery in visual communication that combines the use of print, online, and other multi-media communication
- Mastery in the ability to defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign
- Mastery in the ability to develop ad media planning strategies
- Mastery in the ability to develop and integrate communication strategies into a creative ad campaign
- Mastery in the ability to describe any research theories, practice, legal, and ethical challenges

**ADV 561**

ADV 561 student learning outcomes regarding SLO 1 are aligned with this program learning outcome. Evidence of achieving this outcome is reflected through presentations of students’ final project. Below are excerpts from one of the presentations.

**ADV 475**

Direct assessment (external and internal – judges for creative ad campaign) show students are effectively combining the use of print, online, and other multimedia.

Based on the performance of midterms and judges’ comments, online advertising could be improved. For example, during Fall 2011 the average midterm grade for digital designs was 80% and the average final campaign rubric ranking for the digital ad designs was “satisfactory.” Some of the judges indicated that a course in digital advertising could help improve student learning of digital strategy and execution.
Direct assessment from the professor in students’ drafts indicate learning the past five years. Below is an example of Group drafts 1, 2 and the final from Fall 2010 classes. Please see appendix for the rubrics used to assess students’ final campaign demonstrating copywriting and layout.

ADV 475.01

Team 1: 80% Draft 1; 88% Draft 2; 95% Draft 3 (final one)
Team 2: 78% Draft 1, 84% Draft 2, 96% Draft 3 (final one)
Team 3: 88% Draft 1, 90% Draft 2, 96% Draft 3 (final one)
Team 4: 90% Draft 1, 92% Draft 2, 98% Draft 3 (final one)

ADV 475.02

Team 1: 78% Draft 1; 82% Draft 2; 90% Draft 3 (Final)
Team 2: 82% Draft 1; 85% Draft 2; 98% Draft 3 (Final)
Team 3: 82% Draft 1; 86% Draft 2; 90% Draft 3 (Final)

MSCO 371

Course content ranges from Photoshop, Illustrator, Quark, InDesign, Dreamweaver, and Flash to principles of design, animation, advanced design; typography, package design and portfolio development.

Student Learning: Course delves into the meaning, intent and productive development of visual communication as it relates to all forms of mass media. Emphasis is given to the application of design concepts, terminology, production techniques, layout, typography, and graphic presentations.

Students are expected to practice the design process in course projects and demonstrate an analytic ability to discern elements of good design as applied to all various and distinct forms of visual media such as magazines, websites, billboards, etc. using imagery and typography.

The following sites contain samples of completed class projects, as well as historical style references and color schemes, photography, and resumes. Students have, in fact, used these
Pepperdine websites to attain employment or secure competitive internships.

http://students.pepperdine.edu/kmlund/
http://students.pepperdine.edu/schung5/
http://students.pepperdine.edu/lacarter/
http://students.pepperdine.edu/tlallstu/
http://students.pepperdine.edu/aranschu/
http://students.pepperdine.edu/knbaker/
http://students.pepperdine.edu/klbeauch/
http://students.pepperdine.edu/cebergen/
http://students.pepperdine.edu/aubergad/
http://students.pepperdine.edu/lrbowdit/

Learning Outcome 3:

Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

This learning outcome is assessed in ADV 575 and ADV 475.

In ADV 575 students demonstrate mastery of this outcome through an individual ad campaign project that is then presented to external and internal reviewers who evaluate the campaign; and in ADV 475 students demonstrate this outcome through a creative ad campaign group project that is presented to multiple external and internal judges that evaluate the campaign. Please see the appendix on the rubrics used to assess this program learning outcome.

Examples of Evidence of Student Learning Outcome that aligns with this Program Learning Outcome

ADV 575

ADV 575 is the Ad Major’s capstone course. The following charts demonstrate that the past 5 years students are demonstrating mastery in this Program Learning Outcome. Evidence is based on rankings of 1-5, with the average of 4.12 over the past five years. Improvement can be made in the digital area of the ad campaign (strategy and execution). Please see the appendix on the rubrics used to assess this program learning outcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Q1: Mastery in visual communication that combines the use of print, online, and other multi-media communication
- Q2: Mastery in the ability to defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign
- Q3: Mastery in the ability to develop ad media planning strategies
- Q4: Mastery in the ability to develop and integrate communication strategies into a creative ad campaign
- Q5: Mastery in the ability to describe any research theories, practices, legal, and ethical challenges

**ADV 475**

For the past five years, students in ADV 47 have demonstrated this Program Learning Outcome.

For over nine years students have been involved in the development and presentation of a creative ad campaign for a real client. Students compete in teams and present their work to ad professional judges (external reviewers) and faculty (internal reviewers). Their work includes two drafts and a final campaign book and presentation on ad strategy; research; target market; big idea development and deployment; theories; diversity; ethical and legal applications; and execution of online/digital ads, print ads, out of home ad, package design, point of purchase ad, direct mail, radio, Youtube spot, and ad pieces of choice that culminate in an integrated ad campaign pitched to the client and ad guest judges.

Direct evidence shows students are meeting this Learning Outcome with an average score of “Good” (ranking of Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and Unacceptable) the past five years. Direct evidence also indicates out of the campaign, the most improvement that needs to be made is the Online/Digital strategy and execution where the average ranking has been “Satisfactory.”

**After the pitch event in ADV 475, SapientNitro offered paid internships to each of the winning team members in the Fall 2011 ADV 475.01 class. SapientNitro has asserted**
it will continue to offer paid internships to the ADV 475 team winners for future semesters.

Example of Fall 2011 ADV 475.01 Ad Campaign Competition pitches for Medgest all-natural probiotic. 1 faculty judge (internal reviewer) evaluated three teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program PLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s). 2 faculty judges (internal reviewers) evaluated four teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program PLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Team</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- SmartSharks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Simplicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bucketlist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 judges (external reviewers) evaluated four teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program PLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).
Fall 2011 ADV 475.02 Ad Campaign Competition pitches for Medgest all-natural probiotic.

1 faculty judge (internal reviewer) evaluated three teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program PLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Team</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Sock Puppet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Runaway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Accolade</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 judges (external reviewers) evaluated three teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program PLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Team</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Sock Puppet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Runaway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Accolade</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see the appendix for rubrics used to evaluate student learning.
Learning Outcome 4:

Develop advertising media buying and planning strategies.

This learning outcome is assessed in ADV 575, ADV 375, and MSCO 220.

This outcome for ADV 575 is measured through an individual ad campaign that integrates media planning and buying strategies. ADV 375 is a critical component of advertising theory, with the course typically falling midway through the program. The course integrates both quantitative and qualitative analysis of traditional and non-traditional media. This learning outcome is measured by examinations, class projects, and a final group project and presentation designed to synthesize and integrate the entire course content. In MSCO 220, this leaning outcome is introduced to students and is measured through a class assignment and exams.

Examples of Evidence of Student Learning Outcome that aligns with this Program Learning Outcome

ADV 575

ADV 575 is the Ad Major’s capstone course. The following charts demonstrate that the past 5 years students are demonstrating mastery in this Program Learning Outcome. Evidence is based on rankings of 1-5, with the average of 4.22 over the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

Q1: Mastery in visual communication that combines the use of print, online, and other multi-media communication
Q2: Mastery in the ability to defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign
Q3: Mastery in the ability to develop ad media planning strategies
Q4: Mastery in the ability to develop and integrate communication strategies into a creative ad campaign
Q5: Mastery in the ability to describe any research theories, practice, legal, and ethical challenges

![Advertising 575 Assessment Data](chart.png)
ADV 375

Example of Spring 2011 ADV 375.01 Direct Evidence include a Final Project (Media Plan).

1 faculty member and 1 external judge evaluated 9 teams’ (37 students) final media plans using rubrics that include program SLOs 3, 4, and 5:

PLO #4- Develop advertising media buying and planning strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of students</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADV 375 Final Exam (Course Comprehensive)

37 students’ final examinations using rubrics that include this program SLO: Develop advertising media buying and planning strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of students</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rubric Key: Excellent = A/A-; good = B+/B/B-; Satisfactory = C+/C/C-; Unsatisfactory = D+/D/D-; Unacceptable = F)

Students in this course during Fall 2011 demonstrated application of audience measurement (e.g., coverage vs composition, frequency of different media; audited, circulation, audience accumulation, ABC, BPA, SRDS, rating share, HH, HH1, TVHH, HUT, etc.); research media strategies; frequency, effective frequency, passalong, CPM, CPC, DMA, RPC, etc.; and tactics (e.g., technographics, demographics, media kit contents, target market, demographics). During the Fall 2011 ADV 375 class, students also demonstrated learning through the midterm, final exam, final group project, and overall course grade. For example, the average course grade evaluating this learning outcome was 92% and the average final exam was 89%. The average midterm grade was 94% and the average group project grade to evaluate this outcome was 90%. Please see appendix for samples of students’ work that demonstrate learning.

Overall, during the past five years, evidence indicates students are achieving this learning outcome.
Learning Outcome 5:

Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s)

This learning outcome is assessed in ADV 575, ADV 475, ADV 561, MSCO 371, and MSCO 220.

One of the primary goals is to assess student learning through exams, portfolios, and/or projects. In ADV 575 students demonstrate mastery of this outcome through an individual ad campaign project that is then presented to external and internal reviewers who evaluate the campaign; in ADV 475 students demonstrate this outcome through a creative ad campaign group project that is presented to multiple external and internal judges that evaluate the campaign; in ADV 561 students demonstrate this outcome through assignments; in ADV 375 students are introduced and demonstrate this outcome through a media plan project; in MSCO 371 students are introduced to this outcome through individual projects and a progressive portfolio; and in MSCO 220 students are introduced to this outcome through exams and a group project.

Examples of Evidence of Student Learning Outcome that aligns with this Program Learning Outcome

ADV 575

ADV 575 is the Ad Major’s capstone course. The following charts demonstrate that the past 5 years students are demonstrating mastery in this Program Learning Outcome. Evidence is based on rankings of 1-5, with the average of 4.05 over the past five years. Please see chart.
### Key
- Q1: Showed Mastery in visual communication that combines the use of print, online, and other multi-media communication
- Q2: Showed Mastery in the ability to defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign
- Q3: Showed Mastery in the ability to develop ad media planning strategies
- Q4: Showed Mastery in the ability to develop and integrate communication strategies into a creative ad campaign
- Q5: Showed Mastery in the ability to describe any research theories, practice, legal, and ethical challenges

### Advertising 575 Assessment Data

#### Fall 2008-Spring 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester and Year</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADV 561

Students in ADV 561 are achieving learning of this outcome through the class Student Learning Outcome: A written project paper / presentation that reflects a clear, interesting and effective communications style with relevant insights and examples. The project / term report and two essay examinations are assigned to measure the application of effective, clear written communications skills.

The following table provides information on how various forms of assessment contribute to the student learning outcome as highlighted above. This student learning outcome aligns with the 5<sup>th</sup> Ad Major Program Learning Outcome.
Measures of Student learning outcome in ADV 561 that aligns with the 5th Ad Major Program Learning Outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measures used to evaluate student learning show students are successfully achieving this Program Learning Outcome.

**ADV 475**

Evidence shows students are learning, based on scores of their two rough drafts to the final campaign book and pitch. This 5th Student learning Outcome was met: Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s)

Additional Evidence:

**After the pitch event in ADV 475, SapientNitro offered paid internships to each of the winning team members in the Fall 2011 ADV 475 class. SapientNitro has asserted it will continue to offer this for future semesters.**
# TIMELINE FOR EVALUATING THE ADVERTISING PROGRAM’S LEARNING OUTCOMES

Table 9. Identified Courses and Timeline for Evaluation of the Advertising Program’s Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Course for Assessment</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 5 (1-year review)</td>
<td>ADV 575, ADV 475</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Project, exams, external and internal reviewers</td>
<td>Student evaluation</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 (5-year review)</td>
<td>ADV 575, ADV 475, ADV 561, ADV 375, MSCO 371, MSCO 220</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Projects, exams, portfolios, assignments, external and internal reviewers</td>
<td>Student evaluation</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 4 (1-year review)</td>
<td>MSCO 220, ADV 475, ADV 375, MSCO 371, MSCO 220</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Projects, exams, portfolios, assignments, external and internal reviewers</td>
<td>Student evaluation</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3 (1-year review)</td>
<td>ADV 575, ADV 475, ADV 561, MSCO 371</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Projects, exams, portfolios, assignments, external and internal reviewers</td>
<td>Student evaluation</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the five major learning outcomes identified for the Advertising Program, each course offered to advertising majors also lists learning outcomes. An example of a learning alignment map that will be placed in future syllabi is shown in Table 8. Table 9 provides a timeline for the assessment of each course.

**ALIGNMENT OF COURSE LEVEL LEARNING OUTCOMES WITH PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES**

**Table 10. Alignment Example of Course Level Learning Outcomes with Program Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising PLOs</th>
<th>ADV 475</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.</td>
<td>Describe, analyze, apply relevant theories in a creative ad campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.</td>
<td>Include diversity in a creative ad campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#1: Describe and analyze the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.

Describe ethical and legal challenges in the fields of advertising

#2: Design effective visual communication for various advertising approaches that combine the use of print, online and other multi-media communication.

Design and write copy for print, online/digital, video, radio, out of home, point of purchase, direct mail, and other media that targets a specific market

#3: Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client.

#5: Develop and integrate communication strategies in an advertising project(s)

Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client.

TIMELINE FOR ASSESSMENTS OF ALL ADVERTISING COURSES

Table 11. Timeline for Assessments of All Advertising Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV 575</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 475</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 375</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 595</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 371</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Pepperdine’s Advertising program has a unique relationship with the University’s mission, focusing on the importance of service, purpose, and leadership. Faculty in the program train and prepare students to become advertising professionals equipped with excellent advertising skills while maintaining high levels of ethical standards and service leadership for the industry and for the world. To generate students as qualified professionals, the program’s coursework is carefully developed and sequenced in a highly rigorous pattern, combined with practical training components to meet the Program Learning Objectives. Student Learning Outcomes are aligned with the Program Learning Outcomes, which are aligned with the University’s Mission.

Establishing a strategic partnership program with outside corporations/agencies and nonprofits as well as partnering with alumni working in the field is significant for the advertising major. For example many alumni return as guest speakers or judges for in-class ad campaign presentations for ADV 575 and ADV 475. The student class advertising competitions have become so popular that Pepperdine’s Alumni department has taken notice and has co-sponsored these events. As many as 30+ Pepperdine alumni have attended these events.

The Advertising Program’s presence in the West is significant. Most other large academic programs in Advertising are located in the East and Midwest regions. With possible exceptions of programs at University of Texas/Austin and at the University of Oregon, Pepperdine’s Advertising Program presence is well-established as an institution providing a B.A. in Advertising.

Recommendations for Pepperdine’s Advertising Program

The advertising program/major as well as other media related programs/majors at Pepperdine must keep current with the industry by offering the latest in advertising media classes (e.g., interactive media or digital media) in its curriculum. Pepperdine’s students must be given an education that equips them with the ability to analyze, design, and bring to market advertising media using the latest digital design trends in a rapidly changing advertising climate.

Suggestions to keep Pepperdine’s advertising major at the forefront of the industry include offering two advertising tracks: Creative (Online and digital design) and Account Management (media planning and buying, research, strategy, digital, etc.). Each of these tracks could include an interactive media component, such as classes in interactive advertising management, digital media,
online consumer research, media alliances, advertising graphics and production, interactive advertising design, integrated strategy, integrated communication campaigns as well as digital metrics, online privacy, and nontraditional media concepts. The leading advertising Universities are already doing this. The University of Texas at Austin and Florida International University already offer advertising tracks under the above mentioned categories.

From the analysis of 23 universities, 16 of 23 universities offer an advertising degree program; one university offers an advertising concentration (Cal State Fullerton), and one university offers a journalism-advertising degree (University of Oregon). Of the 16 universities that offer an advertising degree, several universities are now offering “tracks” with an emphasis in either a creative track or an account management (or media) track with PR being a completely separate degree. Also it was noted that most of the other universities had several more faculty and staff on hand for their advertising programs, and offer more specialized classes to choose from. Additionally, most universities appoint an academic advisor to advise students whereas Pepperdine’s Ad Major Program’s one tenured faculty member advises all ad majors. One of the Ad Major’s Visiting Professors volunteers to advise ad majors. Further, most universities have more full-time professors (tenured, tenure-track) than Pepperdine.

A suggested area of improvement based on assessment and comparison of Pepperdine’s Ad Major to other universities could include returning to an introduction to advertising course (similar to other peer institutions) or Introduction to Advertising and Integrated Brand Communication (similar to University of Texas at Austin) instead of the current introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication course (MSCO 220) that covers Advertising, PR, and Marketing. The current MSCO 220 course is geared toward accommodating three majors’ Program Learning Outcomes (Advertising, PR, and IMC) instead of only Advertising.

**Ad Program Weaknesses**

**Pepperdine Ad Major’s weakness** is its lack of offering curriculum tracks to allow students to specialize in one advertising competency track (e.g., creative, account management) with interactive included in both tracks. Another observation has been a lack of an Online/Digital Media Strategy course in the curriculum. Although online advertising/media strategy is discussed in MSCO 220, ADV 375, ADV 475, and ADV 575, during the 2009-2011 academic years, external reviewers judging/evaluating students’ ad campaign in ADV 575 and ADV 475 suggested on the rubrics that students’ acquire more knowledge and learning in online media (i.e., web analytics, research skills in online advertising, media planning in online advertising, creativity in online ads, various online advertising/media formats). Additionally, many alumni who attend the ADV 475 pitches as evaluators/judges indicated the need and importance of having an online media course in the curriculum. During the Spring 2011 ADV 475 campaign competition, 15 of the 31 external judges were alumni. Nine alumni indicated the need to develop an online media class that includes strategy, types/formats of online advertising to reach the target market, etc. During the Fall 2011 ADV 475 campaign pitches, a total of 57 combined ad judges (external reviewers) for two pitch events indicated on rubrics that students need more training in digital media. One judge, an alumna, wrote on the evaluations sheet: “Please work with all groups on digital.” Each class scored either “unsatisfactory” or
“satisfactory” in the digital component of the creative ad campaign.

Pepperdine’s faculty to student ratio may be much lower than other universities (see previous write-ups on comparison to other universities in this report) and choice of available elective class offerings may be much lower when compared to other universities.

Pepperdine’s faculty to student ratio may be much lower than other universities (see previous write-ups on comparison to other universities in this report) and choice of available elective class offerings may be much lower when compared to other universities. Additionally, there is only one full-time tenured faculty member, one full-time visiting faculty member who also serves as the Director of Internships in the Communication Division, one part-time visiting faculty member, and three adjuncts. Most of the student advising for the approximately 130 ad majors is done by the one full-time tenured faculty member.

Pepperdine needs to compare the number of advertising majors (130) to the number of tenured faculty members (1) and number of tenure-track faculty (0) and determine if additional tenure-track advertising faculty members are needed. When compared to other Pepperdine majors and other universities the Pepperdine’s full-time tenured advertising faculty to student ratio is much higher. Without adding additional full-time tenure track advertising professors the advertising major will suffer in the long run. For example, the advertising club has been eliminated several years ago due to lack of faculty resources and keeping the advertising major competitive with additional academic tracks will be impossible without additional tenure-track faculty members.

Previously (2007 and prior), there were two full-time tenured faculty members and one full time visiting professor that were augmented with a few adjunct faculty members representing the advertising major. Now there is one full-time tenured faculty member, one full-time visiting member (also assumes director of internships position), and one part-time visiting faculty member augmented with several more adjunct faculty members. When one of the tenured advertising faculty members left several years ago, that position has never been filled. This has left only one tenured faculty member to teach, research, advise, commit to Seaver Faculty Association committees, and write the one year and 5-year Ad Major Program assessment reports. The Ad Major is in need of at least one more tenure-track faculty member.

The current MSCO 220 course covers Advertising, PR, and Marketing to accommodate three majors (Advertising, Integrated Marketing Communication, and PR) instead of only Advertising. Peer institutions offer courses in either Introduction to Advertising or Introduction to Advertising and Integrated Brand Communication.

The advertising class sizes have increased the past five years without adding professors. The IMC Major is a new major since the last five year review, and this major requires two advertising classes: MSCO 220 and ADV 375. Additionally, ADV 575 and ADV 475 are elective classes for the IMC Major. This has increased the number of students in each class and many times has pushed it over 20 students. ADV 375 and ADV 561 consistently have over 20 students in class. ADV 475 has had the need to offer two sections during the fall semester or it would reach close to 40 students in the class if only one section were offered. This has taxed the class sizes with the same number of professors teaching before the increase in advertising major
enrollment and the IMC major.

Ad Program Strengths

**Strengths of the Ad Major Program** are its ongoing connections to the advertising and media industry through classroom speaking engagements, alumni relations, internships, and applied classroom projects and assignments. Guest speakers from leading advertising and media firms are actively recruited each semester to present their work and experiences or critique student projects, such as in ADV 475 and ADV 575. External (professionals, including alumni) and internal (faculty) reviews of student learning outcomes strengthen the program and contribute to the evidence of student learning through their evaluations. That relationship with industry executives and alumni gives students real world experiences and networking job opportunities that other universities would be hard pressed to match. Evidence from students’ work and evaluations show students are learning the SLOs and PLOs.

Pepperdine’s Communication Division and Advertising Department have a robust internship program headed by Visiting Advertising Professor Debbie Wideroe. This internship program offers students competitive opportunities to engage in real-world advertising work experience. Pepperdine is ideally located in the Los Angeles area boasting some of the biggest and award-winning advertising and media agencies in the world that offer internships (e.g., TBWA Chiat Day, BBDO, R&PA, Horizon, Initiative, Saatchi & Saatchi, Fox, OMD, Dreamworks, J Walter Thompson, E! Entertainment, NBC, CBS, Zenith Media, SapientNitro). The 2007-2008 academic year had a successful internship entry-level placement rate of 72%, and the 2009-2010 academic year had a successful internship entry-level placement rate of around 70%.

Additional strengths of the Ad Major Program are the faculty who teach in the program. During the past several academic years, the program brought seasoned and experienced faculty teaching core advertising courses (see curriculum map): three adjunct faculty, two visiting faculty, and one tenured faculty member. Faculty members in the program support each other. For example, many faculty members attend the ADV 575 and ADV 475 campaign pitches to provide internal assessment of student learning outcomes. Further, faculty members gather once a year to discuss the ad major program. During the 2010-2011 annual meeting faculty discussed the strengths of the program, such as assessment, the program course requirements and location in the LA area.

Direct evidence in ADV 575 indicates students are learning. Direct evidence of student learning the SLOs aligned with the PLOs was supported by internal and external reviewers of students’ ad campaign pitches to their external and internal reviewers. Indirect and Direct Evidence in ADV 475 indicate students are learning. Internal and external reviewers of students’ ad campaign pitches to their class client, the midterm exam, and assignments supported direct evidence of student learning outcomes aligned with the PLOs. Indirect evidence includes course exit questions, which also show students are learning the SLOs and PLOs. Direct Evidence in ADV 375 indicates students are learning. Direct evidence of student learning the SLOs was
supported by internal and external reviewers of students’ ad media campaign pitches to their external and internal reviewers, the midterm, and the final exam. Additionally, direct evidence of student learning in ADV 561 is demonstrated through exams. Further, direct evidence in MSCO 371 indicates student learning. Student learning outcomes in MSCO 371 align with the program learning outcomes, which are demonstrated through projects, assignments, midterms, final exams, and portfolios.

Other strengths of the Ad Program are its ongoing connection to the advertising and media industry through classroom speaking engagements, alumni relations, internships, and applied classroom assignments. Guest speakers from leading advertising and media firms are actively recruited each semester to present their work and experiences or critique student projects. That relationship with industry executives and alumni gives students real world experiences and networking job opportunities that other universities would be hard pressed to match.

One significant example on how Pepperdine’s Ad program is a leader in the industry is with the internship relationship Pepperdine has established with SapientNitro. SapientNitro’s Vice President and Director of Marketing for North America attended the Fall 2011 ADV 475.01 student competition pitches and evaluated each team’s work. SapientNitro was so impressed that the company has offered paid internships to each of the winning team members in the Fall 2011 ADV 475.01 class. SapientNitro has asserted it will continue to offer this for future semesters. Another significant example of the success of Pepperdine’s advertising internship program was during the 2011-2012 academic year, one Ad Major Alumnus and a parent of an Ad Major Alumnus made two separate donations to the Ad Program. These are two separate examples on how Pepperdine’s advertising program is a lead producer of advertising students within the industry and also a lead producer of active Pepperdine alumni within the university.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Grading Rubric for External Reviewers for ADV 475 Campaign

Ad Guest Judges’ Evaluation Team Name: ________________

1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th: Rank Team________________________

Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable COMMENTS
5 4 3 2 1

Newspaper print ad designs (color and black and white)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magazine print ad designs (color and black and white)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Home</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter, Facebook</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point of Purchase</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package Design</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Advertising (2 kinds):</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st one:</td>
<td>1st one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Advertising</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd one:</td>
<td>2nd one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad piece of choice #1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad piece of choice #2</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Spot</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Grading Rubric for ADV 475 Ad Campaign Internal Reviews

Ad Guest Judges’ Evaluation Team Name: ________________

1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th: Rank Team____________________________

Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory| Unacceptable
5        4        3        2        1

Newspaper print ad designs (color and black and white)
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory| Unacceptable
5        4        3        2        1

Magazine print ad designs (color and black and white)
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory| Unacceptable
5        4        3        2        1

Out of Home
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory| Unacceptable
5        4        3        2        1

Twitter, Facebook
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory| Unacceptable
5        4        3        2        1

Point of Purchase
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory| Unacceptable
5        4        3        2        1

Direct Mail
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory| Unacceptable
5        4        3        2        1
Package Design
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Digital Advertising (2 kinds):
1st one: ______________________________
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Digital Advertising
2nd one: ______________________________
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Ad piece of choice #1 ____________________
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Ad piece of choice #2 ____________________
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Radio Spot
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Youtube
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Strategy Statement/Selling Concept/overall pitch
Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Comments:

Appendix C: Grading Rubric for External Reviewers for ADV 575 Campaign (aligns with Program Learning Outcomes)

Demonstrates Mastery in the relevant theories, practice, legal issues, ethical challenges, faith, and diversity in the fields of advertising and marketing communication.

Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1
Demonstrates Mastery in effective visual communication design for various advertising approaches that combine the use of print, online and other multi-media communication.

Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Demonstrates Mastery in creating and defending the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign

Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Demonstrates Mastery in developing advertising media buying and planning strategies

Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Demonstrates Mastery in developing and integrating communication strategies in an advertising project(s)

Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Unacceptable
5   4   3   2   1

Appendix D: MSCO 371 Pre-and Post-Assessment Questionnaire

Name: __________________________ date: __________

1. What do the letters d.p.i. mean?
   a. Double Point Incline
   b. Dots Per Inch
   c. Decimals per inch
   d. Design Point Inclines

2. What file resolution do we assume appropriate for the Web?
3. What file resolution do we assume appropriate for print?

a. 72
b. 150
c. 300
d. 500

4. What are some differences between RGB and CMYK files?

a. one is for Web, one is for Print
b. One is for digital images, one is for analog images
c. one represents process colors, one represents spot colors
d. a. and b. are both correct

5. Sans serif typefaces are:

a. Often considered modern and clean.
b. Decorative and curly
c. Not used for body copy, or full paragraphs of text
d. Found only on gravestones

6. What is html?

a. Hyped type made language
b. Hyper text markup language
c. Human text made language

7. What is the best file format for high resolution image printing?

a. BMP
b. TIFF
c. GIF
d. JPEG

8. What is the best file format for photo-realistic web images?

a. JPEG
b. GIF
c. TIFF
d. PDF

9. What is the best file format for multi-page layouts?
a. SWF  
b. PNG  
c. BMP  
d. PDF

10. A raster file is essentially:
   a. pixels and object-based curved edges  
   b. pixels and a grid-like layout  
   c. rastings and curved edges

11. A vector file is essentially:
   a. pixels and curved edges  
   b. curved edges and compact algorithmic data  
   c. curved objects and compact algorithmic data  
   d. pixels and large data file size

12. There are three kinds of figure/ground relationships. What are they?
   a. Dynamic, stable, and figurative  
   b. Reversible, ambiguous, and figurative  
   c. Figurative, ambiguous, and dynamic  
   d. Stable, reversible, and ambiguous

13. What are warm colors?
   a. orange, green, violet  
   b. yellow, green, blue  
   c. red, yellow, orange  
   d. blue, green, turquoise

14. What are cool colors?
   a. orange, green, violet  
   b. yellow, green, blue  
   c. red, yellow, orange  
   d. blue, green, turquoise

15. Justified text is:
   a. flush left, aligned right text columns  
   b. even along both sides of the text column  
   c. evenly distributed across and down the page  
   d. proof-read and ready for publication
**Gestalt Principles:**

16. This principle explains that people often perceive objects as a group or pattern because they look alike.

   a) Similarity b) Proximity c) Figure/ground d) Closure e) Continuity

17. A smooth flowing line leads the viewer's eye to another point on the layout.

   a) Similarity b) Proximity c) Figure/ground d) Closure e) Continuity

18. People will perceive an object as “complete” if enough information is given.

   a) Similarity b) Proximity c) Figure/ground d) Closure e) Continuity

19. Items are perceived as a unified whole if they are near each other.

   a) Similarity b) Proximity c) Figure/ground d) Closure e) Continuity

20. People can differentiate one object from another because of this principle.

   a) Similarity b) Proximity c) Figure/ground d) Closure e) Continuity

**True or False:**

21. Contrast is required to perceive figure and ground.
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22. Colors adjacent to each other on the color wheel are “Complimentary.”
   a) True     b) False

23. Photoshop is the best software program in which to build a logo.
   a) True     b) False

24. CMYK stands for yellow, black, cyan and magenta inks.
   a) True     b) False

25. An RGB file is best viewed in printed materials.
   a) True     b) False

26. CMYK and RGB are color modes used only in Photoshop.
   a) True     b) False

27. Using Dreamweaver requires that you be fluent in html.
   a) True     b) False

28. By definition, a .gif, .jpg, and .png files are single layer files.
   a) True     b) False

29. Photo-realistic images prepared for the web should be .jpg files.
   a) True     b) False

30. Web animations should also be saved as .jpg files.
31. Commonly used Illustrator tools are the Rubber stamp and the Dodge and burn.
   a) True       b) False

32. Commonly used Photoshop tools are Cell insert and Rollover image.
   a) True       b) False

33. The placement and shape of text paragraphs is referred to as “formatting.”
   a) True       b) False

34. Leading is the vertical space between lines of text; tracking is horizontal.
   a) True       b) False

35. “Old Style” typefaces refer back in history in typefaces like, “American Typewriter.”
   a) True       b) False

36. Advertisements for newsprint must be generated for quickly than for television.
   a) True       b) False

37. Advertisements for the internet are quite restrictive in color palettes and size.
   a) True       b) False

38. Hierarchies and focal points are essentially the same thing in graphic design.
   a) True       b) False

39. Graphic design is a shrinking professional field because of technology.
   a) True       b) False
40. Graphic design is concerned about the placement of images AND type.

a) True   b) False

Appendix E: Grading Rubric for Portfolios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Required items</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Reflection/Critique</th>
<th>Overall Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All required items are included, with a significant number of additions.</td>
<td>Items clearly demonstrate that the desired learning outcomes for the term have been achieved. The student has gained a significant understanding of the concepts and applications.</td>
<td>Reflections illustrate the ability to effectively critique work, and to suggest constructive practical alternatives.</td>
<td>Items are clearly introduced, well organized, and creatively displayed, showing connection between items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All required items are included, with a few additions.</td>
<td>Items clearly demonstrate most of the desired learning outcomes for the term. The student has gained a general understanding of the concepts and applications.</td>
<td>Reflections illustrate the ability to critique work, and to suggest constructive practical alternatives.</td>
<td>Items are introduced and well organized, showing connection between items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All required items are included.</td>
<td>Items demonstrate some of the desired learning outcomes for the term. The student has gained some understanding of the concepts and attempts to apply them.</td>
<td>Reflections illustrate an attempt to critique work, and to suggest alternatives.</td>
<td>Items are introduced and somewhat organized, showing some connection between items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A significant number of required items</td>
<td>Items do not demonstrate basic learning outcomes for the term. The student has limited</td>
<td>Reflections illustrate a minimal ability to critique work.</td>
<td>Items are not introduced and lack organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Team</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Pierette Pheeney, in *The Science Teacher, October 1998*.

**Appendix F: Samples of overall rankings of ADV 475’s Program Learning Outcome #3**

Fall 2011 ADV 475.01 Ad Campaign Competition pitches for Butterfly Twists ballet flats

2 faculty judges (internal reviewers) evaluated four teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program PLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Team</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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22 judges (external reviewers) evaluated four teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program PLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Team</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-SmartSharks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Simplicity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bucketlist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nam</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2011 ADV 475.02 Ad Campaign Competition pitches for Medgest all-natural probiotic.

1 faculty judge (internal reviewer) evaluated three teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program PLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Team</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Sock Puppet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Runaway</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Accolade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 judges (external reviewers) evaluated three teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program PLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Team</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Sock Puppet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Runaway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Accolade</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2011 ADV 475.01 Ad Campaign Competition pitches for Maurice Hilliard's book, The Price of a Pearl

7 faculty judges (internal reviewers) evaluated three teams' final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program SLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Team</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Candi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Sup4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Marcz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 judges (external reviewers) evaluated three teams' final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program SLO: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Team</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Candi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Sup4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Marcz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2011 ADV 475.01 Indirect Evidence: Spring 2011 ADV 475 Indirect Evidence was used to measure SLO #3 by providing students with a pre- and post-knowledge survey in ADV 475
ADV 475.01 Spring 2011 Student Pre-knowledge Survey (11 students enrolled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>No Experience</th>
<th>Little Experience</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADV 475.01 Spring 2011 Student Post-knowledge Survey (11 students enrolled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>No Experience</th>
<th>Little Experience</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2010 ADV 475.01 Ad Campaign Competition pitches for StyleWest's Dav multipurpose, all-weather boots

5 faculty (internal reviewers) evaluated three teams’ final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program SLO #3: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 professionals (external reviewers) evaluated three team’s final campaign pitches using rubrics that include this program SLO #3: Create and Defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2010 ADV 475.02 Direct Evidence: Ad campaign competition pitches for ADV 475 to Introduce/Demonstrate the learning outcome

Fall 2010 ADV 475.02 Ad Campaign Competition for Madison Hildebrand’s Agent Control website product

4 faculty evaluated three teams’ final campaign pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 professionals evaluated three teams’ final campaign pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indirect Evidence was used to measure SLO #3 by providing students with a pre- and post-knowledge survey in ADV 475

ADV 475.01 Fall 2010 Student Pre-knowledge Survey (17 students enrolled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>No Experience</th>
<th>Little Experience</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADV 475.01 Fall 2010 Student Post-knowledge Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>No Experience</th>
<th>Little Experience</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADV 475.02 Fall 2010 Student Pre-knowledge Survey (13 students enrolled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>No Experience</th>
<th>Little Experience</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADV 475.02 Fall 2010 Student Post-knowledge Survey (13 students enrolled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>No Experience</th>
<th>Little Experience</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and defend the strategy and execution of a creative ad campaign for a client(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samples of Indirect Assessment of ad campaign competition—Sample of Student Survey course exit comments.

“Very, very good experience. I loved it. You should make it a course requirement. It made me assess my abilities, pushed me, and challenged me. It is a great way to really understand the process.”

“Hard but very good.”

“It was the best project I've done so far. I liked the campaign – felt like the final (exam) was not necessary because the project took up the whole time.”

“Because this is an upper-division class, we’ve learned all the theory over and over.

“You can only learn theory so long, but the campaign helped us put it into practice.”

“Definitely do this again. Learned a lot from all the drafts and final pitch.”

“It was really fun! You should make it a course requirement.”

“It was fun, and the fact that it was a competition made me more motivated to do well.”

“The competition was a great success. I really enjoyed it and felt much more confident for the real-world campaign creative process. We really improved from the beginning of the semester to the pitch.”

Samples of Indirect Assessment of ad campaign—Sample of External Reviewers’ Survey Comments

“Super consistent and easy to follow (concept), loved the pitch, loved the first person (in pitch), so engaging, very creative work with incredible pitch, great design and excellent concept carried through on all pieces.”
“Include more training on digital strategy and tactics.”

“Include training on google analytics and search.”

“Very professional. Great ideas, great Photoshop work, great PowerPoint, very polished.”

“Good ideas. Concept flowed well throughout campaign. Loved the call for action. Target market was perfect.”

“Please work with all groups on digital.”

“Didn’t like Twitter.”

“Online ads: Where is the product/box?”

“Youtube: which URL?”

“Website: Great idea to advertise a free sample, providing incentive is always good.”

“Facebook: A conversation needed. A Q and A on the wall.”

“Magazine: Good use of white space but product use needs to be more apparent.”
Integrated Marketing Communication

Five Year Review

Prepared by Ken Waters and Don Shores

The Integrated Marketing Communication degree began two years ago after being a contract degree for several years. The degree is housed in the Communication Division, with classes shared with the Business Administration division. The catalog copy is included below.

Bachelor of Arts in

Integrated Marketing Communication

This interdisciplinary major is designed to give practical preparation in the field of modern integrated marketing communication. The field requires a thorough grounding in the fundamentals of business; principles of mass communication, an introduction to modern corporate image, branding, advertising, public reputation communication, and public relations practices; and insight into the behavior of stakeholder audiences and consumers. Successful completion of the program will allow graduates the flexibility to step into responsible positions in the areas of marketing management or communication management. Students wishing to declare the integrated marketing communication major must have a 3.20 GPA in a minimum of 24 graded semester units.

Interdisciplinary Major in Integrated Marketing Communication: 49-53 units

General Education Core Requirements: 12 Units

COM 180 Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis (GE

COM 240 Introductory Statistics (GE

ECON 200 Economic Principles (GE

Lower-Division Requirements: 11 Units

BA 220 Accounting and Finance for Non-business majors

COM 200 Communication Theory

MSCO 220 Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication

Upper-Division Requirements: 38-42 Units

ADV 375 Advertising Media
BA 355 Principles of Marketing
BA 470 Marketing Research
BA 471 Marketing Strategy
COM 595 Internship in IMCO

INTS 497 Senior Seminar (International Management) (PS, RM, WI)
MSCO 371 Communication Graphics

Choose one of the following:
BA 352 Management Theory and Practice (WI)
BA 366 Organizational Behavior (WI)

Choose one of the following:
BA 410 Business Ethics
COM 400 Communication Ethics

Choose one of the following:
BA 358 Legal and Regulatory Environment of Business
COM 570 Media Law

Choose two of the following:
ADV 475 Advertising Copywriting and Layout
ADV 575 Advertising Campaign Management
BA 474 International Marketing
COM 301 Message Creation and Effects
COM 408 Multimedia Production and Authoring
COM 581 Contemporary Voices of Leadership
MSCO 560 Philosophy and Effects of Mass Communication
PR 380 Public Relations Writing

PR 455 Public Relations Techniques and Campaigns

Students must have completed all prerequisites for elective courses and are encouraged to check this catalog for minimum requirements. Some courses must be completed in a prescribed sequence.

Table 1: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005—Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>IMCO</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2092</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005—Fall 2011
Table 2: Degrees Awarded from Fall 2005—Summer 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>IMCO</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2604</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2074</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2084</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2092</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2094</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2114</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: High School GPAs from Fall 2005—Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>IMCO</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

363
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMCO Major Retention</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008 to Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declared IMCO Initially: 1</td>
<td>*IMCO majors are not supposed to declare coming into Pepperdine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declared after one or more semesters at Pepperdine: 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continued as IMCO major</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changed to major within the Communication Division</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changed to a major outside Communications</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Left Pepperdine</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2009 to Fall 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declared IMCO Initially: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declared after one or more semesters at Pepperdine: 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continued as IMCO major</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changed to major within the Communication Division</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changed to a major outside Communications</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES:

1. The PLOs for the IMC major are:

   1. Understand the role of research and strategic communication in the marketing of the products and services of businesses and organizations, including the identification of target markets, message creation and the use of public relations, advertising, events, sponsorship and other tools.
   2. Demonstrate an ability to develop a strategic marketing plan.
   3. Create appropriately targeted media materials in a variety of formats
   4. Appraise proper ethical responses to problems in the corporate communication world.

Fall 2010 no one declared IMCO
## Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course/Number</th>
<th>SLO #1</th>
<th>SLO #2</th>
<th>SLO #3</th>
<th>SLO #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA 220</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 200</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 240</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV 375</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 355</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 471</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 595</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTS 497</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 352/366</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 410/COM 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 358/COM 570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I=Introduce, D=Develop, M=Master

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>When to Assess</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis and Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Embedded exam questions in BA 220, COM 200, COM 240, and ADV 375; knowledge survey in MSCO 220; projects in BA 470 and BA 352/366; final project in Senior focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report/ Program Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The major is only three years old. The national accrediting regulations and expectations of the AACSB, the courses taught in business are assessed a bit differently than those in the Communication Division. For these reasons, an active assessment program for this major is still not in place. Informal meetings involving Don Shores, Ken Waters, Jere Yates and V. Seshan have taken place during the past year, as enrollment of IMC majors has risen and put a burden on the ability of Business faculty to teach the “capstone” class, INTS 597. The Business Division has accommodated this problem in consultation with Communication Division faculty, but these meetings have not been formal enough to write up minutes and there was no assessment data to consider at those meetings. All of us are aware that some changes in course planning, perhaps even in the list of courses, will need to be made during the next academic year based on the growth of the IMC major. If number of students is an indicator, the major is successful as the number of majors grew from 33 in 2007 to an average of 60 or so the past few years.

Assessment prior to May of 2012

- The capstone class for this major is currently listed as INTS 597, although some of the students have taken BA 497 as an alternative capstone. The Business Division, because of AACSB accreditation, does not assess each course individually. Thus there is not the type of assessment data available for the capstone that is needed. One area of conversation with the Business Division in the future will be the need to create a rubric by which a group of faculty can evaluate the final team project of INTS597/BA497.
- An additional issue raised in several student course evaluations and phone conversations between Com Division faculty and parents is that students in the IMC major thought they would all be able to take a common capstone class. Instead, because of the numbers of IMC and International Studies/Business majors needing INTS 597 during the spring semester, IMC students were divided up and some took BA 497 instead. Conversations between faculty members in both divisions are continuing. There are two options: split the IMC students so as many take the class in the fall semester as in the spring, thus alleviating the need to move some students into BA 497 when INTS 597 is supposed to be their capstone. (Dr. Seshan, who teaches both classes, says he is aware of the majors of students in both of
those classes and teaches nearly identical material in both, so this isn’t a problem from a student learning perspective).

- The enrollment numbers over the past few years are as follows:
  - Spring 2009  Seshan 597, 14 students, 4 from IMC
  - Spring 2009  Arnold 597, 26 students, 21 from IMC
  - Fall 2009    Seshan 597, 16 students, 6 from IMC
  - Spring 2010  Seshan 597, 11 students, 0 from IMC
  - Spring 2010  Arnold 597, 14 students, 14 from IMC
  - Fall 2010    Seshan 597, 9 students, 0 from IMC
  - Spring 2011  Seshan 597, 28 students, 18 from IMC
  - Spring 2011  Seshan BA 497, 12 students, 5 from IMC

The comfortable maximum of students in the course is 20, so the Business Division has on occasion accommodated more students in order to assure that all International Studies and IMCO students took the class when needed. One option discussed between the divisions recently is Com hiring one of the Business Division adjuncts who can teach the course exclusively to IMC students so it is truly a capstone class that can be assessed in a manner that allows for a Program Assessment report each year.

**Direct Assessment in May of 2012**

The first direct assessment of the program will take place in May of 2012 at the completion of the first-ever IMCO capstone course. The course is being taught during the spring 2012 semester by Brian Hemsworth, an adjunct professor in advertising. He will assess the capstone project so we have a benchmark for future assessment of the program.
Five-Year Assessment and Review of Journalism

Communication Division, Seaver College

Pepperdine University

March 2012

Prepared by Professor Michael Murrie with Professors Mike Jordan and Ken Waters, and Elizabeth Smith, director of student journalism and visiting professor.
Introduction

Public enlightenment is the forerunner of justice and the foundation of democracy. The duty of the journalist is to further those ends by seeking truth and providing a fair and comprehensive account of events and issues. Conscientious journalists from all media and specialties strive to serve the public with thoroughness and honesty. Professional integrity is the cornerstone of a journalist’s credibility.

From the Preamble of the Code of Ethics of the Society of Professional Journalists

The journalism major at Pepperdine is modeled after these ideals integrated with University ideals. The program supports Mr. Pepperdine’s vision of a college that prepared young people to lead lives of service, to become salt and light to professions such as journalism, which needs people dedicated to honesty, integrity, public service and Christian values. In addition, professors in the major uphold the University’s affirmations, especially: “Truth, having nothing to fear from investigation, should be pursued relentlessly in every discipline….. [and] knowledge calls, ultimately, for a life of service.”

History and Development

The journalism major was established in 1966 at the recommendation of Dr. James Smythe. The major separated from the English major, which had offered journalism courses. The influence and diversity of news media have grown dramatically since the major was instituted. Now more than ever the profession and the nation need value-centered communicators. Hundreds of Pepperdine journalism alumni are fulfilling that role today in leading newspapers, magazines, online and broadcast outlets. Throughout the major’s history, course content and offerings have adjusted in recognition of the changing needs of the profession, the audiences and the technology. The most recent revision took place in 2011 as part of a broader restructuring of media majors (see Appendix A). The revision expanded students’ skills and understanding of converging media while preserving a strong liberal arts education with an outside concentration of courses unrelated to the major. The changes included transferring the broadcast news concentration out of the old telecommunications major and into journalism as a video/online with its courses available to all journalism majors.

Enrollment Trends

Between 2005 and 2011, the number of journalism majors remained almost the same – 52 in the fall of 2005 and 54 in the fall of 2011. However, during those years the number of majors varied up to 20 percent from a high of 62 in the fall of 2008 to a low of 39 in 2010-2011. The percentage of journalism majors in the Communication Division ranged from six to 10 percent usually staying at about nine percent. Last year the proportion dipped to almost six percent, but returned to nine percent perhaps partly because broadcast news became part of journalism. Incoming students interested in broadcast news are designated as journalism majors in 2011, whereas in previous years broadcast news majors were under the old telecommunication major. See Table 1 for the data and Figure 1 for a graph of the data.
Table 1: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005—Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>JOUR</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Sp</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 F</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Sp</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Sp</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Sp</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Sp</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Sp</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1 – Patterns of Student Enrollment in Journalism from Fall 2005 – Fall 2011
Retention of journalism majors varied over the last three years with at least half switching to another major or leaving the university. Each year a few students added journalism as their major, too (see Table 3). Given the cutbacks in the industry during these recession years, the losses are not surprising.

Table 3. Journalism Retention 2008-2011

Fall 2008 to Fall 2011: Declared Journalism Initially: 19

Declared after one or more semesters: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continued as a Journalism major</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major within the Communication Division</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside of Communication</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2009 to fall 2011: Declared Journalism Initially: 12
Declared after one or more semesters: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued as an Journalism major</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major within the Communication Division</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside of Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2010 to Fall 2011: Declared Journalism Initially: 6

Declared after one or more semesters: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continued as an Journalism major</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major within the Communication Division</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside of Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Broadcast news was under the old telecommunication major until the fall of 2011. The initial number of majors tended to be lower; the major picked up a few students and lost a few.

Table 4. Broadcast News* Retention 2008-2011

Fall 2008 to Fall 2011: Declared Broadcast News Initially: 7

Declared after one or more semesters: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continued as a Broadcast News major</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major within the Communication Division</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major outside of Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Pepperdine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2009 to Fall 2011: Declared Broadcast News Initially: 4

Declared after one or more semesters: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continued as a Broadcast News major</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a major within the</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2010 to Fall 2011: Declared Broadcast News Initially: 6
Declared after one or more semesters: 3

| Continued as a Broadcast News major | 3 |
| Changed to a major within the Communication Division | 0 |
| Changed to a major outside of Communication | 2 |
| Left Pepperdine | 1 |

**Degrees Awarded**

Since 2008 the number of graduates who majored in journalism has ranged from 30 to 40 in the most recent year. Before 2008 the number of journalism graduates was significantly less such that we question the accuracy of the figures.

**Table 5: Degrees Awarded from Fall 2005—Summer 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>JOUR</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Sp</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Su</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Sp</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Su</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mission**

The Journalism Major at Seaver College prepares students to serve as leaders in the communication of news and information to diverse audiences, so as to strengthen humanity’s pursuit of fairness, justice and freedom. The Journalism Major provides a Christian education environment stressing purpose (enlightening the public through ethical communication); service (promoting democracy by exposing corruption and helping alleviate social, political and cultural challenges), and leadership (excelling in a manner that honors God and the cause of justice).

**Program Learning Outcomes**

Upon completion of the journalism program a graduate should be able to demonstrate:

1. **Knowledge**: Explain the role of the free press in a democratic society, apply the principles and laws of free speech, identify the key events history of journalism, and identify the trends of the current media landscape and in journalism practice.
2. **Skills:** Conduct relevant research, identify and interview sources for news articles, evaluate source credibility, and present the resulting news stories in a clear and concise fashion using a variety of words, images and sound.

3. **Collaboration:** Collaborate with respect for others and make ethical choices in the production, management, funding and promotion of media messages.

4. **Values:** Recognize insensitivity, disrespect and injustice and develop practices to respect and include minority voices and perspectives.

These PLOs are adapted from the core values and competencies of the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/PROGRAM/STANDARDS.SHTML). Initially the Journalism Program had adopted these core values and competencies as PLOs but revised them into four PLOs to simplify assessment and make it more manageable.

**Curriculum**

Journalism students can select a print/online emphasis or a video/online emphasis. In the spirit of ACEJMC's emphasis on liberal arts education and work outside a media major, the curriculum requires additional learning in an outside concentration. Thus, in addition to general education requirements and the 42 units in the major, each student is required to take a minimum of 9 to 12 upper division units in a field other that media selected in consultation with the student's advisor. The selection should supplement and support the major and the career goals of the student.

**Communication Core Courses: 9 units**

COM 200 Communication Theory ................................................ (3)

COM 300 Introduction to Communication Research ........................ (3)

COM 400 Communication Ethics ................................................. (3)

**Media Core Courses: 11 units**

COM 205 Storytelling with Media ............................................. (3)
COM 260 Introduction to Media .................................................. (4)
COM 570 Media Law .................................................................. (4)

**Journalism Major Courses: 14 units**

JOUR 241 Introduction to News Writing and Editing ......................... (4)
JOUR 561 Journalism in Society and Culture ................................... (3)
JOUR 590 Specialized Journalism .................................................. (4)
JOUR 251/351 or MED 261/262 (2 semesters) Practicum ...................... (2)
JOUR 595 Journalism Internship ..................................................... (1)

**Text/online Emphasis: 8 units**

JOUR 345 Reporting and Editing .................................................... (4)

Choose one of the following:

   MED 270 Video Field Production ............................................. (4)
   MSCO 371 Communication Graphics .................................. (4)

**Video/online Emphasis: 8 units**

MED 270 Video Field Production .................................................. (4)
JOUR 330 Television News ......................................................... (4)

**Additional Learning: 9-12 upper level units**

Curriculum Matrix of Program Learning Outcomes

Table 6 shows courses of the journalism major beyond the communication core and the level of learning for each course. Some courses are primarily introductory; others introduce material and practice learning outcomes. In some upper division courses, students master learning outcomes.

Table 6. Learning Outcome Matrix (I = introduced; D = demonstrated; M = mastered)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes:</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2. Skills</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4. Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 205 (media core)</td>
<td>Storytelling through Media</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 260 (media core)</td>
<td>Introduction to Media</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 570 (media core)</td>
<td>Media Law</td>
<td>I, D, M</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 241</td>
<td>Intro. to News Writing Editing</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 251 (Practicum)</td>
<td>Publication Production</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 325</td>
<td>Publication Design</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 330</td>
<td>Television News</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 345</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; Editing</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 561 (capstone)</td>
<td>Journ. in Culture &amp; Society</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 590 Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I, D, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 595 Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td>D, M</td>
<td>D, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 270</td>
<td>Video Field Production</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alignment of Program with Institutional Learning Outcomes

Table 7 aligns institutional objectives with journalism program learning outcomes. The third column identifies courses that incorporate the aligned outcomes.

Table 7. Alignment Map of Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Objectives Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery. | 1. **Knowledge:** Explain the role of the free press in a democratic society, apply the principles and laws of free speech, identify the key events history of journalism, and identify the trends of the current media landscape and in journalism practice.  
2. **Skills:** Conduct relevant research, identify and interview sources for news articles, evaluate source credibility, and present the resulting news stories in a clear and concise fashion using a variety of words, images and sound. | COM 205 Storytelling through Media  
COM 260 Introduction to Media  
COM 570 Media Law  
JOUR 241 Intro. to News Writing & Editing  
JOUR 251 Publication Production (practicum)  
JOUR 325  
Publication Design  
JOUR 330  
Television News  
JOUR 345  
Reporting & Editing  
JOUR 561 Journalism in Culture & Society  
JOUR 590 Topics  
JOUR 595 Internship |
| Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice. | **3. Collaboration:** Collaborate with respect for others and make ethical choices in the production, management, funding and promotion of media messages. | **4. Values:** Recognize insensitivity, disrespect and injustice and to develop practices to respect and include minority voices and perspectives. | **MPRD 270**  
**Video Field Production** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.** | **3. Collaboration:** Collaborate with respect for others and make ethical choices in the production, management, funding and promotion of media messages. | **4. Values:** Recognize insensitivity, disrespect and injustice and to develop practices to respect and include minority voices and perspectives. | **COM 570 Media Law**  
**JOUR 241 Intro. to News Writing & Editing**  
**JOUR 251 Publication Production (practicum)**  
**JOUR 330 Television News**  
**JOUR 345 Reporting & Editing**  
**JOUR 561 Journalism in Culture and Society**  
**MPRD 270 Video Field Production** |
| **Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.** | **2. Skills:** Conduct relevant research, identify and interview sources for news articles, evaluate source | | **COM 570 Media Law** |
| Respond to the call to serve others. | 3. **Collaboration**: Collaborate with respect for others and make ethical choices in the production, management, funding and promotion of media messages. | JOUR 251 Publication Production (practicum)  
JOUR 325 Publication Design  
JOUR 330 Television News  
JOUR 345 Reporting & Editing  
JOUR 561 Journalism in Culture and Society  
JOUR 590 Topics  
JOUR 595 Internship  
MPRD 270 Video Field Production |
|---|---|---|
| 4. **Values**: Recognize insensitivity, disrespect and injustice and to develop practices to respect and include minority voices and perspectives. | COM 205 Storytelling through Media  
COM 260 Introduction to Media  
COM 570 Media Law  
JOUR 241 Intro. to News Writing & Editing  
JOUR 330 Television News  
JOUR 345 Reporting & Editing  
JOUR 561 Journalism |
| Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement. | 1. **Knowledge:** Explain the role of the free press in a democratic society, apply the principles and laws of free speech, identify the key events history of journalism, and identify the trends of the current media landscape and in journalism practice.  
2. **Skills:** Conduct relevant research, identify and interview sources for news articles, evaluate source credibility, and present the resulting news stories in a clear and concise fashion using a variety of words, images and sound.  
4. **Values:** Recognize insensitivities, disrespect and injustice and to develop practices to respect and include minority voices and perspectives. | COM 570 Media Law  
JOUR 241 Intro. to News Writing & Editing  
JOUR 251 Publication Production (practicum)  
JOUR 330 Television News  
JOUR 345 Reporting & Editing  
JOUR 561 Journalism in Culture and Society  
JOUR 590 Topics |
|---|---|---|
| Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity. | 1. **Knowledge:** Explain the role of the free press in a democratic society, apply the principles and laws of free speech, identify the key events history of journalism, and identify the trends of the current media landscape and in journalism practice.  
2. **Skills:** Conduct relevant research, identify and interview sources for news articles, evaluate source credibility, and present the resulting news stories in a clear and concise fashion using a variety of words, images and sound. | COM 205 Storytelling through Media  
COM 260 Introduction to Media  
COM 570 Media Law  
JOUR 241 Intro. to News Writing & Editing  
JOUR 251 Publication Production (practicum) |
### Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.

1. **Knowledge:** Explain the role of the free press in a democratic society, apply the principles and laws of free speech, identify the key events history of journalism, and identify the trends of the current media landscape and in journalism practice.

3. **Collaboration:** Collaborate with respect for others and make ethical choices in the production, management, funding and promotion of media messages.

4. **Values:** Recognize insensitivity, disrespect and injustice and to develop practices to respect and include minority voices and perspectives.

### Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.

1. **Knowledge:** Explain the role of the free press in a democratic society, apply the principles and laws of free speech, identify the key events history of journalism, and identify the trends of the current media landscape and in journalism practice.
events history of journalism, and identify the trends of the current media landscape and in journalism practice.

4. Values: Recognize insensitivity, disrespect and injustice and to develop practices to respect and include minority voices and perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Journalism</th>
<th>Broadcast News</th>
<th>Communication Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Quality**

Incoming freshmen in journalism exceeded the average Communication Division majors in two of three categories. High school grade point averages were slightly higher (Table 8). SAT reading scores were at least 30 points higher. SAT math scores were slightly under Communication Division averages (Table 9).
Table 9: High School mean SAT Scores from Fall 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Journalism Reading</th>
<th>Journalism Math</th>
<th>Broadcast News Reading</th>
<th>Broadcast News Math</th>
<th>Communication Reading</th>
<th>Communication Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>596.09</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>584.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>590.93</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>583.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>625.56</td>
<td>583.57</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>591.17</td>
<td>586.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>621.67</td>
<td>582.09</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>590.51</td>
<td>593.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>628.08</td>
<td>585.53</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>586.11</td>
<td>591.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>617.74</td>
<td>589.09</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>583.07</td>
<td>591.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum and Learning Environment
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Seaver College’s peer institutions (Calvin College, Occidental College, Pomona College, University of San Diego) do not have comparable journalism programs. Even among the aspirational institutions only one, Baylor University, has a comparable journalism program. Some of these institutions do have media studies majors, journalism minors and journalism courses. It should be noted that none of the peer or aspirational institutions, except Baylor, has a program accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC).

Because we have comparable institutional faith missions and programs, we identify peer journalism programs at Abilene Christian University, Brigham Young University and Baylor. Programs that might be aspirational for us would be private universities significantly larger and better endowed but with minimal faith emphasis.

A word about accreditation might be important here. Accreditation in journalism is not like other fields. It has often been controversial and not universally adopted. ACEJMC currently accredits programs at 111 universities. Pepperdine attracts high quality applicants without journalism accreditation. The curriculum generally follows ACEJMC guidelines including the 80/65 rule – at least 80 units outside of journalism including at least 65 units of liberal arts and sciences. ACEJMC also requires a balance between theory and skills courses. The Seaver journalism faculty discusses accreditation on occasions. It may be that an accreditation application would be an outgrowth of this review.

Requirements for a BA degree in journalism are comparable to the peer programs. We require a language and liberal arts courses beyond general education requirements. Requirements for the major include communication theory, media law, research methods, and ethics. Not all programs require research methods and ethics as separate courses. We recently broadened skills classes to require that all media students have exposure to print, photography, Web and video.

Table 10. Requirements for the BA degree in journalism at Pepperdine and peer institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Total Units in major</th>
<th>Outside units</th>
<th>Liberal arts</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilene Christian</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3  3*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Faculty Profile

Journalism has four full time faculty members including three men and one woman. All are white. Three are tenured, and one holds a continuing term appointment. Two hold Ph.Ds; one holds a J.D. and one an M.A. All have substantial professional media experience of five or more years. Two have media experience across multiple media (e.g. newspapers and television). Expertise is sufficient to more than cover all the courses of the curriculum and some other areas of the Communication Division such as media production or core classes. Table 11 lists each faculty member, highest degree and expertise. Table 12 lists courses typically taught by each professor.

Table 11. Expertise of the Journalism Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Jordan</td>
<td>J.D. 1982</td>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>Media law, news writing, editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Murrie</td>
<td>Ph.D. 1998</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University Carbondale</td>
<td>Television news, media production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Smith</td>
<td>M.A. 2003</td>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Journalism writing, publication design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Waters</td>
<td>Ph.D. 1982</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Feature writing, ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. List of Courses Regularly Offered with Typical Instructor Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Offered</th>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Courses Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Media law and ethics combined
Assessment of Learning Outcomes

Instructors have conducted assessment of most journalism classes in one form or other since 2004. The Communication Division usually holds a two-day annual retreat each August usually devoting more than half of the time to assessment and curriculum discussions including program level sessions. Reporting results and using results to improve curriculum has been inconsistent amid mixed messages about expectations for assessment.

For a more than a decade faculty responded to changes in the journalism, such as convergence and online news, with adjustments to course content and co-curricular activities. More fundamental curriculum revisions were necessary. Beginning in 2007 faculty and students including a graduate student surveyed media leaders about changes in journalism. They gathered information about other programs. Faculty held special discussions and meetings that finally led to a revision of media production and journalism curricula detailed in Appendix A. After developing proposals eventually approved at division, college and university levels, implementation began in 2011.

Assessment of PLO 1: *Explain the role of the free press in a democratic society, apply the principles and laws of free speech, identify the key events history of journalism, and identify the trends of the current media landscape and in journalism practice.*

In 2010 the journalism program focused on the first learning outcome regarding knowledge by administering knowledge surveys. In the introductory course, JOUR 241, it showed strong increases in knowledge of the role of the press and most areas of journalism practice. The survey showed weakness in progress in knowledge regarding journalism history. One of the curriculum changes enacted in 2011
included again requiring an introductory media course, COM 260, Introduction to Media, which includes some history.

PLO 2: Conduct relevant research, identify and interview sources for news articles, evaluate source credibility, and present the resulting news stories in a clear and concise fashion using a variety of words, images and sound.

The journalism program generated the first annual program assessment report under the new assessment guidelines in 2009. It assessed the second learning outcome regarding skills by examining 37 portfolios from students in three writing classes. A rubric was used to assess student work across several dimensions that added up to the equivalent of reporting, source credibility and writing. The work indicated improvement from one class to the next, but the improvement was disproportionate with little progress between JOUR 241, the introduction class, and JOUR 345, the intermediate class. Scores improved only two or three percent. Improvement between the intermediate class and the upper level class (JOUR 561 then called Public Affairs Reporting) was considerable with scores improving from 29 to 31 percent for a total improvement range from JOUR 241 to JOUR 561 of 33 to nearly 38 percent.

The 2009 report also included results of a survey of graduates. In early 2008, 102 alumni completed surveys, about half those invited. Those surveyed indicated satisfaction with their journalism major and co-curricular experiences. They indicated co-curricular experiences were more valuable than classes in terms of personal and career growth. The co-curricular activities helped especially with writing, editing, page designing, managing workflow, and working with other staff. Co-curricular were weak in online and photo skills.

One important finding was that half of respondents indicated some level of dissatisfaction with the communication core. Since the survey, online scholarship funding, the size of the online staff and online training have increased. The 2011 curriculum revision dropped the weakest and least popular communication core class, COM 301, Message Creation, for COM 205, Storytelling with Media, a media core class that exposed entering students to all media including Web, online, photography and other imaging.

Program assessment in 2011 focused on the second learning outcome regarding skills again, this time in the capstone course under the new curriculum, JOUR 561. This was the first semester the revised course was offered as part of the new curriculum, which elevated the course to capstone level. Three journalism professors evaluated final, cross-media projects that included print, Web, radio and television versions of a public affairs story. Five of the six groups had projects consistently rated satisfactory of better. Faculty rated one group’s work unsatisfactory. One of the reasons for the unsatisfactory work was the level of post-production work in the television and web-based stories. A discussion with the faculty in the media production major, which teaches basic courses in the use of cameras and video editing, is ongoing with the hope of adding an advanced post-production course for journalism and media production majors. The capstone class for journalism, JOUR 561, will be used to encourage students to invest more time in post-production as appropriate. In the spring of 2012, strategies changed in JOUR 561 to increase individual accountability while preserving group collaboration.
Details of program assessments of 2009, 2010 and 2011 are available in Appendix B.

No direct assessment data is available for PLOs 3: Collaborate with respect for others and make ethical choices in the production, management, funding and promotion of media messages or 4: Recognize insensitivity, disrespect and injustice and develop practices to respect and include minority voices and perspectives.

As noted, however, the faculty reviewing the final projects in the new capstone course did notice a need for improving collaboration in student groups. Also, the rubric used to assess these final projects will be altered to include a dimension that directly addresses the quality of stories in terms of their sensitivity to marginalized voices in American society, and to any ethical issues of reporting that may arise in the student work.

With the five-year review in 2012, journalism will not assess a program-learning outcome. Table 13 shows the schedule for future assessment of program learning outcomes. This year, however, the journalism program is involved in implementing assessment of co-curricular activities. These include peer-edited articles or television news reports from student media such as the Graphic, a newspaper, or Newswaves, a student produced television news program. Faculty also started improving assessment of indirect evidence of student learning this year including reviews of internship papers, better surveys of alumni, awards and job placements. All of these are discussed in the overall five-year review of the Communication Division.

Table 13. Assessment plan including schedule of review of program learning outcomes, evidence of learning and means of review and analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Analyze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>KS, TR</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Selected annual reports,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOUR 241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Skills</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>SWR, OR</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Selected annual reports,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOUR 241, 345, 561</td>
<td></td>
<td>Awards Internships</td>
<td>Program reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 561</td>
<td>3. Collaboration</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>SWR</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Respect and Values</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>SWR</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AS= Alumni survey
KS= Knowledge survey
OR= Outside professional reviewer
PR= Peer review survey
SS= Student survey
SWR= Student work assessed with rubrics
TR= Test results
APPENDIX A

Journalism Curriculum Changes Implemented in 2011

1. Changed JOUR 561 from Public Affairs Reporting to a cross-media capstone course, Journalism in Culture and Society.

2. Moved history out of JOUR 241. Required Com 260, Introduction to Media, which includes more mass media theory, economics, technology and history.

3. Added COM 205, Storytelling with Media, to the media core requirements to emphasize story telling and provide basic background for all media students in all media including Web, imaging, print, and video. To make room, COM 301, Message Creation and Effects, was removed because of inconsistent teaching, less relevance, and weak evaluation in survey of graduates.

4. Moved broadcast news from the old Telecommunications major to Journalism to improve the rigor and journalism orientation of broadcast news.

5. Required practicum courses such as JOUR 251 Publications Production, Independent Study.

6. Required JOUR 590 Topics in Journalism to improve opportunities for more advanced journalism courses such as Producing Online News [offered spring 2012] or investigative reporting.

7. Improving assessment of program, classes, internships, and co-curricular activities; increased data collection and analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Course Number</th>
<th>New Course Title</th>
<th>Old Course Number</th>
<th>Old Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 205</td>
<td>Storytelling Through Media</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Replaces COM 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 260</td>
<td>Introduction to Media</td>
<td>TC 250</td>
<td>The Telecommunications Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 570</td>
<td>Media Law</td>
<td>MSCO 570</td>
<td>Mass Communication Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 241</td>
<td>Introduction to News Writing and Editing</td>
<td>JOUR 241</td>
<td>Intro to Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 330</td>
<td>Television News</td>
<td>TC 330</td>
<td>Broadcast Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 270.01</td>
<td>Video Field Production</td>
<td>TC 270</td>
<td>Video Field Production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Summaries of Assessment Results from 2009, 2010 and 2011

Spring 2011 Total Scores of Journalism Faculty Panel Using Rubric to Evaluate Major Groups’ Projects in Capstone Course, JOUR 561

Excellent – 2, Good – 28, Satisfactory – 24, Unsatisfactory – 10, Unacceptable - 2

Fall 2010 Knowledge (confidence) Survey Before and After Completing JOUR 241, Introduction to News Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of a Lead</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Half Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kinds of Leads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of a Lead</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Half Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2010 Knowledge (confidence) Survey Before and After Completing Com 570, Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explain Defamation</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Half Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explain Negligence</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Half Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46 %</td>
<td>54 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Spring 2009** Total Scores of Journalism Faculty Panel Using Rubric to Evaluate Skills Demonstrated in Student Portfolios in JOUR 241, JOUR 345 and JOUR 561

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JOUR 241</th>
<th>JOUR 345</th>
<th>JOUR 561</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean-reporting</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean-Writing</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring 2009** Improvement in Portfolio Scores from JOUR 241 to JOUR 345 to JOUR 561

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 241 to 345 reporting</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 345 to 561 reporting</td>
<td>29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 241 to 561 reporting</td>
<td>33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 241 to 345 writing</td>
<td>2.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 345 to 561 writing</td>
<td>31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 241 to 561 writing</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Media Production major

Self-study prepared by Ken Waters and Susan Salas

MEDIA PRODUCTION (FORMERLY TELECOMMUNICATIONS)

History of Curriculum and Facilities

Pepperdine University has had an academic broadcasting and media production program since the school moved to Malibu in 1972. The Telecommunications Major (Broadcast News/Production) traces its origins to 1975 when Pepperdine offered a B.A. in Communication with either a Broadcast Emphasis or a Broadcast Management Emphasis. In 1976 a Broadcast Journalism Emphasis was introduced, and with the arrival of Dr. Ron Whittaker from the University of Florida. In 1979 Pepperdine offered a B.A. in Broadcasting with emphases in Radio Production, Television Production, Broadcast News and Broadcast Sales and Management. Much of the early curriculum was patterned after the University of Florida program from which the major’s founding professor, Ron Whittaker, and mid-1980s hire Don Shores, obtained their Ph.D. degrees. Originally the program was a small major in the Communication Division. There was one TV studio/class room, control room/edit bay, one radio production room, and one announcers’ booth. A newsroom and two faculty offices were added in 1984 and a third faculty office was carved out of the newsroom in 1985.

The Telecommunications curriculum was updated with a Mass Communication Core in 1986. In the fall of 1986, the Telecommunications Major moved from the main part of campus to trailers on the Communication Pad (Com Pad). The Stauffer Telecommunications Building was completed on the Com Pad in 1987. Also in 1987, the Telecommunications Major was condensed to a Bachelor of Arts degree in Telecommunications with a specialty in broadcast journalism, production or management. In 1998 the curriculum was revised again and streamlined to two sequences: Broadcast News; and Production.

In fall 2000, the Communication Division and the TC major’s faculty moved again to interim trailers while the new Center for Communication and Business (CCB) building was constructed. In fall 2002 the CCB was dedicated. Within the three-story structure (shared with the business division and Public Safety) the media studio and Lloyd Sigmon radio station. The entire area totals 8,648 square feet. The radio station consists of a DJ booth, talk studio and production studio. The television facility includes a television studio which measures 1,710 square feet, five edit bays, a newsroom with 15 additional editors, green room, equipment storage and check out, Facility Manager, Adjunct and Engineer offices and Master Control. At about the same time an emphasis in sports broadcasting joined the curriculum and a joint degree in Theatre and Telecommunications began in conjunction with the Fine Arts Division.
In 2010, the university approved change to the Telecommunications major including a name change to Media Production, and agreed that we could separate broadcast news and media production. Broadcast news merged with the Journalism major to create a more comprehensive journalism education for students, one encompassing the presentation of news and information for print, broadcast and online delivery systems. The Media Production major changed slightly to accommodate a production sequence and a sports broadcasting sequence. Several courses required of media production majors were changed slightly in this separation. Further, a core Communication Division course focused on persuasion theory (Com 301) was dropped in favor of a new required course called Storytelling Through Media, an introduction to storytelling and how those stories are shaped by the technologies students begin to learn—news writing, radio presentation, film, and the web.

In 2011, further changes occurred in the Media Production major (for implementation beginning with the fall semester of 2012). After their Five Year Review, professors in film studies (Humanities and Teacher Education Division) realized their students wanted not only to study films, but to learn how to make them. The Communication and Humanities Divisions then agreed on a better structured and explicit sequence of production classes for students interested in storytelling for the cinema, television, online sources and, at some point, for mobile devices. All those classes will be taught by Communication Division faculty (primarily adjuncts).

**Current Curriculum Overview**

The Media Production major requires three communication core courses (12 units) and 27-28 production units. Students must also take a complementary concentration of nine to twelve upper-division units outside of mass communication. Despite the various curriculum changes, the number of general education courses and major courses, plus the content in the major courses, has stayed aligned with the accreditation standards of the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication should the major’s professors decide to seek national accreditation for the media production major.

Currently we have students with outside concentrations in Business, Fine Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Political Science and Languages. In place of the outside concentration, some students choose minors in Film Studies or Multimedia Design.

At the graduate level, a new M.A. in Media Production will begin offering classes in 2012. Several current faculty and adjuncts are likely to teach and advise students in this additional graduate program in the Communication Division.

**The Curriculum and High Impact Learning**

One of the benefits of a Pepperdine media production degree is the opportunity for students to begin high impact learning literally the second they arrive on campus as first-year students. Juniors and seniors majoring in Media Production often encourage underclassman to help them as
crew members for existing or new television and radio programs. Television programs are available to the Malibu and surrounding communities via commercial cable provider Charter Communications and Verizon. Currently, Media Production majors lead student teams in the creation and production of four television programs that air on TV 32: The Randumb Show, Buenos Noches Pepperdine, Manwaves and The Beacon. In 2011, Pepperdine’s athletic league, the West Coast Conference, required all member schools to provide live broadcasts of women’s and men’s basketball and volleyball via the web. The volume of games and crew responsibilities provides numerous opportunities for sports broadcasting students to practice on-air and technical aspects of their profession in return for course credit. Several hours of radio programming is also produced by media production majors and other students from outside the Communication Division. Increasingly, students in upper division production courses are also creating film festival-ready productions that are winning awards at local Malibu festivals and beyond.

This high impact learning is not only encouraged, but students majoring in Media Production are now required to complete at least two units of applied production coursework to obtain their degree. In addition, all Media Production majors are required to complete at least one unit of internship as part of their graduation requirements. Because of Pepperdine’s proximity to the headquarters of many international media companies and media-based start-up organizations, Media Production majors receive an excellent education during the course of their internship. Many Media Production majors complete two or more internships during their four years as an undergraduate student.

**Faculty and Staff: History and Current Status**

Major faculty changes occurred in 1999 and 2000. Dr. Michael Murrie joined the faculty in a tenure-track position in 1999. That same year, Dr. Ron Whitaker retired, and Prof. Susan Salas assumed a long-term visiting faculty position and became Director of Broadcasting. Dr. Don Shores stepped down as division chair in 2000 and returned to teaching broadcast management. Dr. David Lowry, an adviser to the radio station and occasional instructor of telecommunication courses, left the university in 2004. In 2006 Kara Gould accepted a position as a telecommunications professor and director of the radio station. The high cost of living in the Los Angeles area forced her family to move out of state in 2008. Thus the full contingent of tenure track faculty—four—was reduced to three. In 2010, Dr. Murrie became associated primarily with the journalism major because of his expertise in broadcast journalism. He is still the faculty advisor to television news programming (NewsWaves) and occasionally teaches one media production class. During the past few years, both Dr. Murrie and Dr. Shores have assumed other responsibilities within the Communication Division and the university reducing the full-time, fully focused media production faculty to one person—Prof. Susan Salas. Most semesters she teaches three media production classes. The remaining three to four courses are taught by adjuncts.

Over the years, a contingent of professionals living in the Malibu area has taught media production courses as adjuncts. Carin Chapin (MFA) has been teaching several sections of the introductory video production courses as an adjunct since the departure of Cara Gould in 2008. Don
Ohlmeyer, former president of NBC West, joined the program in fall 2003 as an adjunct professor, teaching primarily a class on programming development and production course. The outcome was a student produced television series, "The Legends of Television," consisting of eight biographical documentaries. Ohlmeyer also taught courses in directing and storytelling to small cohorts of students. In 2009, movie director Tom Shadyac began teaching courses that gave students throughout Seaver College an insider’s view of the industry. In 2009, Shadyac assisted two female students to realize their dream of creating a documentary and nonprofit organization to educate young woman about the negative effects of bullying. The Kind Campaign has received national acclaim for its positive efforts to promote more civil conduct. Oscar nominated directors and producers such as Joe Sargent and Graeme Clifford are currently teaching media production courses. Oscar nominated writer Randall Wallace has also taught courses in the media production and the film studies programs.

As the result of an impending retirement of Dr. Michael Jordan, a print journalism professor, the division is searching for a tenure-track faculty member with expertise in print and broadcast news, directing, documentary production and other courses that cross over from journalism to media production. The addition of an M.A. in Media Production beginning with the 2012-2013 school year may result in the addition of a professor who can teach production at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

An undertaking of this magnitude requires a committed staff. The staff serving in the production studio consists of a facilities manager and a technician. Both are overseen by the Director of Broadcast Services, currently Prof. Salas. The staff's job is to manage an increasingly crowded media production studio. During the day, several courses meet in the studio, and students enrolled in other classes use the editing facilities for class projects assisted by graduate students and the facilities staff. During the evenings and early mornings the facility is used for four student-led entertainment programs for TV-32, in addition to serving as the set for the broadcast news programs, of which there are at least two per week. As a result of increased use of the facility, cameras and editing equipment, strict usage and access rules are in place to protect equipment from abuse or theft. The downside of these policies is student confusion over who can use the media studio, and occasional tension among faculty teaching courses related to production with students who don’t have access to the studio to use its equipment and facilities.

### Media Production Mission Statement

With a strong foundation in purpose and service, the Media Production major empowers students to write, produce, direct, edit and provide technical expertise to tell stories of socially redeeming value with the highest narrative and production values. Students become cultural leaders who can flourish in any part of the art or business of creating and distributing narratives through radio, television, film, the Internet, wireless devices and social media.
Student Learning Outcomes: (revised September, 2011)

A media production graduate from Pepperdine can:

1. Develop and identify major theoretical, business, legal, social, ethical and technological shifts in media.

2. Research, develop and create stories from diverse sources targeted for a variety of diverse audiences.

3. Produce, direct, shoot, and edit original media on location and in the studio.

4. Evaluate media for creativity, continuity, technical qualities, ethical sensitivity, and emotional and social impact.

Current Curriculum (2011-2012 academic year)

Communication Core Courses: 9 units
COM 200 Communication Theory.................................................................(3)
COM 300 Introduction to Communication Research (PS, RM, WI).................(3)
COM 400 Communication Ethics.................................................................(3)

Media Production Core Courses: 25 units
COM 205 Storytelling Through Media.........................................................(3)
COM 260 Introduction to Media.......................................................................(4)
COM 570 Media Law......................................................................................(4)
MPRD 261/262 (2 semesters) Independent Study..............................................(2)
MPRD 270 Video Field Production.................................................................(4)
MPRD 370 Advanced Video and Audio Production ............................................(4)
MPRD 550 Entertainment Industry Strategies...................................................(3)
MPRD 595 Media Production Internship..........................................................(1)

Production Sequence: 10-12 units
MPRD 470 Advanced Narrative Video Production.............................................(4)
MPRD 590 Topics in Media Production............................................................(2-4)

Choose one of the following:
COM 408 Multimedia Production and Authoring.............................................(3)
COM 506 Media Worldwide.............................................................................(4)
COM 512 Media Impact and U.S. Minorities.......................................................(4)
MSCO 560 Philosophy and Effects of Mass Communication..............................(4)

Sports Sequence: 11 units
JOUR 241 Introduction to News Writing and Editing.........................................(4)
JOUR 330 Television News..............................................................................(4)
MPRD 590 Topics in Media Production............................................................(3)
Program Learning Outcomes
Telecommunications Major
(2004 to spring 2010)

These are placed here for information purposes only. The majority of the assessment data reported in this document is from the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years. That matrix and the assessment plan going forward are on the next few pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Course</th>
<th>1 Identify Knowledge, history, issues</th>
<th>2 Develop diverse sources for stories</th>
<th>3 Produce, direct shoot original media</th>
<th>4 Evaluate media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 250</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 270</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 261</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 262</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 241</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 370</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 470</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 550</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 595</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Introduce  D = Develop  M = Master

2011-2012 Academic Year PLOs and Matrix
401
These PLOs and matrix were adopted by the Telecommunications (production sequence) major was changed to Media Production with two emphases: production or sports broadcasting. The emphasis in broadcast news moved to Journalism beginning in August of 2011. These changes occurred after evaluation of assessment data from 2006 to 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>PLO 1</th>
<th>PLO 2</th>
<th>PLO 3</th>
<th>PLO 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 205</td>
<td>Storytelling through Media</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 260</td>
<td>Intro to Media</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 270</td>
<td>Video Field Production</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 261</td>
<td>Independent Audio Production</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 262</td>
<td>Independent Media Production</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 370</td>
<td>Advanced Audio and Video Production</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 470</td>
<td>Advanced Narrative Production</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 550</td>
<td>Entertainment Industry Strategies</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 590</td>
<td>Special Topics</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 595</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I = Introduce</td>
<td>D = Develop</td>
<td>M = Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Media Production Major

### Assessment Plan (2012-2014)

This assumes all the PLOs will be assessed in May of 2012 as part of this Five Year Assessment Document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>When to assess</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis and Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop and identify theoretical, business, legal, social, ethical and technological shifts in media.</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Knowledge surveys; imbedded test questions; rubrics (MPRD 260, MPRD)</td>
<td>Senior exit surveys</td>
<td>Annual report/ 5 year program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research, develop and write stories using diverse sources targeting a variety of diverse audiences.</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Rubrics used to grade final projects (MPRD 470) and MPRD 550)</td>
<td>Senior Exit Surveys</td>
<td>Annual report/ 5 year program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Produce, direct, shoot and edit original media on location and in the studio.</td>
<td>May 2013 and each year thereafter</td>
<td>Rubrics used to grade final projects. Self-assessment, reflections, knowledge surveys, embedded test questions. (MPRD 470, MPRD 550)</td>
<td>Internship supervisor evaluations; senior surveys; Outside evaluators; digital portfolios</td>
<td>Annual report/ 5 year program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluate media for</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>Rubrics used to grade final</td>
<td>Internship site supervisor</td>
<td>Annual report/5 year program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
creativity, continuity, technical qualities, ethical sensitivity, and emotional and social impact.

| projects, in capstone courses (MPRD 470, MPRD 550) | evaluations; senior surveys; outside evaluators; digital portfolios | review |

Alignment with the Institutional Objectives

Following Appendix D on page 18 of the Program Review Guidebook—April 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Educational outcomes</th>
<th>Media Production PLOs</th>
<th>MPRD Courses satisfying the University IEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrate expertise in an academic discipline, display proficiency and engage in process of academic discovery. | PLOs 1-4 | MPRD 470  
MPRD 550  
MPRD 590  
COM 300 |
| Explore the complex relationship between faith, learning and practice. | PLO 1, 4 | COM 200 and 400  
MPRD 470 |
| Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity | PLO 2, 4 | COM 205  
MPRD 370  
MPRD 470  
MPRD 550 |
| Apply knowledge to real world challenges | PLO 2, 3 | MPRD 270  
MPRD 470  
MPRD 590  
COM 570 |
| Recognize the responsibility and call to use one’s talents in the | PLO 1-4 | MPRD 260 |
| Service of others rather than merely for personal or material gain. | MPRD 370  
| | MPRD 470  
| | MPRD 550  
| | COM 200 and 400  
| 
| Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement. | PLO 2, 3  
| | COM 205  
| | MPRD 470  
| | MPRD 261/262  
| 
| Read widely, think critically, and communicate clearly. | PLO 1, 2, 4  
| | MPRD 260  
| | MPRD 370  
| | MPRD 470  
| | MPRD 550  
| 
| Engage in responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life. | PLO 1, 4  
| | MPRD 370  
| | MPRD 470  
| | MPRD 550  
| | COM 400  
| 
| Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice. | PLO 2, 3  
| | MPRD 590  
|
Demand for the Major from Potential Employers

Occupational trends also suggest increases in demands for the education opportunities provided by Pepperdine’s Media Production Major. In recent projections by America’s Career InfoNet (2004), television jobs were rated in the top fifty fastest growing jobs in America to 2010 (#36 Producers and Directors; #41 Film and Video Editors). The National Department of Labor (2004) projects that jobs in the fields of television/video editing, camera operation, broadcast sound engineering, producing and directing will all grow 10-20% during the next few years.

Enrollment Trends (Patterns of student enrollments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Com Division*</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast News</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Production</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Broadcasting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as % of Com Division</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pepperdine headcount by division from Factbook

Overall, Telecommunications degree enrollment remained steady over the past five years. A closer look reveals, however, that the areas falling into what is now just Media Production (called in the chart
“Television Production” and “Sports Broadcasting”) has grown 71 percent over the past five years. One explanation for the growth of Sports Broadcasting is likely the growth in high impact (co-curricular) opportunities for students such as the opportunity to do live online broadcasts of Pepperdine sporting events. What these charts don’t show is the increased demand from students in the Humanities and Fine Arts Division for courses that are also taught to media production majors. That impact is discussed in another section of this assessment document.

### Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast News</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Production</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Broadcasting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the enrollment trend is upward, the number of degrees conferred has dipped slightly. One possibility, verifiable through indirect assessment data provided by surveys of students in Communication Division core classes, is that some students are transferring from the Communication Media Production major to the Film Studies major because students would rather study about film history and theory than Communication Theory, Communication Research and Communication Ethics, which are required courses for all Communication majors. While the Division is proud of its emphasis on these core subjects because they are crucial to a strong liberal arts education, professors in the Communication core courses are working together to ensure that supplementary readings, course examples, student essays and research projects focus on relevant media subjects so students can see how studying theory, research and ethics enhances their ability to become a creator, producer, director and technician whose educational background enhances critical thinking and management skills.
In reviewing this data, it is important to note that most Communication majors do not declare the major until their sophomore or junior year. Thus the number of students declaring a major in the Communication Division while still in high school is small and thus these two indicators of program quality are not necessarily reliable data by which to judge the program quality of the Media Production major.

SAT upon admittance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Av. for Division</td>
<td>584.69</td>
<td>583.84</td>
<td>588.61</td>
<td>591.89</td>
<td>588.62</td>
<td>587.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. For MPRD</td>
<td>591.36</td>
<td>594.37</td>
<td>598.40</td>
<td>592.11</td>
<td>612.71</td>
<td>576.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high school SAT scores of students who declare a Media Production degree is similar, or slightly higher, than the overall SAT scores for students in the Communication Division.

GPA scores of incoming students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Av. for Division</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. For MPRD</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GPA of students coming into the division and the GPA of those choosing to major in Media Production are almost identical. In both cases, the scores of students who do choose Media Production as a major while still in high school indicate a generally strong quality of student intelligence and potential capability.
Expertise of members of the media production faculty

(CVs are included in Appendix 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty member</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carin Chapin White</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Film and TV production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Detweiler</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>Fuller Seminary</td>
<td>Media history; media and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Murrie</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>TV news, TV production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shores, Don</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>U of Florida</td>
<td>TV production, media strategies and economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Ohlmeyer</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>TV Production and directing; documentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeme Clifford</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Film directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Radler</td>
<td>B.A. (one class short of MFA from NYU)</td>
<td>Babson College</td>
<td>Documentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Salas</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>American Film Institute</td>
<td>Film and TV production, directing; media and society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Shadyac</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Film and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Megalos</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of courses offered and faculty members responsible for each course

(Does not include Communication Core classes—Com 200, 300 and 400)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 205</td>
<td>Storytelling Through Media</td>
<td>Stivers, Salas, Murrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 260</td>
<td>Introduction to Media</td>
<td>Salas, Detweiler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 570</td>
<td>Media Law</td>
<td>Jordan, Pfeiffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 261/262</td>
<td>Independent Study (Co-curricular work on TV)</td>
<td>Salas, Murrie, Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 270</td>
<td>Field Video Production</td>
<td>Salas, Murrie, Chapin-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 370</td>
<td>Advanced Video and Audio</td>
<td>Salas, Chapin-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 550</td>
<td>Entertainment Strategies</td>
<td>Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 595</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>Shores, Salas, Murrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 470</td>
<td>Advanced Narrative Production</td>
<td>Salas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRD 590</td>
<td>Topics (Documentary, Directing, Cinematography)</td>
<td>Ohlmeyer, Radler, Clifford, Megalos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 241</td>
<td>Introduction to News Writing</td>
<td>Jordan, Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 330</td>
<td>Television News</td>
<td>Murrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 408</td>
<td>Multimedia Authoring</td>
<td>Stivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 506</td>
<td>Media Worldwide</td>
<td>Shatzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 512</td>
<td>Media Impact and U.S. Minorities</td>
<td>Stone Watt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 560</td>
<td>Philosophy and Effects of Media</td>
<td>Myers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmarking

Seaver College is one of the few liberal arts colleges in the nation to dedicate resources to combining both media studies and media production. Most liberal arts schools focus strictly on media studies. This provides us an advantage over even the larger and better funded schools in our area, such as UCLA and USC. Our students are welcomed into courses blending knowledge and skills even as first year students (Storytelling Through Media, Video Production) and first year students are recruited by juniors and seniors in media production to help crew one of our (co-curricular) television programs. Students need no experience to work on one of our co-curricular programs.

The other high profile media production program at a private liberal arts university near Pepperdine is the Dodge School of Communication at Chapman University. This massively endowed program offers the B.A., BFA, MA and MFA programs in a variety of media subjects including producing, directing, writing and managing film, television, and Internet storytelling.

The only peer institution offering a program similar to ours is Calvin College. Baylor University, an aspirational institution, offers a more extensive program than we do. Here are course and major comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calvin College Media Production Major</th>
<th>Baylor University Film and Digital Media</th>
<th>Seaver College Media Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semester hours) Required courses:</td>
<td>(36 units) Required courses:</td>
<td>(37-40 units) Required Courses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Film and Media</td>
<td>Visual Literacy: Sight, Sound, Motion</td>
<td>Communication Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Video Production</td>
<td>Production Methods or Production Methods II</td>
<td>Communication Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing for the Media Audio Design and Aesthetics</td>
<td>History of Motion Pictures or History of Radio and Television</td>
<td>Communication Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing for Media Markets or Screenwriting or Television Writing</td>
<td>Storytelling Through Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telecommunication Policy or Media and Society</td>
<td>Introduction to Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video Field Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two courses from:</td>
<td>Choose 18 more hours from the following:</td>
<td>Advanced Video Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Camera Production</td>
<td>Practicum in Audio Production</td>
<td>Entertainment Industry Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Production II</td>
<td>Practicum in Video Production</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Directing</td>
<td>Introduction to Mass Communication</td>
<td>Media Production majors only:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three courses with at least one from each category:</td>
<td>Film Appreciation</td>
<td>Advanced Narrative Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic News Reporting</td>
<td>Topics in Media Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business of Media</td>
<td>Choose One:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Programming</td>
<td>Multimedia Authoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion of Innovations</td>
<td>Media Worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Media Technologies</td>
<td>Media Impact and U.S. Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teleconferencing</td>
<td>Philosophy and Effects of Mass Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Broadcasting</td>
<td>For Sports Production majors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic Culture</td>
<td>Intro to News Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art and the Moving Image</td>
<td>Television News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film and Video</td>
<td>Topics in Media Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetics: Theory and Criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Mass Communication Campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication and Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Definition Studio Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two courses from:</td>
<td>Post-Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film and Video Direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course from:</td>
<td>Topics in Media History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Media Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course from:</td>
<td>Choose 18 more hours from the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum in Audio Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum in Video Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Mass Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film Appreciation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic News Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business of Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion of Innovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Media Technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teleconferencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art and the Moving Image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film and Video</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetics: Theory and Criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Mass Communication Campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication and Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Definition Studio Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film and Video Direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose One:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multimedia Authoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Worldwide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Impact and U.S. Minorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy and Effects of Mass Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Sports Production majors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intro to News Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topics in Media Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose One:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multimedia Authoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Worldwide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Impact and U.S. Minorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy and Effects of Mass Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Sports Production majors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intro to News Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topics in Media Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Ethics</th>
<th>Senior Seminar</th>
<th>Topics in Media Management and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topics in Media Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topics in National Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topics in Media Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topics in Media Genres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topics in Contemporary Cinema</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key differences noted in this comparison are that the Pepperdine media production major requires course work in communication theory, research, ethics and history. The other programs are more narrowly focused on media history, theory, research and ethics within a few required and several optional classes. This affirms the Pepperdine emphasis on the liberal arts as critical to the media production degree. The downside, we've been told in exit interviews with students, is that they feel they are graduating without enough experience in the technical aspects of media production—especially editing, lighting, color correction and marketing. The division has offered special topic courses the last few years (advanced cinematography, lighting, etc.) in an attempt to provide students with more technical skills, but some students are unable to take the courses because they are not required for the major and the expense of added tuition creates too big a burden for the students to take the courses as extra electives not required for graduation. While faculty continue to work on tweaking course offerings to provide more options for post-production, they also point out to students that the Communication Division offers motivated students the opportunity to gain as much post-production experience as they desire through involvement in co-curricular (high impact learning) experiences. Those opportunities for informal learning are abundant and all aspects of the programs are critiqued by professors and external reviewers who are also highly decorated media industry employees.
A Summary of Program Learning Outcome Assessment

2005-2011

The following section provides summaries of the manner in which the Media Production major was assessed over the past five years. A few caveats are presented. The major has not yet designated a true capstone course. Thus there is not one course that can serve as the course that provides most of the data related to how well students met the learning outcomes for the major. Rectifying that situation is at the top of the list for the faculty to consider and solve by the end of this Five Year Assessment process. Even with that issue solved, the nature of the Media Production major is such that the best way to assess student learning in the program is to consider course assessment data from a variety of courses. What follows, then, is a summary of data gathered from a variety of courses. The value of this approach to assessment has been a continual dialogue among the various full-time and adjunct professors teaching in the major. The many curriculum changes mentioned at the beginning of this report were all undertaken after discussions among professors analyzing student final projects or portfolios and noting ways in which curriculum changes might improve student learning outcomes. Here, then, is a summary of some of that assessment information and how it was used during the past five years, and is still being used, to spark faculty discussions on how to improve student learning.

At the end of his/her career as a Pepperdine student, a Media Production major should be able to:

PLO 1:
Develop and identify major theoretical, business, legal, social, ethical and technological shifts in media.

PLO 2:
Research, develop and create stories from diverse sources targeted for a variety of diverse audiences.

PLO 3:
Produce, direct, shoot, and edit original media on location and in the studio.

PLO 4:
Evaluate media for creativity, continuity, technical qualities, ethical sensitivity, and emotional and social impact.

Assessment Report of PLO 1

Achieving PLO 1 is the task of several courses in the major since all introduce increasingly sophisticated theoretical, legal and ethical issues within the context of ever-changing business and technological shifts.

Evidence of Student Learning for PLO 1 of the Media Production Major in COM 260.
COM 260 is a general overview course which focuses on the history and current trends of media in society including print, motion pictures, radio, television and the internet. Media theory and business practices are introduced in this course.

This course is required by Media Production, Journalism, Multi-Media Minor and Sports Broadcasting. The course is lecture based with PLO 1 embedded in test questions and demonstrated with a research paper and oral presentation at the end of the semester. Course material and exams cover the history, current trends, regulation and technological changes that impact the cultural and ethical shifts in media.

Example of exam questions covering PLO 1:

Within the context of the film industry, explain the concepts of oligopoly and vertical integration. Briefly explain the digital divide and how the Internet is involved.

What role do newspapers play in a democracy?

How would you describe cross platform distribution. Provide an example.

Assessment Report(s) on PLO 2:

One course that carefully assessed PLO 2 was TC 270 Video Production taught by Prof. Carin Chapin. Here are excerpts from her Fall 2011 course assessment.

In the course students learn a variety of theoretical concepts and basic knowledge related to the creation of stories told in a video format. The five Student Learning Outcomes in the class are:

**Student Learning Outcomes for MPRD 270**

As a result of your full participation in this course, students will:

Develop an understanding of cinematography concepts including depth of field, focus, lens selection, framing and composition; and how to apply these concepts to achieve strong storytelling.

Develop an understanding of key audio concepts including microphone selection and proper use to achieve best quality sound and storytelling through audio

Develop an understanding of key lighting techniques, including three-point lighting; and how to apply these concepts to achieve strong storytelling

Develop an understanding of key editing principles, including proficiency on Avid, understanding of workflow issues; and how to apply these concepts to achieve strong storytelling

Develop an understanding of the production process, which includes successful creation of a short video project from preproduction, production and through post-production.

The first four SLOs in this class directly relate to Program Learning Outcome number 2 of the Media Production major. To assess student learning of PLO 2 in the context of this media production course, the professor analyzed student performance on the final exam.

Example of a questions covering SLO 1—understanding cinematography concepts and how these contribute to storytelling:
As discussed, there are at least FOUR variables that affect Depth of Field. Please define what is meant by depth of field, how depth of field can contribute to telling your story, and how each of these four variables plays a role in contributing to either a great or shallow depth of field.

Wide angle and narrow angle lenses contribute greatly to the look-and-feel of the scene. Please explain specific scenarios when you would use each of the lenses, and how each contributes to storytelling. Be sure to include specific examples of each lens in terms of how each affects speed of objects; field of view and magnification; compression; and distortion.

The director wants the scene you’re shooting to have a great sense of depth (3-dimensions). As discussed, depth is affected by at least four variables. Discuss the scene you’re shooting and how you would create an illusion of depth considering these variables.

An example of a question covering SLO 2— understanding audio concepts and how these contribute to storytelling:

You are responsible for capturing the best audio possible for an outdoor narrative scene at a park. The focus of the scene is a couple trying to have a romantic picnic lunch. You want to capture their dialogue clearly without picking up too much of the background noise of children playing on the playground, although some muted background ambience is desirable. What kind of mic(s) would you use and why? Be sure to specify type of mic(s), pick-up patterns and why.

Examples of questions covering SLO 3— understanding lighting concepts and how these contribute to storytelling:

You are the lighting director for a narrative scene—there is one person sitting at the kitchen table. She receives a phone call that is clearly bad news. The kitchen has a large sliding glass door letting in tons of sunlight, as well as overhead fluorescent lights. How would you light this scene? List specific lights, their locations, and all necessary support equipment and please draw a picture to further illustrate, including placement of camera. Be sure to include what mood you are going for and describe it in terms of contrast ratio and fall-off.

Examples of questions covering SLO 4— understanding editing concepts and how these contribute to storytelling:

List the four basic transition devices in editing and what each one achieves in story-telling terms.

The class average for the final exam was 84.6%:

Discussion: These results indicate that most of the students mastered the course’s knowledge content, with a majority scoring 80% or above. The final exam consisted entirely of essay questions, so that students truly had to have mastered the material in order to answer the questions successfully.

This course is a very hands-on, participatory environment, and attendance is crucial over the entire semester.
Students who scored below 80% are most often the students whose attendance is sporadic and class participation is lacking. I also see lower scores from those students who are not Media Production, Film Studies, and/or TV/Theater Majors (i.e. Broadcasting, Advertising, and Integrated Marketing Communication majors in general seem to perform more poorly.)

Evidence of Student Learning for PLO 2 of the Media Production Major

To show how well students are beginning to understand story creation and production, the final course project—a 3 to 5 minute video was assessed. The assignment calls for students to create a “Short Narrative Movie.” Here is a description of the assignment:

3-5 minute Short Narrative Movie

Required Production Elements:
Primary field sound from dialogue and environment.
Audio mixing (e.g. music, sound effects, dialogue and room tone/ambience)
Titles (e.g. opening and closing credits)
Appropriate special effects (e.g. dissolve, wipe)
Appropriate use of three-point lighting (must use lighting kits and gels!)
Appropriate use of camera to tell the story: must have at least one of each of the following:
Rack focus
Shallow depth of field shot
Great depth of field shot
Intentional use of wide angle lens
Intentional use of narrow angle lens
Proper framing and composition, including intentional use of rule of thirds

Students are graded using a rubric that measures their achievement on a 1-10 scale in 10 areas:

Project fulfills requirements
Is technical quality satisfactory?
Is quality of audio satisfactory?
Is appropriate lighting/exposure achieved?
Is appropriate framing/composition achieved?
Is proper continuity achieved
Proper pace and timing of cutting on dialogue?
Effective use of reverses and cutaway shots?
Was there enough coverage to tell story?
Overall story telling

The average score for the assignment was 85%, indicating that the students were successfully proficient in making a movie from start to finish, which is the major goal of the course. Where the students were lacking in this assignment was in creativity and moving beyond proficiency into excellence in storytelling.

**MPRD 270 FALL 2011 - Chapin**

The following table shows the rubric breakdown for Project Three: Each student writes, directs, shoots and edits his/her own short movie, with evaluation criteria based on strong character development; well-established story and tone/genre using principles of continuity, composition and framing; lens selection and camera placement; lighting/exposure; audio; and pacing of dialogue in editing.

This assignment fulfills PLO 2 and PLO 3

1. Research, develop and write stories from diverse sources
2. Produce, direct, shoot, and edit original media on location and in studio
3. Evaluate media for creativity, continuity, technical qualities, and emotional and social impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Lacking proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that this in their first course in production, the number of students scoring satisfactory and outstanding on the 10 dimensions of the rubric is very good and it is rare to earn a higher score for this assignment.

Indirect Measurement of PLO 2 as related to the MPRD 270 assignments

I received some very good feedback/critique from my students regarding the *new* assignments we experimented with this past semester (the same Stolen Item movie divided into three projects).
Overall the feedback was positive, but some good insights were presented by the students:

1. 9 students out of 12 felt like they were totally burned out on the SAME three-page script by the time the final project came, and had no creative energy left for it.

2. They needed additional experience with shooting and editing audio, specifically dialogue, BEFORE they shot their project two, so they could learn from their mistakes in "practice" form before they had to shoot their official scene of dialogue with no prior practice, and be stuck with it for what would eventually be their final movie.

3. Approximately one-third of them actually re-shot their entire movie (three scenes) all over again during their "project 3" shooting time because after I had evaluated each of the first two projects individually, they were aware of their rookie mistakes, and didn't want those weak shots in their final movie. So many just opted to re-shoot everything from scratch—which was beneficial in their learning curve. But, by that time, they had no creative energy left so even though technically the movies were stronger, they often fell flat and left the students dissatisfied with the experience.

In view of the feedback from students on the assignments geared toward helping them with PLO 2 of the major, the assignments will be revised the assignments accordingly. The two in-class camera exercises to start the semester are the same. These are good practices with the camera.

NEW: Project one is stand-alone project, a silent narrative movie emphasizing visual storytelling. Similar in theory to previous semesters project one, but much more narrow in scope with very specific guidelines as to specific shots (no more than 15 total). This assignment is meant for them to gain practice and confidence with the camera, to learn visual story telling principles, to learn to light a scene, and basic editing techniques.

Project Two is a scene of dialogue. This is meant for them to practice mastering shooting dialogue, using the boom mics, and editing the dialogue.

Project three is the Stolen Item movie. It is still confined to the very limited template we created, so it will not be a "capstone movie project" too large in scope for this class. They will shoot only during class time in their groups.

I think this method will prove to be a strong addition to the changes to the curriculum that were implemented in response to assessment results from past years. It will allow for more hands-on work with additional unique projects, which will lead to better proficiency. It will also give them the needed creative outlet they were asking for, while still keeping the assignments contained to specific parameters and all shooting during class will continue to allow for the consistent workflow issues with lab and editing.

**Assessment Report on PLO 2 and PLO 3**

Evidence of Student Learning for PLO 2 and PLO 3 of the Media Production Major in MPRD 370.

MPRD 370 is a four camera studio production course which is based on theory and practice. This is the second production course in a sequence of three production courses for the Media Production major. The students are given two written exams in the first half of the semester based on assigned reading and in class lectures. Labs and classroom practical experience provide the opportunity of applying production theories to live studio production. The first production project demonstrates the students’ level of learning of PLO 2 and PLO 3. A description of this project, Demonstration, can be found in Appendix 1.
Three direct measurement tools used are; imbedded test questions and rubrics. An indirect measurement tool used is a student self-assessment. Sample rubric and student self-assessment can be found in Appendix 2 and 3.

Assessment results of the rubrics for this project show that five out of nineteen students were excellent, eleven fell in the satisfactory range and three students were in the below satisfactory range. The major areas where students fell into the satisfactory or below satisfactory ranges were in preproduction and directing their script. This was also evident in the student self-assessment where several areas were noted for improvement by 60% of the students.

1. Stronger preparation before directing project (preproduction)
2. Pay stronger attention to camera framing
3. Prepare a stronger rundown for directing
4. Take more time to rehearse with the crew
5. Use proper commands when directing and being clear with production needs for the crew

One student wrote that this project “was the best way to throw everyone into management (directing) and control of their own project.”

The class views and critiques the individual Demonstrations with the instructor. This type of evaluation proves to be beneficial as a teaching tool to demonstrate PLO 3 by using student projects which involves the entire class as production members. This also presents the opportunity to illustrate PLO 2 in order to help the student develop a stronger understanding of storytelling for a specific audience. And lastly, the students are actively engaged with each other as they critique their own work in a public arena which strengthens their abilities to master PLO 4.

This project is designed to help the student recognize what improvements need to be made to their individual performance before the Final Production in this course; a live broadcast of an original television program on TV 32 which is created and produced by the class as a production team. The Final Project demonstrates to the student the process of collaboration when working as a team member on a production and three Student Learning Outcomes for the course that support PLO 2 and PLO 3 for the Media Production major include

- Identify and explain the key technical concepts necessary for studio produced programming
- Apply technical skills and creativity in the various production positions
- Apply cooperation with other students as a member of a production team

**Assessment Report on PLO 4**

Evidence of Student Learning for PLO 4 of the Media Production Major in MPRD 470.

MPRD 470 is the Production Capstone Class for the Media Production major. Students successfully completing this course will produce an original narrative short that will serve as their portfolio, a narrative short on DVD. The assessment tools used for this project can be found Appendix 4 -8.

MPRD 470 is structured to provide the student with a “real world” industry experience which supports PLO 2, PLO 3 and PLO 4 of the Media Production major. Students are divided into production teams of four or five principle roles for collaborating on a short narrative film: producer, director, screenwriter, editor, director of photography. The process of selecting teammates is left to the students and is not predetermined by the
instructor. Every student in the class pitches (presents) a story line with character descriptions. The production teams choose a story which the screenwriter for each team develops into the first draft of the screenplay. The instructor meets with the screenwriter to give notes on the first draft of the screenplay resulting in a second draft which is then discussed with the team. The collaboration process of film making is experienced by each student performing their specific job for the team by meeting deadlines, providing materials from their area necessary for the completion of the short, and actively participating in the actual production as a crew member and post-production decision making.

The first edit (rough cut) is viewed by the instructor and teams before the Final Project is viewed by the entire class and an outside evaluator. Before production begins and during the preproduction process, lectures in the classroom and pod casts provide instruction covering every aspect of production and the roles for each team member. Shorts produced from the previous semester are viewed and evaluated by the class as well as production books (required by each team member) to provide learning examples.

The Individual Assessment tool allows the student to assess their performance and contribution to the Final Project. The Rubric for the Team and Individual are assessed by the instructor. The Outside Evaluation by an industry expert was initiated in spring 2011 and proved to be in line with the same outcomes as the above mentioned rubrics.

The Individual Assessment tool showed improvement over the outcomes of MPRD 370.

90% of the students felt they had improved on preproduction, but suggested that even more time to prepare before going into production would have been beneficial. The students also mentioned a disappointment in the overall camera work in regards to lighting and focus issues expressing more opportunities for instruction in these areas before entering the capstone class. Directing actors was a skill 95% of the team members felt a lack of experience aside from what was taught in MPRD 470.

The Outside Evaluator results were in line with the student self-assessments. Two of the six narrative shorts scored in the excellent range. Four of the shorts were assessed as satisfactory. One of the satisfactory shorts received an excellent score for camera work and editing. One short was ranked not satisfactory for story and the other areas on the rubric were ranked as satisfactory.

The table below shows these results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) Outstanding</th>
<th>3) Satisfactory</th>
<th>1) Not Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**MPRD 470 Final Project: Outside Evaluator Results**
Based on these results, the approach to MPRD 470 has been adjusted for spring 2011. The instructor is dividing the classes before production which occur in the first half of the semester into theory and practicum. Course material will be presented in lecture, power point, film clips, and podcasts in the first half of class. The class will then have the remainder of the class to apply the material presented in their preproduction on their final projects. This will be assessed by a written course assessment presented to the students on completion of their final project.

Results of Five Year Assessment Submitted August, 2007

Based on the results of course assessments, a senior exit survey and an alumni survey reported in the August 2007 Five Year Assessment Report, the following changes were made to the Telecommunications Major

(renamed as Media Production.)

- The name of the major was changed from Telecommunications to Media Production
- Additional industry professionals were added to the adjunct faculty along with specialized classes in their expertise: film directing, camera and lighting and documentary film production
- COM 206 – Storytelling Through Media - was added to the required curriculum
- MPRD 321 – Acting for the Camera was added to the curriculum

One existing question is still unresolved with only offering editing instruction in the first production class only without a more advanced editing class offered in the sequence.
Faculty Reflections and Recommendations for Improving Student Learning

In late January the Media Production faculty met to review the schedule and classes for the fall 2012 semester. During this meeting several unresolved issues became blatantly apparent. Due to the cross listing of classes with the Film Studies Production Sequence majors and Theatre/Media Production majors (mentioned in the History and Curriculum section of this report) the following points will need to be addressed.

- Achieving the PLO’s in regards to major matrix sequencing of three majors from three different academic divisions
- Matching SLOs which are in alignment with three majors from three different academic divisions.
- Assessment tools which are in alignment with three majors from three different academic divisions.

These academic and assessment questions lead to an even larger discussion regarding the following:

- Facility space and needs currently shared by three majors from three different academic divisions and Broadcast Journalism
- Staff overseeing and managing (Facility Manager and Engineer) facility space and needs currently shared by three majors from three different academic divisions, Broadcast Journalism and the high impact-learning program (co-curricular.)
- Instructors who teach students in three majors from three different academic divisions, Broadcast Journalism, Advertising, Public Relations and the high impact learning program (co-curricular.)
- Production equipment needs which support three majors from three different academic divisions, Broadcast Journalism, Advertising, Public Relations, and the high impact-learning program (co-curricular.)
- Computers, work space, software and continual upgrades to software for three majors from three different academic divisions, Broadcast Journalism, Advertising, Public Relations, and the high impact learning program (co-curricular.)
- Maintenance due to high demand and use of production equipment (check-out and studio) along with computers, software and servers by three majors from three different academic divisions, Broadcast Journalism, Advertising, Public Relations, and the high impact learning program (co-curricular.)

In addition, the Media Production faculty will need to assess course sequence, projection of major enrollment, current class sizes and future class sizes, instructor needs for projected multiple sections based on enrollment projections with Film Studies and Theatre faculty. In line with this discussion will be facility, production equipment, post-production equipment, facility space, additional staff to manage and maintain projected growth and shared budget allotment from all three divisions; Communication, Humanities and Fine Arts.
A curriculum discussion is also needed in regards to offering classes to current students who will be following specific course requirements according to their catalogue year and Film Studies, Media Production and Theatre and Media Production agreeing on the sequence of courses in the fall 2012 catalogue which will dictate course requirements for incoming first year majors.

Currently there is a discussion with the staff and faculty of Media Production regarding the post-production needs of the Media Production major. These lines become blurred when the facility and curriculum are shared by the media majors in the Communication Division; Advertising, Public Relations, Journalism and Media Production. There is a situation of technology and software, and exactly what students will need to learn in the classroom in order to succeed in the workplace; one size does not fit all.

The faculty will be meeting again in early February to begin this discussion and the application of PLOs in the media majors within the Communication Division, the Film Studies and Theatre/Media Production majors.

In early February, 2012, prior to the arrival of the external reviewer for the Media Production program, professors who teach in the major met to discuss the implications of the findings of this report. Present at that meeting were Susan Salas, Media Production major curriculum coordinator and director of broadcasting; Michael Murrie, advisor to the broadcast news emphasis; Don Shores, director of the sports broadcasting sequence; Chris Stivers, the primary professor for Communication 205, Storytelling Through Media; Carin Capin, adjunct professor of media production; and Ken Waters, Chair Communication Division. A summary of this meeting was written by Prof. Salas which follows.

Areas to be further addressed after the January meeting were discussed. The need to identify the capstone class for the major and reviewing the current curriculum to adjust to changing requirements of a Media Production major. Currently two capstone classes have been identified: MPRD 470 which meets PLO 2,3 and 4 and MPRD 550, which meets PLO 1,2, and 4. MPRD 470 is currently assessing PLO 2,3, and 4. MPRD 550 should be assessing PLO 1. The question of what type of assessment tool will give the program the best results; knowledge survey, rubric, embedded exam questions. The Senior Exit Survey should also be administered in this class due to all Media Production majors are required to take this course. MPRD 470 is also required, but Film Studies majors and Theatre/Media Production majors are also required to take this course. MPRD 550 seems the best capstone class to administer the Senior Exit Survey.

The need to assess web page development and implementation was also discussed as this is introduced in COM 205. The faculty are considering curriculum changes to add a higher division course
(COM 408) to the required list of classes and assessing the results. There will be more discussion before steps can be taken in this direction.

A means to partner with Internship Site Supervisors (MPRD 595) is being considered as a resource for outside evaluation of our curriculum and structuring our courses to meet the needs of the industry. This goes in step with the above mentioned need to incorporate a web page design class into the Media Production major curriculum.

Susan Salas met with the Film Studies faculty before the February meeting. The meeting resulted in a sequence for the cross listed courses (MPRD and FILM) and discussions of shared Program Learning Outcomes for each course cross listed.

At the end of the spring 2012 semester,

- the faculty will meet again to review the assessment results of the changes implemented in MPRD 270 and MPRD 470
- Senior Exit Survey will be conducted in MPRD 550
- Assessment tool for PLO 1 will be developed for MPRD 550
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Introduction and Overview

Public Relations Program in Context

The Public Relations program is within the Communication Division, which is one of the eight divisions in Seaver College at Pepperdine University. Public relations represents one of nine primary majors offered by the Communication Division, comprising about 19% of the division’s total student enrollment. The Bachelor of Arts degree in Public Relations is designed to give both theoretical and practical preparation in the varied areas in which the public relations professional should have expertise, focusing on strategic communication planning and writing skills, and including an overview of mass media, technology, speech, persuasion, and management courses. The public relations curriculum complements the liberal arts courses in the General Education program, which together provide a comprehensive foundation for a career in public relations. Pepperdine’s PR major stands apart from other universities’ programs because of the university’s Christian mission, exceptional location and setting, unique liberal arts approach to PR education, and emphasis on experiential learning.

In addition to the 40 major units, the public relations requires that students successfully complete a minimum of nine to 12 upper-division units in a concentration outside of mass communication. The outside concentration is chosen in consultation with an advisor to complement the public relations coursework. For instance, if students already know they will be interested in a specific area of public relations work, such as corporate or government settings, that interest should be taken into consideration when choosing an outside concentration.

The public relations program is closely aligned and interdependent with the division major in Integrated Marketing Communication, which requires eight units (MSCO 220, Introduction to Integrated Communication; MSCO 371, Communication Graphics) also required by public relations students. All public relations students are required to complete the 12-unit core (COM 200, Communication Theory; COM 300, Introduction to Communication Research; COM 301, Message Creation and Effects; COM 400, Communication Ethics) common to advertising, intercultural communication, organizational communication, and rhetoric and leadership majors.all other communication majors. The remaining five courses required in the major are PR 380 (Public Relations Writing), PR 455 (Public Relations Techniques and Campaigns), PR 505 (Public Relations Management), PR 555 (Advanced Case Studies in Public Relations (the capstone course), PR 595 (Public Relations Internship), and MSCO 570, Media Law.

One primary goal and distinctive of the Communication Division is to provide students with opportunities for experiential learning. The public relations major has a long and extensive record of experiential, and service, learning. During multiple required courses, students have opportunities for academic experiential, service learning that centers on researching, planning, executing, and evaluating strategic communication plans for Southern California nonprofit organizations and businesses as well as for Pepperdine departments and organizations. Experiential, service-learning projects that integrate both academic and service components in such a way that the academic learning prepares students for the service work they do, and the service work provides an experiential base for academic learning and discussion, have proven to be effective in achieving program learning outcomes, have positive effects on students’ personal growth (see attached article), and are consistent with curricula in public relations programs at benchmark and aspirant
institutions. In addition, service learning has been shown to be an effective tool that can help bridge the gap between universities and their civic missions, bringing about social change; the service learning that is incorporated into the public relations major supports Pepperdine’s university mission in that way. More specifically, the service learning that is incorporated into the public relations major supports the university’s Institutional Educational Objectives (IEOs) and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) related to Knowledge & Scholarship ("apply knowledge to real-world challenges"), Faith & Heritage ("respond to the call to serve others"), and Community & Global Understanding ("demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement" and “use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice”).

Another avenue for experiential learning is the internship. All public relations students are required to complete at least one 1-unit internship; many students complete several. These internships occur primarily in the United States; however, some are in international locations. The application of foundational knowledge and skills in experiential, service-learning projects equips Pepperdine public relations majors with the abilities necessary to land highly competitive and prestigious internships. In many cases, their demonstrated knowledge and skills, combined with the work ethic and service approach inculcated from the university mission and culture, result in Pepperdine public relations students being preferred for these internships over students from larger universities. The educational benefits of the internship are discussed in that section of the overall Communication Division Five Year Assessment document.

In addition, the public relations major houses the Fred L. Casmir Chapter of the Public Relations Student Society of America (PRSSA), which offers students leadership and management, service learning, strategic planning, event promotion and implementation, recruiting and fundraising, professional development, and networking experiences which may lead to internship and job opportunities.

During the past five years, the program has averaged slightly over 110 majors. Within Seaver College, Biology with 150 majors has 7 tenured faculty, with five teaching full-time in the major. Chemistry, with 40 students, has five full-time faculty. Accounting, with XX students, currently has four full-time faculty (which is one faculty member short of its historic allotment). Currently, there is only one full-time faculty member (Dr. Denise P. Ferguson, Associate Professor and Program Director, and Director of Graduate Programs in Communication) teaching in the public relations program. Adjuncts Kathy Shores, Michael Furtney, Kerry Miller, and Jennifer Musselman also teach required public relations courses (with the PR prefix). In addition, full-time faculty members in other related academic programs—Michael Jordan, Professor of Journalism; Dr. Ginger Rosenkrans, Associate Professor of Advertising; Debbie Wideroe, Visiting Professor and Director of Internship Programs; Dana Zurzolo, Assistant Professor of Graphic Arts; and Chris Stivers, Visiting Assistant Professor of Media—teach required courses in related disciplines. The four required core Communication Division courses are taught by a variety of professors; their assessment is provided in the Communication Division overview. Dr. Denise Ferguson’s appointment as Director of Graduate Programs in Communication carries a teaching reduction of one course over the academic year, or an annual teaching load of three public relations courses and one graduate course.

Given the responsibilities for oversight of curriculum and advising associated with more than 100 majors, extensive service-learning projects, an active co-curricular program (PRSSA), evidence gathered from this five-year program review, and consistent internal and external evidence of growth in this professional area, the public relations program is in need of a second full-time faculty member.
Program History and Description

In the late 1970s, Professor Emeritus Dr. Fred L. Casmir started one of the first public relations programs in the West Coast at Pepperdine University. Although its initial incarnation was as a sub-unit of the journalism major, student interest increased so much and so fast that the sub-unit became a sequence within the Bachelor of Arts in Communication. In an era when professional internships were not widely accepted, Pepperdine became one of the first universities in the country to develop a professional internship program for public relations students.

The Pepperdine public relations program outgrew its journalism roots and became an independent major in 1986, with a balance of theory and practice throughout its progressive curriculum. Since becoming a full major, the public relations curriculum has been deliberately modeled after recommendations made by the 1987 Commission on Public Relations Education Report, the 1999 Public Relations Education for the 21st Century: A Port of Entry, and the 2006 Report of the Commission on Public Relations Education, The Professional Bond. The reports are products of an appointed committee of leading international educators (including Pepperdine public relations program director Dr. Denise Ferguson) and practitioners representing a consortium of allied academic and professional communication organizations: the Public Relations Society of America and its Educators Academy; Institute for Public Relations, National Communication (which Dr. Ferguson represents); Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication; Global Alliance for PR; Canadian Public Relations Society; Council of Public Relations Firms, Center for Global Public Relations, Hispanic Public Relations Association; Association for Women in Communication, Black Public Relations Society, International Association of Business Communications, and International Communication Association.

A strong traditional liberal arts and social science is a necessary foundation for public relations education. It also is requisite that a multicultural and global perspective pervades the curriculum, and that public relations be taught within the

Communication (which Dr. Ferguson represents); Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication; Global Alliance for PR; Canadian Public Relations Society; Council of Public Relations Firms, Center for Global Public Relations, Hispanic Public Relations Association; Association for Women in Communication, Black Public Relations Society, International Association of Business Communications, and International Communication Association.

The Pepperdine public relations major was originally designed to achieve both the liberal arts education goals of the college and division as well as to enact the proposed curriculum outlined by the Commission on Public Relations Education (CPRE). The Commission’s Public Relations Education for the 21st Century: A Port of Entry states:

Both the 1999 and 2006 Commission reports list the following courses as essential to a strong undergraduate education in public relations (see Appendix II). How the Pepperdine public relations major not only meets, but also exceeds, these recommendations, are also presented below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CPRE Recommendations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pepperdine Public Relations Major</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Public Relations</td>
<td>MSCO 220 (Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including history, theory, principles)</td>
<td>COM 200 (Communication Theory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 301 (Message Creation and Effects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Research, Measurement, and Evaluation</td>
<td>COM 300 (Communication Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Writing and Technology</td>
<td>MSCO 371 (Communication Graphics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PR 380 (Public Relations Writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Strategic Planning and Management</td>
<td>PR 455 (Public Relations Techniques and Campaigns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PR 505 (Public Relations Management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies in Public Relations</td>
<td>PR 555 (Advanced Cases in Public Relations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Law and Ethics</td>
<td>COM 400 (Communication Ethics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSCO 570 (Mass Communication Law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Internship Experience</td>
<td>PR 598 (Public Relations Internship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed Electives</td>
<td>Outside concentration: 9-12 units in non-mass communication area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The curriculum is designed to give both theoretical and practical preparation in the varied areas in which the public relations professional should have expertise, focusing on writing and strategic planning and management, and including an overview of mass media, speech, persuasion, and management courses. The specific public relations courses are designed to be progressive in concept acquisition, skills development, strategic thinking paradigms and problem-solving intricacies. The major requires 40 units of Communication Division courses and nine to 12 upper-division units in a non-mass communication area that can enhance the public relations specialty interests. All courses are fully in support of Seaver College’s mission, and foster a through line of professional and personal responsibility development. Stated goals, concepts and competencies have been met consistently from introductory to capstone coursework.

Changes in Public Relations Program Since 2005 Review

There have been significant changes in public relations faculty and in the program since the last (2005) program review. The current sole full-time, tenure-track public relations professor is Dr. Denise Ferguson. She re-joined the public relations faculty, having been a full-time faculty member in the program during 2000-2002, and became program director in fall 2011 after the resignation of Dr. Emily Kinsky, who directed the program from fall 2009 through spring 2011. Due to periods without a primary full-time director of the public relations program and to periods of oversight interruption due to maternity leave and international program assignment, the program has experienced a significant instability over the past several years and has had to rely on adjunct instructors to deliver many required program courses. It is important to note, however, that student demand for the public relations major has remained strong.

Significant curriculum changes also have occurred since the 2005 program review. Largely due to a shortage in public relations and advertising faculty, the previous introductory public relations course (PR 255) was combined with the introductory course for advertising (ADV 275) to become MSCO 292, which shifted to MSCO 220 in fall 2009. This course is required for advertising, public relations and integrated marketing communication majors, and is often taken by students outside these majors. Multiple sections of this course are offered both semesters, which presents challenges in maintaining consistency of student learning outcomes, textbooks and resources, evaluation methods, and student preparation for subsequent courses in the majors. Because the introductory course includes advertising content, it is often taught by the division’s advertising faculty: full-time, tenured professor Dr. Ginger Rosenkrans and visiting professor Debbie Wideroe. Adjunct professor Mike Furtney also teaches multiple sections of MSCO 220, but will not be returning after spring 2012. Other courses with the PR designation are taught by adjunct professors Kathy Shores, Kerry Miller, and Jennifer Musselman.

The co-curricular program for the public relations major, the Fred L. Casmir Chapter of the Public Relations Student Society of America, has been historically quite active but has been less so in recent years due to gaps in faculty leadership. 2008-2009 marked a major revitalization of the chapter with a dramatic increase in membership, activities, and plans for the future, including to revive the student-run PR firm next year. Chapter activity again declined due to a combination of inadequate student and faculty advisor leadership, however, in fall 2011 Dr. Ferguson (Pepperdine PRSSA chapter faculty advisor) and new student leaders are re-energizing the chapter.

Enrollment Trends and Degrees Awarded

Between Fall 2005 and Fall 2011, the percentage of public relations majors averaged about 18% of total
enrollment within the Communication Division; since spring 2008 the percentage of public relations majors has been 18% or more (Table 1), ranging between 101 to 123 students since 2007 (Fig. 1). Other data gathered include capacity indicators such as the number of degrees conferred to date (407) and current major count (Spring 2011=118, the second largest major with 19% of total students in the Communication Division). This growth is appropriate and is expected to continue, based on student interest and growth in the industry.
### Table 1: Student Enrollment from Fall 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Public Relations</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
<th>PR % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2092</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public relations function in organizations continues to grow both in its essentiality and by number of practitioners. A Forbes article reported that the number of public relations and advertising agencies grew by 11% in 2011, despite the decline in the U.S. economy and in advertising spending growth. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are currently 243,000 public relations specialists in the United States with an expected growth of 18% through 2016.

**Fig. 1 – Student Enrollment in Public Relations from Fall 2005—Fall 2011**
Table 2: Public Relations Degrees Awarded by the Communication Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Public Relations</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
<th>PR % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2604</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2074</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2084</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2092</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2114</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mission of Public Relations Program

The public relations major provides students with theoretical and historical knowledge and practical skills in research, analysis, planning, counseling, writing and emerging media usage necessary to facilitate ethical communication between organizations and their publics. Ethical communicators who facilitate purposeful interaction between organizations and publics are at the forefront of communicators who are both leaders and servants of society. Public relations practitioners work in all areas of society—business, nonprofit organizations (e.g. the arts, church and ministry, community and service organizations), education, sports,
entertainment, politics, media, and agencies.

Goals: It is the aim of the public relations major to:

1. Provide a foundation of the basic theories, concepts, models, and history of study of human, persuasive, mediated, and mass communication.

2. Provide academic and scholarly insight in the processes of journalism, mass communication, organizational communication, public opinion, and legal constraints on such public communication as is relevant and appropriate for the study of public relations.

3. Provide an introduction to the function of language, symbols, and message effects on audiences.

4. Provide a foundation of the underlying scholarly principles and communication tools of contemporary public relations practice and management, and the trends shaping public relations practice.

5. Provide higher order training in appropriate written, oral, and mediated communication skills essential to a well-educated public relations practitioner.

6. Expose students to the origins and significance of public relations as both an academic discipline as well as a practical art within historic and hypothetical contexts.

7. Critically examine public relations as a process promoting complex, two-way communication; a process affecting the social responsibility and economic impact and survival of all types of organizations (global and domestic); and an influence on social conscience and public opinion.

8. Expose students to the ethics of communication, as well as the standards and responsibilities of the practice of PR.

9. Promote the ideal of social responsibility as a public relations role.

10. Provide opportunities for students to develop entry-level competency in varied areas in which the public relations practitioner should have expertise (e.g., mass media, writing, speech, persuasion, research, visual tactics, new technology, reputation management, strategic planning, and critical thinking).

11. Provide meaningful experiential opportunities in which students can exercise developing competencies, with particular focus on service-learning and ethics (professional and personal).

12. Instill the importance of professional and personal responsibility in the public relations work.
13. Engage in discussion of diversity and diversity issues and their relevance to public relations as vital to understanding and meeting the needs of special publics.

**Objectives:** Each public relations graduate will:

1. Identify and address public relations implications of mainstream problems, situations, challenges or trends (global and domestic) [Goals 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10]

2. Apply critical-thinking, problem-solving and proactive action skills [Goals 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10]

3. Apply the four-step public relations process in developing or analyzing campaigns [Goals 2, 4]

4. Debate ethical ramifications of actions taken in the name of public relations [Goals 2, 4, 5, 6, 9]

5. Critically examine how professional necessity and personal values may collide, and how to manage possible collisions [Goals 4, 5, 6, 9]

6. Situationally determine what is acceptable, according to ethical standards of the profession [Goals 2, 4, 5]

7. Test problem-solving and analyzing ability with case analyses [Goals 1, 2, 4]

8. Anticipate and manage issues through environmental scanning, strategizing and optimizing persuasive efforts, and putting those efforts into action [Goals 2, 3, 4, 7]

9. Manage information-gather, organize, prioritize and disseminate information to mass or segmented audiences [Goals 1, 2, 7]

10. Compare and contrast the perspectives, goals and loyalties of public relations with its related areas (e.g., advertising, fundraising, marketing, journalism) [Goals 2, 4]

11. Produce the most important and most common public relations tools according to commonly accepted standards [Goals 2, 7]

12. Identify evident and potential public relations situations from current events, develop public relations campaigns, carry out a publicity campaign for a client, produce a press kit, produce a direct mail package, design a special event plan and accompanying publicity materials, and conduct a major analysis and develop a campaign for organization as the senior
thesis [Goals 7, 8]

13. Present case analyses to colleagues in a professional setting and manage question-and-answer forums [Goals 3, 4, 7, 8]

14. Analyze situations, strategize and implement ideas with sensitivity to diverse audiences [Goals 3, 4, 10]

15. Quantitatively and qualitatively evaluate public relations efforts [Goals 2, 4, 7]

16. Research and write the senior thesis [Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]

17. Integrate technology into research and presentations [Goals 2, 4]

18. Be familiar with the job search process through research, interviews with professionals, and resume and portfolio development [Goals 7, 8, 9]

Public Relations Major Program Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes were revised in fall 2011. Students completing the public relations major should be able to:

1. Describe and analyze relevant theories, philosophies and practices of communication and public relations.
2. Communicate their thoughts clearly, succinctly and persuasively in textual, visual and oral formats using appropriate style for the situation and medium involved.
3. Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy, clarity, appropriate style, grammatical correctness and sensitivity.
4. Demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts that integrate faith with the responsibility to serve and engage communities and social justice globally.

Table 3 lists courses available for public relations majors and the level of learning expected for each outcome in each course. Some courses are primarily introductory, others provide both introductory material and practice, and the senior capstone expects mastery in all learning outcomes.
Table 3. Public Relations Learning Outcome Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>PLO #1: describe and analyze relevant theories, philosophies and practices of communication and public relations</th>
<th>PLO #2: communicate their thoughts clearly, succinctly and persuasively in textual, visual and oral formats using appropriate style for the situation and medium involved</th>
<th>PLO #3: critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy, clarity, appropriate style, grammatical correctness and sensitivity</th>
<th>PLO #4: demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts that integrates faith with the responsibility to serve and engage communities and social justice globally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 371</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 570</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 380</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 455</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 505</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 555</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 595*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1 = introduced; P = practiced; M mastered)

Table 4 displays alignment of the learning outcomes identified by the public relations program with those outlined by Seaver College and the Communication Division. Public relations courses related to both sets of learning outcomes are listed on the right hand side of the table.
Table 4. Alignment Map of Learning Outcomes
School: Seaver College/Communication Division
Program: Public Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes from IEOs</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td>PLO #1: Describe and analyze relevant theories, philosophies and practices of communication and public relations</td>
<td>MSCO 220 MSCO 371 MSCO 570 PR 455 PR 505 PR 555 PR 595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLO #2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate their thoughts clearly, succinctly and persuasively in textual, visual and oral formats using appropriate style for the situation and medium involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</td>
<td>PLO #4:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts that integrates faith with the responsibility to serve and engage communities and social justice globally</td>
<td>MSCO 220 MSCO 570 PR 455 PR 505 PR 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.</td>
<td>PLO #3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy, clarity, appropriate style, grammatical correctness and sensitivity</td>
<td>PR 455 PR 505 PR 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.</td>
<td>Demonstrate preparedness of students for service and leadership in science related issues affecting society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

442
| Recognize the responsibility and call to use one’s talents in the service of others rather than merely for personal or material gain. | PLO #4: Demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts that integrates faith with the responsibility to serve and engage communities and social justice globally | PR 555  
PR 595  
MSCO 220  
PR 555 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement. | PLO #4: Demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts that integrates faith with the responsibility to serve and engage communities and social justice globally | MSCO 220  
PR 455  
PR 555 |
| Read widely, think critically, and communicate clearly. | PLO #2: Communicate their thoughts clearly, succinctly and persuasively in textual, visual and oral formats using appropriate style for the situation and medium involved | MSCO 371  
PR 380  
PR 455  
PR 505  
PR 555  
MSCO 570 |
| Engage in responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life. | PLO #4: Demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts and be able to discuss the ethics of various communication efforts of others, including crisis communication | MSCO 220  
MSCO 570  
PR 505  
PR 555 |
| Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice. | PLO #4: Demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts that integrates faith with the responsibility to serve and engage communities and social justice globally | MSCO 220  
PR 455  
PR 505  
PR 555 |
Public Relations Program Quality

Student Profile

Student recruitment focuses primarily on predictors of academic success, such as high school GPA and either SAT or ACT scores. The average high school GPA of incoming public relations student majors rose slightly from 2005 until 2008, when it was its highest point, and has declined slightly since then (Table 3). The average high school GPA of incoming public relations students have been consistently lower, although slightly, each year than those of the aggregated Communication Division student GPA (Fig. 3).

Table 5: High School GPA, Fall 2005—Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>COM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: High School GPA from Fall 2005-Fall 2011
In addition, incoming public relations majors show SAT scores slightly lower than the average for the Communication Division as a whole (Fig. 4).

Fig. 3 – SAT Scores Program 2005-2010

Curriculum and Learning Environment
Requirements for a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Public Relations at Pepperdine University are comparable to many of our benchmark and aspirant institutions (Table 6). Pomona College does not have a degree in public relations or communication; Carleton College has BA degrees in communication and journalism, but no sequence or major in public relations. Wake Forest offers a BA in communication or a minor in journalism, with one course in writing for public relations and advertising. Calvin College offers a major in strategic communication with a professional track that includes 3 units (1 course) in public relations.

Baylor University's BA in journalism has a public relations sequence option that requires 24 units (6 courses).

Of the public relations majors identified below, Pepperdine's program requires the second highest number of units, 49. The public relations major at USC, San Diego State Univ., ACU, and Belmont are housed in journalism and media; BYU and Pepperdine programs are housed in communication. Notre Dame’s program is housed within the English & Communication Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Units Required in Major for BA/BS Degree</th>
<th>Intro to PR</th>
<th>Writing/ Media/ Design</th>
<th>Cases, Campaigns &amp; Mgmt</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Law and Ethics</th>
<th>Internship</th>
<th>Concentration/Electives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State Univ</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame University</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research of benchmark and aspirant programs indicates significant similarity in some content/skill areas, and significant differences or imbalances in others, between these programs and Pepperdine's public relations major. Specifically, the Pepperdine program provides students with comparable preparation in introductory public relations content, research, law and ethics, and internship experience. However, this data reveals substantial differences in writing/media design credits, with Pepperdine students’ preparation in critical writing and media design knowledge and skills being much weaker based on current curriculum requirements. This deficiency is addressed in the proposed public relations curriculum below.

**Faculty Profile**

One full-time tenure-track faculty member is dedicated to and directs the public relations major. Two other full-time members of the faculty, one man (tenure-track) and two women (one tenure-track), teach required courses in the public relations program, not including the core courses shared by other majors. And, two visiting professors and four adjunct professors teach courses in the program. In terms of ethnicity, all are classified as white. The list of faculty and their specific ranks are as follows: Dr. Denise Ferguson (Associate Professor of Communication and Director of Graduate Programs in Communication), Dr. Michael Jordan (Professor of Journalism), Dr. Ginger Rosenkrans (Associate Professor of Advertising), Chris Stivers (Visiting Professor of Media), Debbie Wideroe (Visiting Professor and Director of Internship Programs), and Dana Zurzolo (Assistant Professor of Graphic Arts), and adjunct professors Mike Furtney, Kathy Shores, Kerry Miller, and Jennifer Musselman.

Specialties of the faculty are diverse enough to accommodate all of the curricula offered within the public relations program. However, it remains a serious weakness in the public relations program that there is only one full-time, tenure-track faculty member dedicated to public relations education, which results in the majority of the PR-designated courses being taught by adjunct professors who do not hold the desired academic credentials and do not engage in academic or professional research, which is essential in equipping Pepperdine students with cutting-edge knowledge and skills for this rapidly changing profession. This also results in lack of continuity and consistency in achieving program learning outcomes, as evidenced below.

Table 7 shows a breakdown of each faculty member's specialty, and Table 8 shows the courses taught by each member of the faculty. Abbreviated curriculum vitae for all full-time members of the faculty listed below are provided in Appendix I.
Table 7. Expertise of Full-time Tenure-Track and Visiting Faculty Members

Teaching in the Public Relations Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denise P. Ferguson</td>
<td>Ph.D. 1998</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Public Relations: Activism, Crisis Communication, Political Public Relations, Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jordan</td>
<td>J.D. 1982</td>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>Journalism, Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger Rosenkrans</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Nova Southeastern University</td>
<td>Advertising, IMC, Online Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Stivers</td>
<td>Ed.D., 2003</td>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Media, Visual Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Wideroe</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Advertising, IMC, Internships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. List of courses offered and faculty members responsible for each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Offered</th>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Courses Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220</td>
<td>Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication</td>
<td>D. Ferguson, M. Furtney, G. Rosenkrans, D. Wideroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 371</td>
<td>Communication Graphics</td>
<td>C. Stivers, D. Zurzolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 570</td>
<td>Media Law</td>
<td>M. Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 380</td>
<td>Public Relations Writing</td>
<td>K. Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 455</td>
<td>Public Relations Techniques and Campaigns</td>
<td>J. Musselman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 505</td>
<td>Public Relations Management</td>
<td>K. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 555</td>
<td>Advanced Cases in Public Relations</td>
<td>D. Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 595</td>
<td>Public Relations Internship</td>
<td>D. Wideroe, D. Ferguson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum, Teaching, Student Learning and Assessment, and Resulting Changes

Public relations faculty members have meetings once each semester to discuss all areas of our curriculum, including the assignment of specific teaching duties, coordination of teaching schedules and class coverage, and design of appropriate learning outcomes and their assessment. This section will chronicle the history of general public relations program assessment over the past few years, and discuss resulting program changes; assessment of the specific program learning outcomes will be discussed in a later section.

Spring 2009 Program Review. In spring 2009, PR majors from PR 455 (Public Relations Techniques and Campaigns) and PR 555 (Advanced Cases in Public Relations) were invited to participate in focus groups discussing the major – its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (a SWOT analysis). Individual in-depth interviews were also conducted with a few alumni and external professionals.

A number of positive issues emerged in the review process to date. It is a unique and vital program that is popular with students, linked to the Pepperdine mission, and in growing demand by external constituents. Students spoke highly of the real-world experiences shared by adjunct professors, the rigor of the writing course, and the helpful advice shared by guest speakers. They also appreciated having a required internship and assignments that forced them to learn diverse writing methods, new technology, and personal branding through their written and digital résumés. However, a number of critical issues emerged that have served as a series of guiding issue points as we have tried to quickly move to enhance the major. Critical issues that emerged in the review analysis included:

• Student perceptions of unnecessary redundancy in course content
• Student concerns about quality and quantity of materials covered in courses and course sequences
• Student perceptions of gaps within the program (e.g., inadequate knowledge of history and theories, lack of business and financial understanding, the need for more development of writing skills throughout the major)

These results were shared and discussed at a PR faculty meeting in spring 2009. As a result of the meeting, several course content and assignment changes were implemented in fall 2009. One of the biggest keys to resolving these problems appears to be simple communication between the professors teaching PR courses. Instructors in the public relations program met several times during 2008-2009 and have continued communicating with the hopes of benefiting instructors, students and the division.

Spring 2010 Program Review. During 2009-2010 public relations faculty assessed student learning related to technology (PLO #1), ethical behavior (PLO #2), accuracy (PLO #3), and diversity (PLO #4) using a variety of indirect and direct measures. With regard to the major as a whole, a survey was also taken of the juniors and seniors in PR 455, PR 505 and PR 555 this spring (see Appendix G).
Student comments pointed toward a number of dissatisfactions and changes needed, including more individual writing opportunities across the curriculum as a whole and uniformity in standards, increased advanced technology skills (especially social media and visual communication), more media relations experience (e.g., pitching stories and building relationships with media representatives), too much repetition across courses, more experience implementing strategic communication campaign plans and other hands-on experiences, more challenging coursework, redesign of the PR writing course, more demonstration of professors’ professional experience.

Significantly, MSCO 220 (the gateway/introductory course to the major) was not rated highly as a useful course, indicating urgent need for revision. This course integrates public relations, advertising, and integrated marketing communication, and is required for all students in these three majors; previously, public relations majors were required to take a dedicated “principles of public relations” introductory course. These open-ended student responses are included in the appendix.

**Spring 2011 Program Review.** Public relations faculty members met in late spring 2011 to discuss findings from 2010-2011 assessment through course instruments, focus groups, and interviews with alumni and other professionals, and resulting changes to the public relations curriculum. PLOs were reduced from 14 to 4. There was discussion of revisions to individual course SLOs, including the goal of a common set of SLOs for MSCO 220. Because the PLO #2 assessment during spring 2011 only looked at the written aspect of the senior thesis, the plan should be adjusted for further assessment of this PLO to include other writing samples as well as oral messages and design work.

The group’s work culminated in proposed curriculum changes based on evidence obtained during 2010-2011 assessment efforts. The proposed changes were approved by the Communication Division Curriculum Committee in spring 2011. Due to Dr. Kinsky’s departure and Dr. Ferguson’s transition as program director and the five-year program review process, the proposed changes have not been advanced to the Seaver Academic Committee; rather, it was felt by the new program director and division chair that it would be beneficial to integrate any additional needed changes that emerged through the five-year program review into the curriculum changes that will be proposed to the Seaver Academic Committee. Some changes to course descriptions and student learning outcomes are anticipated, however, the previously approved curriculum and requirement changes listed below will remain in substantively in the proposal to the Seaver Academic Committee that is anticipated to be submitted for consideration in fall 2012. Additional proposed changes generated through the 2011-2012 five-year program review are indicated by italicics.

**Public Relations CURRENT Curriculum (49-52 total units required):**

**Communication Core Courses: 12 units**
- COM 200 Communication Theory ............... (3)
- COM 300 Introduction to Communication Research (PS, RM, WI) .... (3)
- COM 301 Message Creation and Effects ............ (3)
- COM 400 Communication Ethics .................. (3)
Public Relations Major Requirements: 28 units
MSCO 220 Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication (4)
MSCO 371 Communication Graphics (4)
MSCO 570 Mass Communication Law (4)
PR 380 Public Relations Writing (4)
PR 455 Public Relations Techniques and Campaigns (4)
PR 505 Public Relations Management (4)
PR 555 Advanced Case Studies in Public Relations (3)
PR 595 Public Relations Internship (1)

Outside Concentration: 9-12 upper-division units

Public Relations PROPOSED Curriculum; changes underlined (55-59 total units required)

Communication Core (9 units):
COM 200 Communication Theory (3)
COM 300 Introduction to Communication Research (3)
COM 400 Communication Ethics (3)

Media Core (19 units)
COM 205 Storytelling Through Media (3)
COM 570 Media Law (4)
JOUR 241 Introduction to Journalism (4)
MSCO 220 Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication (4)
MSCO 371 Communication Graphics (4)

Public Relations Major Requirements (15-16 units):
PR 380 Public Relations Writing (4)
PR 455 Management, Strategies, and Tactics -- include advanced writing as a component (4)
PR 555 Public Relations Campaigns and Cases -- should be the capstone (3)
PR 590 Special Topics (rotation of event planning, social media, cases, etc.) (3)
PR 595 Public Relations Internship (1)
Choose one from the following:

COM 301  Message Creation and Effects (3)
JOUR 325  Publication Design (4)
COM 385  Argumentation and Advocacy (3)
COM 380  Business and Professional Communication (4)
COM 408  Multimedia Production and Authoring (3)
COM 413  Intercultural Communication (4)
COM 418  Communication in Organizations (4)
COM 507  Public Opinion, Persuasion and Propaganda (4)

Concentration outside media (three upper division courses of 3 or 4 units each) (9-12 units)

The following experiential courses are available and encouraged for voluntary enrollment:

PR 251  Public Relations Practicum, Independent Study (0-2) – (work for Communication co-curricular programs in print and online journalism, television, radio, debate.)
PR 351  Public Relations Practicum, Independent Study (0-2) – (work for Communication Bureau, the division student-run firm or advanced media, if pre-requisites are met)

The proposed curriculum changes are significant. First, they increase the public relations major from 49-52 total units to 55-59 total units. Second, they involve dropping COM 301, Message Creation and Effect, from the Communication Core shared with advertising, intercultural communication, organizational communication, interpersonal communication, and rhetoric and leadership majors. Third, a 19-unit writing and media core is established, with two writing- and media-related courses added to the public relations curriculum: COM 205, Storytelling Through Media, a course added for the first time in Fall 2011, and JOUR 241, Introduction to Journalism, added to correct the deficiency in students’ journalistic writing preparation and skills that were revealed through benchmarking and in program assessment. Fourth, PR 505, Public Relations Management is dropped from the curriculum; management is incorporated into PR 455, which is renamed Management, Strategies, and Tactics. Fifth, PR 555 becomes the capstone, renamed Public Relations Campaigns and Cases, giving students a conventional applied experience in their final course prior to graduation. Sixth, PR 590 (Special Topics) is included to offer students more advanced, specialized knowledge and skill development in an area of their interest. Finally, PR 251 and 351 provide students with low-unit opportunities to gain more practical experience through experiential learning by working on any.
division co-curricular program or in independent study.

In fall 2011, after the SALT review of the public relations program assessment report submitted in spring 2011, response to the review written by Denise Ferguson, and assessment workshops held by Associate Dean Constance Fulmer, the public relations Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) were revised according to the SALT review recommendations and to be aligned with the Pepperdine University Institutional Educational Objectives (IEOs). The PLOs upon which the spring 2011 assessment report was based, and the revised PLOs, upon which current and future assessment of the public relations program will be based, are below.

SPRING 2011 PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Students completing the program should be able to:

1. Describe and analyze relevant theories, philosophies and practices of communication and public relations.
2. Communicate their thoughts clearly, succinctly and persuasively in textual, visual and oral formats using appropriate style for the situation and medium involved.
3. Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy, clarity, appropriate style, grammatical correctness and sensitivity.
4. Demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts and be able to discuss the ethics of various communication efforts of others, including crisis communication.

REVISED FALL 2011 PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Students completing the public relations program should be able to:

1. Describe and analyze relevant theories, philosophies and practices of communication and public relations.
2. Communicate their thoughts clearly, succinctly and persuasively in textual, visual and oral formats using appropriate style for the situation and medium involved.
3. Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy, clarity, appropriate style, grammatical correctness and sensitivity.
4. Demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts that integrate faith with the responsibility to serve and engage communities and social justice globally.

In addition, the MSCO 220 Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) were revised according to the SALT review of the public relations program assessment report submitted in spring 2011. The previous and revised course SLOs are below.
SPRING 2011 MSCO 220 SLOs:

The student will

• learn advertising and PR terms and concepts
• critically examine the influence and role of advertising and PR in society
• evaluate PR and advertising messages
• create messages that communicate with diverse groups in a sensitive manner
• examine and gain an understanding of basic online media
• analyze ethical behavior in advertising and PR
• research, evaluate and present his/her findings on a particular organization’s use of advertising and PR

FALL 2011 REVISED MSCO 220 SLOs

A student who successfully completes of this course should be able to:

7. Articulate an understanding of important advertising and public relations theories, terms and concepts
8. Critically assess advertising as a means of communication, an economic and social institution, a tool for marketing and public relations, and an influence on consumer buying decisions and behavior
9. Differentiate the influence and role of public relations in society, its value to organizations in building mutually beneficial relationships with internal and external publics, its value to publics in contributing to their ability to make informed decisions, and its use as a tool for marketing and advertising
10. Demonstrate competent oral and written communication skills
11. Critically evaluate public relations and advertising messages and ethical behavior that communicates with diverse groups in a sensitive manner

As can be seen in Table 9, fall 2011 student evaluations of courses and public relations professors reveal student perceptions that the program offers some excellent teachers and excellent courses, and that substantial improvements are needed for some courses and teachers.

Table 9. Fall 2011 evaluations of Public Relations core courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>Professor Score</th>
<th>Course Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220.01</td>
<td>13/19</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220.02</td>
<td>20/24</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220.03</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2011 was the first semester at Pepperdine University for instructors of MSCO 220.03, PR 455, and PR 555; adjustment to the division culture and student expectations, and becoming more accustomed to the structure and organization of the courses will improve professor scores in subsequent semesters.

The instances of low professor scores are also related to low course scores, which reveal that significant changes are needed, specifically for PR 555, PR 380, and MSCO 220, to a lesser extent; this need is reinforced by program assessment. MSCO 220, Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication, presents challenges typical in a multi-section course with multiple professors teaching the course. Examination of the syllabi used in fall 2011 revealed significant inconsistencies across sections in course delivery, and even in student learning outcomes:

- 2 of the three used the August 2011 revised Student Learning Outcomes; 1 had SLOs that focused on advertising primarily;
- 1 required NO public relations textbook, even though this is the gateway course for the public relations major;
- 1 did not include a final exam, or comprehensive end-of-semester assessment, other than the final project;
- 1 had little public relations content listed on the course schedule—no mention of history, theory, or the strategic campaign planning process, which are essential building blocks for subsequent public relations courses;
- All 3 syllabi listed different major project requirements; only 1 gave students the option to choose a public relations campaign OR a brand advertising plan, depending on their major.
- 2 required deliverables (finished products) for the final project; 1 required only drafts of creative work

These results were alarming. Clearly, students in the three majors were not gaining the preparation required for the next phase of their academic programs, especially if they were public relations majors. And, the different sections were inconsistent in their expectations for achieving student learning outcomes through texts and readings, major projects, exams, and readings, which is extremely problematic for assessment. It creates the added situation of students comparing expectations for their individual MSCO classes, and fosters disgruntled students if they perceive more is required of them than of their peers in the same course taught by a different professor.

As a result of this examination of MSCO 220 syllabi, program directors in public relations, advertising, and integrated marketing communication together reviewed the course student learning outcomes again in fall
2011, and agreed to use the identical revised SLOs in all three sections of the course in spring 2012. The program directors and chair of the division will meet regularly to discuss the consistent delivery of this course, and the integration of these areas of strategic communication.

The course evaluations reveal major problems with PR 380, Public Relations Writing, which is by adjunct faculty, related to the course design and instruction. The preparation in content and skills needed for public relations professionals in the area of writing has changed more than perhaps any other area of public relations over the last two decades, due to changes in the technology used in delivering public relations messages and engaging with publics. PR 380 simply has not kept pace with these changes; it continues to be taught largely from the perspective of a traditional, old-media journalism model. Thus, students report that the gap between what they learn in this class and what they encounter as interns (who are expected to possess knowledge and skills in current public relations writing and tools) is sizable, and that the class has little value for them in preparing them for internships and professional positions. Open-ended comments evidence a pattern of students’ dissatisfaction with their preparation as writers in their profession. This course is being redesigned with updated student learning outcomes, assignments, and projects that integrate advanced digital and social media, for implementation in fall 2012, which may require a change in instructor.

PR 555, Advanced Cases in Public Relations, the capstone course in the public relations major, also needs substantial redesign, based on Pepperdine PR faculty review, assessment (see below), and course evaluations, and based on the Commission on Public Relations Education undergraduate curriculum recommendations and benchmark programs, which require an applied campaign project in the final course in a public relations major. Pepperdine students perceive a disconnect between being required to write a 20-page thesis-style case study analysis (in the current curriculum) as the culminating project in their professional preparation just prior to launching into entry-level positions for which that style of writing does not apply. This comment typifies students’ perspectives: “Change it from case studies to applicable learning for a career in communication.” The instructor, being new to the program, began the class on the first day of the semester by conducting a focus group interview with these seniors, having gone through the program. Students reported being very dissatisfied with their preparation and with the program, citing the inconsistency of instruction and heavy use of adjunct professors, and feeling unprepared with adequate writing skills. They did see great value in their internship experiences and in their applied class projects.

**Assessment of Learning Outcomes for the Public Relations Program**

Table 10 identifies the primary courses where the four major learning outcomes for the public relations program will be assessed. For each of the program learning outcomes (PLOs), methods of direct and indirect assessment are summarized, and the timeline for each assessment is provided. Data from each method of assessment will be tabulated and analyzed at the end of the assessment period. These data will be evaluated by the faculty in public relations in collaboration with the Division Chair. Any inadequacies of the assessment
protocols will be corrected at the time of our evaluation. Details of the methods used to assess the learning outcomes for the public relations program are presented in the following paragraphs.

Table 10. Identified Courses and Timeline for Evaluation of the Public Relations Program Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>When to Assess</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis &amp; Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: describe and analyze relevant theories, philosophies and practices of communication and public relations</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Embedded questions in MSCO 220 final exam; PR 555 pre-test and post-test; embedded question on PR555 case study rubric</td>
<td>Surveys; Classroom assessment</td>
<td>Annual report/program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: communicate their thoughts clearly, succinctly and persuasively in textual, visual and oral formats using appropriate style for the situation and medium involved</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>PR 380 media kit; PR 455 media kit and campaign; PR 505 management trend presentation and management project; PR 555 case study, strategic campaign and portfolio</td>
<td>Classroom assessment</td>
<td>Annual report/program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy, clarity, appropriate</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Media kit self- and peer evaluation in PR 455; Presentation self- and peer evaluation in PR</td>
<td>Classroom assessment</td>
<td>Annual report/program review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Learning Outcome 1: Describe and analyze relevant theories, philosophies and practices of communication and public relations.

In each course in the public relations curriculum, depth of understanding and application of material are assessed through written exams, writing assignments, and individual and team projects. For this learning outcome, we use both cross-sectional and longitudinal assessments.

Assessment Through MSCO 220, Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication Systematic cross-sectional introductory assessments will be performed starting in spring 2012 through embedded exam questions (to be developed through consensus by program directors in advertising, integrated marketing communication, and public relations) in MSCO 220, the gateway course that is required for all public relations majors and through which students gain entry-level knowledge of basic public relations concepts. In this course, students should be equipped with an understanding of the history and development, theories, functions, publics, communication methods and technology, and contexts for the practice of public relations. Subsequent courses require this background, and there is an expectation that students are prepared in this course for more advanced courses in public relations that require synthesis and critical thinking. Beginning with this course, we will use a longitudinal approach to evaluate knowledge retention and basic preparedness of cohorts advancing through the public relations program. In addition, the PRSSA recommended curriculum and Commission on Public Relations Education curriculum guidelines expect that the introductory course cover this material.
The MSCO 220 Course Description from the 2011-2012 Seaver Academic Catalog states: “This course is designed as an introductory course allowing students to gain the necessary foundation in advertising, marketing, promotion, and public relations. This course begins with the background, role, and economic and social effects of advertising and public relations. Students will develop an understanding of marketing mix strategy, market research, copywriting, storyboarding, design and layout, Internet advertising, sales promotion, and publicity for print, and broadcast and then create an effective plan demonstrating their understanding of these areas.”

During fall 2011 and January 2012, program directors for advertising, integrated marketing communication, and public relations worked together on revising the student learning outcomes (SLOs) for MSCO 220 so that students in all three majors would be adequately prepared with introductory knowledge and skills in this course, corresponding to each program’s curriculum map. The revised MSCO 220 SLOs are provided below.

Course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

A student who successfully completes of this course should be able to:

12. Articulate an understanding of important advertising, integrated marketing communication, and public relations theories, terms and concepts
13. Critically assess advertising as a means of communication, an economic and social institution, a tool for marketing and public relations, and an influence on consumer buying decisions and behavior
14. Differentiate the influence and role of public relations in society, its value to organizations in building mutually beneficial relationships with internal and external publics, its value to publics in contributing to their ability to make informed decisions, and its use as a tool for marketing and advertising
15. Identify various communication formats and the media planning and buying strategies used to deploy them
16. Demonstrate competent oral and written communication skills
17. Critically evaluate public relations, IMC, and advertising messages and ethical behavior that communicates with diverse groups in a sensitive manner

Assessment Through PR 555, Advanced Cases in Public Relations, the Capstone PR Course

As indicated in the Public Relations Program Assessment Plan, longitudinal mastery assessment is accomplished in PR 555, when questions from MSCO 220 again assess knowledge through embedded exam questions. All PR-designated courses subsequent to MSCO 220 provide opportunities for students to practice competency in this program learning outcome.

We evaluated Program Learning Outcome #1 through a post-test of the PR 555 students in both the fall 2010 and spring 2011 terms. The post-test included 21 open-ended questions (see Appendix 2). The results and reflections from Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Fall 2011 are provided below.

Results and Reflection on Pre/Post Tests for PR 555 Fall 2010 Evidence

Out of 21 questions, 15 had more correct answers given on the post-test compared with the pre-test. Few,
however, had 90% or more answered correctly. Only question 14 (What types of tasks does a public relations practitioner do?) scored above a 90% on the post-test. Questions 2 and 3 on the pre-test (Where can you find a public relations job? What are some goals of public relations efforts?) were the only ones to receive above 90% on the pre-test. A majority of students were able to answer 12 questions (of 21 questions, or 57%) correctly on the pre-test, and 12 questions correctly on the post-test (though one was different).

Analysis & Reflection

It was encouraging to see that almost all knew AP style is the correct writing style (89% on post-test), although that should be 100%. Overall, they understand well where they can find a public relations job, what goals they might have in public relations, and what tasks they might perform and materials they might produce.

The fall 2010 and spring 2011 assessment revealed that students completing the public relations major capstone course, as a whole, did not grasp the similarities and differences between public relations and its cousin fields of advertising, marketing and journalism, which are designed to be introduced in MSCO 220. Many of them do not grasp that public relations involves more than image building or publicity. Only one student knew the four models of public relations on the post-test. Very few could name an historic figure from the field, and several gave irrelevant answers. Several used phrases more commonly used outside the field to explain public relations, such as “free advertising.”

There were few commonalities on the definition of public relations. The public relations faculty should determine a common definition to use across the curriculum so that students will graduate with at least one definition clear in their minds. Some students could not answer the final question “What difference does diversity make in public relations?” well. In fact, some were adamant that it made no difference. For example, one student said, “None. Diversity is NOT always necessary. When it happens, that’s FINE TOO. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.” – with the final word underlined.

Suggestions for Improvement

Some of these 21 areas were deemed not as important and were removed from the pre- and post-test (e.g., the importance of licensure) after spring 2011 assessment. We need to clearly communicate and emphasize:

Definition of the field

Theories significant in public relations research and practice

The similarities and differences with allied fields

The four models of public relations

Historic figures from the field
Issues and risk management

How to make ethical decisions in public relations

How diversity plays a role in public relations

Results and Reflection on Post Tests for PR 555 Spring 2011 Evidence

Each of the 21 students understood well that a public relations job can be found almost anywhere, and was able to describe tasks a practitioner would perform. Twenty of the 21 students could also list types of materials produced in public relations. Seventy percent or more of students could describe potential public relations goals, job titles, writing style, the use of social media, and the importance of accuracy. About half of the students could define public relations well; could describe the similarities and differences between public relations, marketing, and journalism; could list potential publics they might want to reach; and could explain the impact of diversity in public relations.

For a few questions, students struggled to completely answer the question, but they got a portion of the answer right: four models of public relations (6 got part, 1 got it all), describing a news release (7 got it partially correct, 5 had a more complete answer), and making ethical decisions (11 answered partially, 7 answered more fully). Only 19% could define issues management and risk communication, and only a third could explain the differences and similarities with advertising.

Trends – Comparison to Fall 2010

More students could define public relations this semester than in the fall (52% vs. 44%); more could tell where a job could be found (100% vs. 89%); more could name the four models of public relations (6 partially, 1 completely vs. 2 partial, 1 complete); more accurately named historic figures from the field (67% vs. 33% in the fall); more shared typical tasks (100% in spring vs. 94% in fall) and materials produced (95% vs. 83%). About the same number could list possible goals of public relations efforts (78% vs. 76%). Fewer could name differences and similarities with advertising (33% vs. 50%); similarities and differences with journalism (57% vs. 67%); and potential publics (57% vs. 67%). Starting in Spring 2012, the level of acceptability for these questions, demonstrating successful accomplishment of this program learning outcome, will be 70%.

Analysis & Reflection

It was encouraging to see better answers on certain questions. For 8 out of 21 questions, there was an increase in the scores in the spring semester and a decrease in only 3 questions; the majority stayed about the same.

As in the fall semester, these results point to either a need to reassess what we deem important or to reemphasize topics. As a result, the list of 21 questions was re-evaluated and shortened to include the following knowledge areas to satisfy Program Learning Outcome #1:
Definition of public relations

Theories significant in public relations research and practice

Historical figures in public relations

Similarities and differences with advertising

Similarities and differences with marketing

Similarities and differences with journalism

Potential publics (though this may have been attributed to them not understanding that a list is requested)

Four models of public relations

Describing a news release (this might be improved with a rewording of the question)

Issues management

Risk management

How to make ethical decisions (specific processes they can follow)

Diversity's role and importance in PR

Strengths (evident in the post-test)

Public relations students clearly know they can look in a number of directions when searching for a job upon graduation. While this may sound straightforward, this is not true at other universities. Our students understand the types of tasks ahead of them, including social media usage. Most of the students recognized the urgency of accurate work and its impact on credibility. They also knew AP style was the correct style to use in their writing, which is an improvement upon past years where more were confused with APA. Many recognized a connection between issues management and crisis management. Many mentioned that they must always tell the truth. Several also mentioned the PRSA Code of Ethics, and others included deontology or other theories to support how they would respond in an ethically challenging situation.

Limitations (evident in the post-test)

The key problem that was evident in both the fall and spring post-tests is that our students still cannot define public relations well. This is an urgent issue to resolve. It is also quite alarming that so many still do not comprehend the differences and similarities with the related fields of advertising, journalism and marketing. Before giving the post-test in future semesters, the instructor could go over the questions with students and print out those details that have been missed by previous students.

Suggestions for Improvement (based on the post-test)

Emphasize at each level of the curriculum how public relations compares and contrasts to advertising, journalism and marketing. Clarify the language of the definition of public relations, and that public relations is not “free,” and also is more than image building. Discuss ethics theories in PR 555, not just in COM 400.
ethics class. Also, read through the PRSA Code of Ethics and perhaps have them memorize it for a test.

Results and Reflection on Pre- and Post-Tests for PR 555 Fall 2011 (improvements in bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>Pre-test raw score correct</th>
<th>Pre-test % correct</th>
<th>Post-test raw score correct</th>
<th>Post-test % correct</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is public relations?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Types of organizations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goals of PR efforts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tasks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sim/Dif from ADV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sim/Dif from MKTG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sim/Dif from JOURN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Positions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Writing style</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Publics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 4 models</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. News release</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Key figures and their contributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Issues Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Risk Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions:

Learning significantly improved in three important areas: knowledge of key figures and their contributions to public relations (#13); identification of primary ethical guidelines (#17); and articulation of how public relations can support the organization’s overall mission and objectives (#18). These questions are transcendent in scope, and related to an historical/social, liberal arts-based understanding of the profession, to the Pepperdine Christian mission, and to a broader, interdisciplinary understanding of how organizations operate.

Learning slightly increased in students’ understanding of public relations (#1), however, this is an area for continued, vital improvement, as well as in understanding of the profession’s similarities to and differences from advertising, marketing, and journalism, which showed little change from pre-test to post-test (only +1 for advertising). There was slight increase in identification of publics (#10) and understanding of risk communication (#15) and the impact of faith (#20).

Results decreased slightly for only two questions: identification of typical positions in public relations (#8—this question was left blank for 1 survey); and how social media are used (#16—1 response only mentioned of two tools)

Recommendations

There needs to be continued focus on clarifying the similarities and distinctions between advertising, public relations, integrated marketing, and journalism. This content is appropriately addressed in the introductory/gateway course to the major, MSCO 220, Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication. As addressed elsewhere in this program review, analysis of the syllabi from the multiple sections demonstrates many inconsistencies in course delivery; no doubt those inconsistencies, or gaps in foundational knowledge and skills, helps explain why seniors in their capstone course are unable to adequately define public relations, identify key figures and their contributions, and models of public relations, etc.

Learning Outcome 2: Communicate their thoughts clearly, succinctly and persuasively in textual, visual and oral formats using appropriate style for the situation and medium involved

One aspect of the second program learning outcome was assessed in spring 2011, by reading and analyzing senior theses from PR 555. Each faculty member (Furtney, Kinsky, Miller, Shores) was given a rubric to evaluate student papers based on clear, succinct, persuasive and appropriate writing on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent and 1 being unacceptable. These were direct assessment measures used after the
semester ended (thus not connected to grading). This thesis is the current capstone experience for public relations majors at Pepperdine.

Four internal reviewers (public relations faculty) reviewed randomly selected capstone projects (case analyses papers from PR 555) and evaluated them on their clarity, succinctness, persuasiveness and appropriateness for the assignment.

Evidence

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent and 1 being unacceptable, PR faculty found that senior public relations majors:

Communicated thoughts clearly: avg = 3.63

Communicated thoughts succinctly: avg = 3.56

Communicated thoughts persuasively: avg = 3.375

Used appropriate style for the situation: avg = 3.44

Analysis & Reflection

The scores averaged to around 70%, so they do demonstrate learning. Based on our assessment, however, the students merely reached the acceptable level of written communication as far as clarity, succinctness, persuasiveness and appropriateness. Their lower level of success on the assessment, however, may be attributable to the way this assignment is set within the curriculum. We train them to write in a particular style (Associate Press) in PR 380, but then in PR 555, they are required to write in a more formal, academic-journal style (American Psychological Association) – something they have not done before in their public relations classes. Also, instead of doing the type of professional work we have had them do in PR 380 and PR 455, they are required to analyze – more at a graduate-school level – the work of public relations professionals in their handling of crises. While this is a credible and valuable assignment, it is not the best assessment of these students’ competence at performing work in the field of public relations, nor of their preparation for it. While a “cases” course is completely appropriate for a public relations program, an academic case study analysis should not be the capstone project.

Strengths & Limitations (based on assessment of PLO #2)

Offering a complete course on public relations cases to undergraduates sets Pepperdine apart from programs at other schools because this type of course is often taught only at the graduate level. However, its placement as the only focus in the final course before students enter the field is likely not as helpful as a culminating project that involves application of knowledge and skills gained throughout their academic career. Pepperdine public relations graduates need to leave with professional public relations writing rules and skills fresh in their minds, which writing an academic paper in APA style does not demonstrate. While it is certainly valuable, the case study course placement, or redesigning the course such that it combines case study analysis with a capstone project, needs to be reviewed.

Public relations students’ writing ability during spring 2011 was assessed using the senior case study thesis. However, to accurately assess the students’ writing styles and abilities for the profession, writing assignments more applicable to public relations work—what they will be doing when they graduate (e.g,
traditional media messages, social media, newsletters, bios, backgrounders, white papers) – should be assessed. Insight into their ability to communicate in writing was gained narrowly, but this needs to be evaluated further from a sample of different materials.

**Suggestions for Improvement (based on assessment of PLO #2)**

The public relations curriculum should be revised such that the current case study course (PR 555) is not the capstone course for seniors. The capstone experience could be a campaign rather than a scholarly research paper, and students can demonstrate their *mastery* of the subject rather than present a completely new way of writing that they have never done before and are likely never to do again, particularly as entry-level professionals.

This PLO also will be assessed during spring 2012, through a PR 380 media kit; PR 455 media kit and campaign; PR 505 management trend presentation and management project; and PR 555 strategic campaign and portfolio. Rubrics needed will be developed by public relations faculty members.

**Program Learning Outcome 3: Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy, clarity, appropriate style, grammatical correctness and sensitivity**

Public relations graduates need to be critical readers of their own and others’ messages—in all forms. This is essential for several reasons. Educators and practitioners agree that excellent writing and visual communication skills are the top skills required by prospective public relations professionals. PR professionals should be distinguished as arguably the best communicators in an organization, because they are the primary conveyors of messages to internal and external publics. Their relationships with key stakeholders (e.g., investors, donors, media, community members, ethnic groups) require that their communication be trustworthy, accurate, written in the style appropriate for specific publics and methods of distribution, and sensitive to diverse groups and perspectives. In addition, PR professionals often serve as editors or gatekeepers of an organization’s communication to internal and external publics, with the “last eyes” on messages that will impact constituents in favorable, neutral, or unfavorable ways. Pepperdine public relations graduates must be equipped to be *responsible producers* of organizational messages as well as *critical evaluators* of others’ organizational messages.

Diversity is mentioned in PLO #3 as the aspect of “sensitivity” – students should be able to evaluate messages for their sensitivity to others. Diversity is currently addressed in a number of classes as we discuss reaching a wide variety of audiences and stakeholders. The consideration of what publics would be impacted by an organization’s actions and how best to communicate with them is repeated in each course of the major. Certain texts have entire chapters devoted to international public relations and multicultural communication.

Diversity can become a larger part of our plan by prescribing particular activities or particular ways of assessing the professor’s own activities already taking place within our courses. For example, in spring 2010’s PR 455 class, students drew audiences from a “hat,” and they wrote speeches on the same topic as each other but with different audiences in mind. In MSCO 220, students examine the target audiences of the organization they research and evaluate whether they think those audiences would be appropriately reached with the campaigns used. An element could be added to the MSCO 220 rubric that specifies how the organization communicates with diverse audiences.
Professors can include diversity more explicitly in their syllabi and rubrics for:

- **MSCO 220** individual assignments; final project
- **PR 380** individual assignments; media kit
- **PR 455** individual assignments; campaign project
- **PR 505** individual assignments or class presentation
- **PR 555** individual assignments; case study/senior thesis

Following the public relations program Assessment Plan, this PLO will be assessed in spring 2012 in PR 455, PR 505 and PR 555. The PR 555 Audience Research Presentation Rubric is included in the Appendix (VI), and the PR 555 Campaign Proposal Peer Evaluation Rubric.

**Program Learning Outcome 4:** Demonstrate ethical research, planning and execution of public relations efforts that integrate faith with the responsibility to serve and engage communities and social justice globally

The ability to research, plan, execute, and evaluate strategic communication plans is central to the profession of public relations, and is consistently identified as the top knowledge and skills area by public relations educators and professionals. Program assessment reviewed above makes it abundantly clear that not only does the profession require advanced experience in strategic campaign planning and implementation, but also that students recognize their need for these skills, and the deficiency that has existed in the Pepperdine public relations program.

According to the program’s Assessment Plan, this PLO is scheduled to be assessed in academic year 2012-2013. However, because this learning outcome is central to public relations’ graduates being equipped to enter the profession, it will also be assessed in spring 2012 through campaign plan and presentation rubrics and reflective essays in PR 455, 505, and 555. The PR 555 campaign project involves service learning with a Los Angeles area nonprofit organization. Integrating “faith with the responsibility to serve and engage communities and social justice globally” will be assessed through the reflection paper at the conclusion of the project.

The ability to plan and execute strategic communication can also be assessed through students’ required internship, one of the strongest and distinct aspects of Pepperdine’s PR major. This opportunity for high-impact learning is essential for those wanting to work in the public relations field. Pepperdine students shine in this area, especially those who have the added benefit of an internship while overseas. The Communication Division’s internship program is headed by Professor Debbie Wideroe. She does a tremendous job helping students find the right match for them and overseeing them throughout the long semesters. Through internships, our students have the opportunity to build relationships with professionals and to experience public relations work first hand. Because of our location, students have opportunities to intern at highly respected agencies, corporations, and nonprofit organizations.

The internship assessment results are reported in that section of the overall Communication Division Five Year Report. That report suggests that students majoring in public relations find the experience to be an excellent addition to their overall learning experience. In addition, the alumni survey results reflect favorably on the role of internships in helping students secure employment after graduation.
The past two years our Public Relations Student Society of America chapter has brought some of the previous year’s alumni back for a panel where they can share their experiences and advice for those behind them. This has been insightful and should be continued. It would be good to have a separate annual meeting perhaps for all alumni of the program and an advisory board made of both alumni and professionals in the field.

One other aspect of internships where improvement could be made is to open the opportunity for students to intern in any of the international programs during the long semesters. If a student or faculty member can line up an internship in Heidelberg or Frankfurt, students should be allowed to do that for one of their courses. Even during the summer, internships are only offered at particular programs. This potential opportunity at each location should be investigated further.

Across the program, we bring in tremendous speakers. Pepperdine students hear from account executives, senior vice presidents, owners and CEOs. This should be continued and a master list of guests should be maintained. Some of these professionals should be invited to participate in an advisory board for the major.

Spring 2012 Public Relations Major Feedback Survey

NOTE: A general survey of the public relations program was created in spring 2012, and all public relations majors were sent an email asking that they follow the link to Survey Monkey and complete the survey. Of more than 100 possible subjects (all majors), only 11 completed surveys were received. Nevertheless, the informal and non-generalizable results were indicative of student attitudes discussed above.

Relevant Findings and Discussion:

All of the 11 respondents were public relations majors. Only one student had selected Pepperdine because of the major. This result is consistent with the sense that students “find” the public relations major after coming to Pepperdine, and that the major is not considered a “destination” program. According to the survey, 82% of students had declared public relations their major by the end of the sophomore year, and the 18% (2) more declared in the junior year. It is very difficult to complete the program’s sequence of courses in the junior and senior years; this is not considered something that needs to be changed.

Recurring responses as to why students chose the public relations major:

- Fit with writing strengths, personality, and “social side”
- Interest in event planning or entertainment PR
- The variety of positions and activities, in different fields
- It’s close to media or journalism fields, but more “practical”

The characteristics reported above which public relations faculty at Pepperdine and other benchmark programs would consider legitimate or consistent with the public relations field are the focus on writing and the variety of skills and duties involved in public relations. Pepperdine public relations students have an interest in entertainment PR and event planning that is atypical of programs at other institutions, and very few students are interested in public affairs, nonprofit, or corporate public relations. The goal would be to
have more students articulate reasons for choosing a public relations that are consistent with professional definitions and descriptions of what public relations practitioners do, and represent the wide array of organizational contexts in which professionals work.

Students combine many different academic disciplines with their public relations studies, including, integrated marketing communication, nonprofit management, advertising, psychology, political science, business, and film, and nearly half (4) of the students (9) are studying a foreign language. One of the strengths, and appeals, of public relations is the ability to combine it with any passion or expertise student, identifying a professional niche. These results bear out that reality.

One area that the survey highlighted for improvement was membership in PRSSA. Only 2 of 11 respondents are members, and a variety of reasons are given: other time commitments, lack of perceived benefits and negative reputation, and lack of information about how to join and the reasons for joining. The two students who ARE members stated that it was because “it looks good on your resume.” While this is true and an important recruiting point, there are several benefits while students are in their undergraduate program that should be communicated clearly to students. 2011-12 has been a rebuilding year for PRSSA, and the current officers (many of whom will be returning for 2012-13) have made significant strides in organizational structure and programming that will be continued next year.

Following is a ranking of required courses in the major, in order of perceived relevance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR 595</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 455</td>
<td>Public Relations Techniques and Campaigns</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 505</td>
<td>Public Relations Management</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 380</td>
<td>Public Relations Writing</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 371</td>
<td>Communication Graphics</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 570</td>
<td>Media Law</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 555</td>
<td>Advanced Cases in Public Relations</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220</td>
<td>Intro to Integrated Marketing Communication</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 301</td>
<td>Message Creation and Effects</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 300</td>
<td>Intro to Communication Research</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 400</td>
<td>Communication Ethics</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 200</td>
<td>Communication Theory</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not surprising that the internship is perceived as extremely relevant to the public relations major; the internship is a strength of our program. The curriculum and the nature of Pepperdine students qualify them
for high-quality internships, which result in full-time job offers for about 80% of our graduates. Likewise, the skills-oriented courses are, not surprisingly, rated high in relevance, even PR 380, which requires revision as demonstrated by ample data in this review.

Interestingly, the capstone course, PR 555, is seen as relevant by slightly over 1/3 of respondents, which may be explained by its current focus on case study analysis. The capstone course should be perceived as one of the more relevant courses in the public relations major, as should the introductory or “gateway” course to the major, currently MSCO 220, also perceived as relevant by only 36% of respondents. Problems with this course that are detailed above, such as students leaving without a clear understanding of what public relations is and what being a public relations professional entails, should be corrected by adding a new introductory course, Principles of Public Relations, and dropping the MSCO 220 requirement.

Another result for discussion and possible revision is the finding that the courses common to the Communication Division core have the lowest perceived relevance. Ethics, theory, and research should be emphasized throughout the public relations major. One possible reason for the low perceived relevance of these courses is that the 300-500 level courses have been taught primarily by adjuncts, who stress practical skills and experience, are less aware of the core courses, lack detailed knowledge of the curriculum in the ethics and theories courses, and thus are less able to make connections to them in upper-level public relations courses. This gap should be eased with continued communication among public relations faculty and consistent program leadership.

Following is a ranking of required courses in the major, in order of LEAST perceived relevance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Perceived Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 200</td>
<td>Communication Theory</td>
<td>(67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 300</td>
<td>Intro to Communication Research</td>
<td>(56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 301</td>
<td>Message Creation and Effects</td>
<td>(56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 220</td>
<td>Intro to Integrated Marketing Communication</td>
<td>(44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCO 371</td>
<td>Communication Graphics</td>
<td>(22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 400</td>
<td>Communication Ethics</td>
<td>(22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR 555</td>
<td>Advanced Cases in Public Relations</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 570</td>
<td>Media Law</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the core courses are perceived as least relevant is consistent with the findings discussed above. It is disturbing that nearly half of respondents reported that the gateway course to the major is least relevant. The proposed changes should correct this perception. It should be noted that the internship, techniques and cases, and management courses scored 0% for least relevant.

Several subject areas for prospective courses were proposed. Students expressed interest in additional courses in entertainment, fashion, PR writing, digital and social media, event planning, and graphic design,
and in different kinds of organizations (e.g., firm and corporate). Respondents reported a wide variety of career plans, consistent with the diversity of positions and organizational contexts available in public relations. Three of eleven students didn’t have specific career plans; others planned to work in TV/film/production, fashion, entertainment, corporate, medical nonprofit, food and wine industry, action sports, with event planning and publicist duties. Again, there seems to be a narrow understanding of the scope of public relations activities, especially those responsibilities related to strategic planning and management.

One bright spot in the survey findings was that 73% of respondents perceived that the public relations major is academically rigorous. And, 82% reported that the major provides them with practical skills, however, the perception of a skills-focus carries with it the question of whether the liberal arts foundation of communication (reflected in the discussion above about lack of connection to ethics and theory) is neglected or not appreciated by students. All 11 students agreed or strongly agreed that “community with other public relations students and professors is important to me,” yet the responses to the statement “there is a strong sense of community among public relations majors” were mixed: 55% agreed or strongly agreed, while 45% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Establishing a public relations-focused gateway course, stable leadership and involved full-time public relations faculty, and building a stronger and larger PRSSA chapter should improve the feeling of community. It was striking that 55% of respondents believe that the major “has equipped me with professional writing skills,” while 45% disagreed. Given that strong writing skills are consistently reported as the primary qualification for professional positions, the high percentage of disagree responses is unacceptable. Of equal concern is the number of students who had previously planned to major in public relations, but who changed majors after having taken that class; while there is no quantifiable data, there is ample anecdotal evidence that this has occurred with regularity. With revisions to PR 380 and continued integration of writing skills in other upper-level courses, students should leave better prepared as professional writers. Finally, there is an unacceptably high level of dissatisfaction with the public relations curriculum and courses, and with the major as a whole. With implementation of the substantial curriculum changes proposed for 2013, stable and experienced leadership of the program, and continued teamwork and communication by adjunct and full-time faculty, it is anticipated that the high levels of dissatisfaction will be reduced gradually.

Aspects of the public relations program that are “working well” were the practical elements: internships, campaign planning, and learning from professionals. However, the statement that “my internship was the first time I really understood what PR was” was alarming, and consistent with assessment data provided and discussed above. The overwhelming perceptions about what needs to be changed in the public relations major are that there needs to be more focus and experience in writing, that PR 380 needs to be substantially revised, and that there should be more variety in professors and in students’ opportunities to apply knowledge and skills in different professional contexts and using a wider variety of media and writing styles.

The open-ended responses are available in their entirety in Appendix IX. While not generalizable due to the small sample size, these findings are consistent with the broader assessment data provided in this review, and point to the proposed curriculum changes.
APPENDIX II

Public Relations Education for the 21st Century: The Professional Bond:
The Report of the Commission on Public Relations Education

November 2006

As the field of public relations has changed since the Commission’s 1999 report, education has kept pace with those changes. So, while the fundamental knowledge and skills recommended by the 2006 Commission have not changed since 1999, the Commission suggests a need for refocusing and realignment in terms of what is most heavily emphasized in an undergraduate public relations curriculum. The purpose of an undergraduate degree is still to prepare students for entry-level positions and to advance over the course of their careers into leadership roles. But what they need to know and be able to do has shifted somewhat.

Research suggests that professional success requires that the right knowledge and skills be accompanied by appropriate personal traits, and certain attributes have been identified as developmental necessities. It continues to be crucial that graduates be responsible, flexible and professionally oriented self-managers. For communication to occur with and among diverse audiences, individuals must be able to respond and adapt to new and changing situations and to feel comfortable in having to make such adjustments without giving up personal identity. Students must have intellectual curiosity and be able to think conceptually. They must have positive attitudes and be able to take criticism. They must be organized selfstarters who take initiative to solve problems. They must be both creative and pragmatic, and they must have integrity as team participants and leaders. Students should be able to demonstrate respect and empathy; even if practitioners do not belong to a group or agree with it, a practitioner must be able to show appreciation for those who are different and be able to understand others’ cultures and perspectives.

Therefore, public relations education must be interdisciplinary and broad, particularly in the liberal arts and sciences. A minor or double major is recommended to broaden students’ education and knowledge base.

The following reorganization of the knowledge and skills identified and recommended in the 1999 Commission report reflects current research on requirements for successful entry into the field.

1. Necessary Knowledge and Skills

The following knowledge and skills should be taught in an undergraduate public relations curriculum:

Knowledge

- Communication and persuasion concepts and strategies
- Communication and public relations theories
2. The Undergraduate Curriculum

The undergraduate public relations curriculum must continue to be strongly grounded in traditional liberal arts and social sciences. Coursework in public relations should be built on a foundation of liberal arts, social science, business and language courses. More than ever, this knowledge base must be interdisciplinary. Principles of public relations and management must be intertwined with and related to business, behavioral science, technology and other disciplines. Changes in the field of public relations demand integration of the knowledge and skills of these disciplines. With the growing need for students to be completely conversant in principles and practices of business, there is a parallel need for them to master principles of etiquette and professionalism.

Globalization now requires more attention in today’s public relations education. It is not enough
to offer a course with a global focus. Global concepts must be integrated throughout the curriculum because many students will be addressing issues related to globalization, diversity and multiculturalism as they enter the practice of public relations. Fluency in a language other than English also is desirable.

Given the organizational crises of recent years, ethics and organizational transparency also require emphasis across the public relations curriculum. Similarly, relationship-building has become a critical skill. In preparation for working with diverse publics and global issues, students will need to learn that establishing trust and acceptance among publics begins with having a clear understanding of those publics and demonstrating sincerity and commitment.

Technology and its use and abuse have become another important consideration in public relations practice. Students must not only understand current technology and its use, but must develop skills that will enable them to adapt to rapid changes and advancements. It is insufficient to train students to use current technology; they also must be able to identify and analyze new technologies as they emerge, understand the ramifications and implications and develop strategies for using the latest technologies and dealing with their effects. Technology will not be sufficiently addressed if isolated from the rest of the curriculum; the only effective way to prepare students for the rapid changes they will face is to integrate the study and use of technology across the curriculum.

More critical than ever is the need for solid research skills and the ability to interpret and use research in decision-making. Students must be capable of conducting research, analyzing and interpreting data and information, integrating research into planning and management and conducting evaluation that demonstrates results. In conducting secondary research, students should recognize that a variety of voices exist and that many people on the fringes of society, or outside the mainstream or center, are often not adequately covered in media and other published works and therefore won’t be represented in secondary research sources. Similarly, when learning about primary research techniques, students should recognize the influence that culture and other aspects of diversity have on research design, methods, participants, analysis and presentation of research. And greater emphasis needs to be placed on using solid research to design and manage messages. Not only must students be able to design messages that motivate publics to action, they must be able to manage the distribution and flow of messages to ensure publics actually receive them and that dialogue is facilitated.

Finally, the ability to incorporate the internal audience into public relations planning and communication is increasingly required in meeting the challenges and opportunities presented to an organization. Whereas organizations have always identified employee publics among those considered important, human resources departments increasingly are expecting public relations to manage employee communication, a change from the days when human resources considered communicating internally to be its exclusive purview.

3. Content of Undergraduate Courses

The following topics are all deemed essential to a strong undergraduate education in public relations regardless of the course(s) in which they are taught. While many of the topics lend themselves to be framed within a specific course, care must be taken that the concepts, knowledge and skills described
above are integrated throughout the public relations curriculum so students better understand the interdisciplinary nature of the practice.

- **Theory, origin, principles and professional practice of public relations:** the nature and role of public relations, the history and development of the field, theories and principles underlying PR practice and the societal forces affecting the profession and its practice. Important to include are the societal mandate and ethical justification of public relations in a democratic society and free-market economy. Also included are practitioner qualifications (including education and training), responsibilities and duties, diversity competencies and skills, functioning of public relations departments and counseling firms and life-long learning and professional development. Also included are a variety of specializations in public relations such as community relations, employee relations, consumer relations, financial and investor relations, governmental relations, public affairs and lobbying, fund raising and membership development, international and cross-cultural public relations and publicity and media relations.

- **Public relations law and ethics:** including codes of ethics and practice in public relations and in other professions; ethical issues and trends toward greater organizational transparency and core values; specific legal issues such as privacy, defamation, copyright, product liability and financial disclosure; legal and policy considerations relating to diversity in the workplace and in communication and legal and regulatory compliance.

- **Public relations research, measurement and performance evaluation:** including quantitative and qualitative research designs, processes and techniques such as public opinion polling and survey research; experimental design and research; new research methods and tools; fact-finding and applied research; observation and performance measurement; social, communication and employee audits; issue tracking; focus groups and interviews; use of external research services and consultants and the ability to effectively direct their efforts; media and clipping analysis and historical research. The emphasis should be on measurement of tangible results in evaluating program effectiveness, staff and counselor performance; criteria for performance; and reporting the results of evaluation. The impact of culture and diversity should be carefully considered.

A minimum of five courses should be required in the public relations major.

- **Public relations planning and management:** including theory, techniques and models related to setting long- and short-term goals and objectives; designing strategies and tactics; segmenting publics and designing effective messages; identifying appropriate channels to ensure message receipt; analyzing problems and opportunities; communicating with top management; developing budgets; contingency planning for crises and disasters; managing issues, developing timetables and calendars; and assigning authority and responsibility. Diversity should be well-integrated into the content and should include the business rationale for diversity in organizations and the demographic changes within countries and across global communities that affect the role and practice of public relations worldwide.

- **Public relations writing and production:** Public relations writing is an essential, discrete skill that is not fully addressed in journalistic writing, composition or creative writing. Content here should address communication theory; concepts and models for mass, interpersonal, employee and internal communication; new and emerging communication technologies and their use and abuse; organizational communication and dynamics; communication with diverse audiences and across cultures; persuasion and propaganda; controlled versus uncontrolled communication; and feedback systems. It also must include competency in such skills as design, layout and graphics; electronic media and Web publishing; speechwriting and delivery; spokesperson training and speakers bureaus; corporate identity and reputation; photography and filmmaking; and working with outside suppliers. It requires a solid
understanding of media, media channels, the societal role of media and the challenges in the explosion of electronic and digital media vehicles. It includes message strategy and delivery (i.e., planning, writing, producing and delivering communication to publics in all media channels). It also includes a focus on designing messages to be sent in channels that will ensure publics receive and act on them.

- **Public relations action and implementation: Content** includes the actual implementation of campaigns; continuing programs (e.g., product publicity and safety); crises and isolated incidents; individual activities of practitioners and firms, clients and employers; meetings and workshops; and special events. It should include ongoing evaluation of efforts and corrective action based on results measurement while a campaign or program is in process.

- **Supervised work experience in public relations:** Internships and other pre-professional work experiences have become essential in public relations education. These practical experiences must be supervised by faculty and practitioners who cooperate to provide professional experience directed by learning objectives and assessed throughout to assure a quality practical educational experience. Students should be sufficiently prepared by prerequisite courses to receive and complete substantive assignments that prepare them to apply the skills and principles they are learning in their programs.

- **Disciplines related to public relations:** Supporting disciplines that provide appropriate supplements to public relations educational programs include intercultural communication, international communication, political communication, organizational communication, interpersonal communication, rhetorical communication, small group communication, psychology, sociology, marketing, management and organizational behavior, finance, journalism, radio and television production, advertising, photography, filmmaking, art design and graphics, information technology and new technology. Students should be encouraged to pursue a double major or minor in a related area of interest.

- **Directed electives:** Certain content in other disciplines should be considered essential for the development and preparation of public relations professionals. It is recommended that public relations education become truly interdisciplinary and that content in these areas be integrated into public relations coursework as described above. Nevertheless, more in-depth treatment of the content in related disciplines may be desirable through elective courses to supplement the core public relations and communication courses. Recommended disciplines for inclusion are business management, marketing, accounting, finance, economics, consumer behavior, political science and the political system, public administration, social psychology, sociology, cultural anthropology, English and English writing, political science, including government and political campaigns, intercultural communication, ethnic and feminist studies, and international business and communication.

4. **Content Configuration in the Undergraduate Curriculum**

This report affirms the 1999 report’s identification of the following courses for an ideal undergraduate major in public relations:

- Introduction to public relations (including theory, origin and principles)
- Case studies in public relations that review the professional practice
- Public relations research, measurement and evaluation

- Public relations law and ethics
- Public relations writing and production
- Public relations planning and management
- Public relations campaigns
- Supervised work experience in public relations (internship)
- Directed electives

Although some academic programs will find it difficult to offer seven courses devoted entirely to public relations, the Commission believes the topics covered in the courses above are essential for a quality public relations education. While these topics could be combined into courses in different ways, and some of these courses might also address additional topics, a major should offer sufficient courses to address the knowledge and skills identified as necessary for success in the field.

A minimum of five courses should be required in the public relations major. An academic emphasis should minimally include these courses:

- Introduction to public relations (including theory, origin and principles)
- Public relations research, measurement and evaluation
- Public relations writing and production
- Supervised work experience in public relations (internship)
- An additional public relations course in law and ethics, planning and management, case studies or campaigns
APPENDIX III – EXAMPLE OF PRE-TEST/POST-TEST FOR PR 555
ADVANCED CASES IN PUBLIC RELATIONS

PR 555 Post-test

1. What is public relations?

2. Where can you find a PR job?

3. What are some goals of public relations efforts?

4. How is public relations similar to AND different from advertising?

5. How is public relations similar to AND different from marketing?

6. How is public relations similar to AND different from journalism?

7. What job titles might you find in the field of public relations?

8. What writing style should you generally use?

9. Who are some publics you might want to reach as a PR practitioner?

10. What are the four models of PR?

11. Describe a news release. (What is it? What information should it contain?)

12. Name one historic figure from the field.

13. What types of tasks does a PR practitioner do?

14. What types of materials/works are produced in public relations?

15. What is issues management?

16. What is risk communication?

17. How is social media being used in PR today?

18. How can you make ethical decisions in PR (what process would you follow)?

19. Explain why accuracy is important in PR.

20. What difference does diversity make in PR?
PR 380 Special Event Media Kit Evaluation

Contents of Media Kit (120 pts.)

Presentation folder ____ (5 points)
Table of contents ____ (5 points)
Email pitch ______ (14 points)
Print news release ____ (14 points)
Online news release ____ (14 points)
TV news release ____ (14 points)
Backgrounder ____ (14 points)
Fact sheet/Media advisory ____ (14 points)

Two or More of the Following (26 points)

- Bi-fold (six-panel) color brochure
- Company newsletter
- Feature story
- Print public image or public interest ad, or PSA for special event

Clean copy: (30 pts.)
Grammar including spelling and punctuation:

Associated Press Style:

Cultural sensitivity

Total Points: ___________
APPENDIX V PR 455 MEDIA KIT RUBRIC

PRESS KIT RUBRIC

EXECUTION:

• Is overall presentation of the press kit attractive with the right “decorum” for the company and product?

• Are individual documents attractive and readable? Do they use lists, headings, graphic elements, font styles, etc. where it is effectively appropriate?

• Do sentences read fluently and naturally?

• Are there egregious usage errors?

• Is punctuation and other mechanical issues a problem or does it follow AP format?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-80)</td>
<td>(80-90)</td>
<td>(90-100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY:

• Are the choices in press kit documents appropriate to achieve objectives?
• Is the key message clear and succinct?

• Are major talking points included to support key message?
• Is interesting, unique or timely angle used in press kit material that would draw the attention of media and intended audience?
• Is the quality of the content of the pieces good? Is it tired and predictable?

• Does its verbal and visual presentation have a fresh, energetic quality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-80)</td>
<td>(80-90)</td>
<td>(90-100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RUBRIC for PR Campaign: Qualities & Criteria

### OBJECTIVES/GOALS/STRATEGIES

- Are objectives for your publicity or media plan clearly defined?
- How well is the PR campaign designed to establish these objectives?
  - Establish your expertise among your peers, the press, or your potential clients or customers?
  - Build goodwill among your customer, supplier, or your community?
  - Create and reinforce your brand and professional corporate image?
  - Inform and create good perceptions regarding your company and services?
  - Assist you in introducing a new service or product to your market?
  - Generate sales or leads?
  - Mitigate the impact of negative publicity and/or corporate crisis?
- Are goals in achieving this objective specific and measurable and inline with your overall business, marketing, and sales objectives.
- Are strategies aligned with objectives?
- Are strategies creative and unique and achievable given environmental circumstances?
- Was research used in formulating these objectives? If so, how/what?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-80)</td>
<td>(80-90)</td>
<td>(90-100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUDIENCES/KEY MESSAGES

- Are multiple target audiences identified?
- Are your audiences logical for objectives?
- Are key messages unique and clearly stated for each audience?
TIMELINE/ACTION

• Is a schedule for your public relation campaigns clearly outlined?
• Is your plan of action clear, succinct, and suitable to meet objective?
• Is your timeline synergistic and coincides your public relations plan with other lines of business efforts?

COMMUNICATION/TACTICS

• Are communication vehicles to get your message to your public(s) clearly defined?
• Are these communication vehicles suitable to achieve objectives?
• Are select media clearly outlined?
• Is communication tactic aligned with strategy (ie. Exclusive, on-the-wire)
• Do they fit the budget?
• Are samples included and if so, is it written with a clear message, interesting angle, succinctly and following AP format (where applicable):
  - Press releases
  - Statements
  - Articles
  - Customer Success Stories
  - Letters to the Editor
  - Press Conferences, Interview, or Media Tours
  - Radio, Television, or Press Interviews
  - Seminars or Speaking Engagements
  - Event Sponsorships
### EVALUATION

- Are measures in place to track the results of your PR Campaign?
- Are they reflective of your objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-80)</td>
<td>(80-90)</td>
<td>(90-100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX VI PR 505 MANAGEMENT TREND PRESENTATION RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Exemplary/A</strong></th>
<th><strong>Above Average/B</strong></th>
<th><strong>Acceptable/C</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unacceptable/D</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization and preparation (20)</strong></td>
<td>Presentation is well-conceived, with logical flow, right amount of information and sensible visual design.</td>
<td>Presentation has a structured, logical flow.</td>
<td>Presentation is structured.</td>
<td>Presentation is hard to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obviously knows material; minimal pauses when moving between slides/points/notes.</td>
<td>Knows material; some pauses and reading from notes.</td>
<td>Is familiar with material, but reads from notes frequently.</td>
<td>Reads from notes completely; seems confused at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows equipment/technology; handles issues smoothly.</td>
<td>Foreseeable technical issues occur; works them out.</td>
<td>Technical issues occur; works them out.</td>
<td>Technical issues significantly hamper effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content (20)</strong></td>
<td>Introduces topic clearly.</td>
<td>Introduces topic briefly, adequately.</td>
<td>Makes an attempt to introduce topic.</td>
<td>Doesn't introduce topic at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives solid analysis of application to PR/comms.</td>
<td>Gives adequate relevant application.</td>
<td>Attempts to apply to PR/comms.</td>
<td>Doesn't make relevant application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporates interesting, relevant information.</td>
<td>Incorporates relevant information.</td>
<td>Incorporates extra information.</td>
<td>Makes no attempt to use extra information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience involvement (20)</strong></td>
<td>Speaks in way which engages the audience.</td>
<td>Holds attention most of the time.</td>
<td>Holds attention to some degree.</td>
<td>Doesn't hold attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gets participation from entire group.</td>
<td>Gets some participation.</td>
<td>Attempts to get participation.</td>
<td>Little participation from group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates interaction smoothly.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Facilitates interaction.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attempts to facilitate interaction.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uses no interaction in presentation.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Speaking style (20)</strong></th>
<th>Speaks clearly and confidently.</th>
<th>Speaks confidently.</th>
<th>Attempts to speak confidently.</th>
<th>Speaks unclearly.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses appropriate professional language.</td>
<td>Language is generally professional.</td>
<td>Language generally unprofessional, poor word choices.</td>
<td>Unprofessional throughout presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses effective eye contact with entire group.</td>
<td>Uses eye contact most of the time.</td>
<td>Uses eye contact part of the time.</td>
<td>Uses no eye contact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits skill with PR terms.</td>
<td>Uses PR terms well for the most part.</td>
<td>Attempts to use PR terms.</td>
<td>Doesn’t use PR terms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Visuals (10)</strong></th>
<th>Visual materials were helpful, not distracting.</th>
<th>Visuals were generally helpful.</th>
<th>Visuals were adequate.</th>
<th>Visuals distracting and unprofessional.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Length (10)</strong></th>
<th>20-25 minutes</th>
<th>20 minutes</th>
<th>15-20 minutes</th>
<th>15 minutes or less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Appearance** | Unprofessional appearance subtracts from overall points. |
# APPENDIX VII PR 505 PR MANAGEMENT PROJECT

## Communication Plan Project Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary/A</th>
<th>Above Average/B</th>
<th>Acceptable/C</th>
<th>Unacceptable/D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment of objective, strategies, tactics (25)</strong></td>
<td>Complete fit between all three.</td>
<td>No major issues, although alignment could be tighter.</td>
<td>Major gaps exist.</td>
<td>Very little connection between all three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic rationale (25)</strong></td>
<td>Strategic approach explained in terms of project research and proven PR approaches.</td>
<td>Strategic approach tied to research.</td>
<td>Strategic approach explained.</td>
<td>Little explanation of strategic approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teamwork (25)</strong></td>
<td>All project pieces tie together; no disconnects. Evidence of healthy teaming is obvious.</td>
<td>Few disconnects; few teamwork issues.</td>
<td>Significant disconnects between project pieces.</td>
<td>Significant disconnects; obvious team problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation (15)</strong></td>
<td>Tactics include fresh, effective approaches.</td>
<td>Some creativity evident.</td>
<td>Little creativity.</td>
<td>Standard approaches, nothing new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of materials (10)</strong></td>
<td>No GSP issues. Design ideas well-presented.</td>
<td>A few GSP and design issues, with little impact on effectiveness.</td>
<td>Many GSP and design issues exist, but still overall positive contribution to project.</td>
<td>Many issues causing serious distraction from project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mid-term Audience Research Presentations

Group being evaluated: ______________________ Evaluator: __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well did the group --</th>
<th>Poorly</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate feedback from the interview with their client’s leadership team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give evidence for your rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define the target audiences for the research?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give evidence for your rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate research tools to reach their target audience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give evidence for your rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle a rating for the group’s --
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th></th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of quality in implementing the research tools</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall success in executing their audience research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall excellence in presentation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thank you for the opportunity to visit the beautiful Pepperdine campus and to provide an external review and evaluation of the undergraduate Mediated Programs in the Communication Division of the Seaver College. Dr. Ken Waters, Esther O’Connor and the faculty and staff were wonderful hosts and helped me with access to all of the materials and information needed to write this independent analysis of their programs.

I have read through the lengthy self-study, interviewed almost all of the full-time faculty, toured the facilities, met with students from each program, sat in on the Graphic editorial board meeting and watched the students produce and broadcast the NewsWaves program. I believe I have enough information to write an informed analysis of the program; its numerous strengths as well as areas for improvement. The mediated programs are considering accreditation by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC), and this report will identify the areas needing improvement before an accreditation visit. Where possible, I will evaluate whether I think the division is compliant on each standard.

**Standard 1: Mission, Governance and Administration**

The Mediated Programs have an overall mission statement for the core classes, the Advertising Program, and the Media Production Program. To best match the expectations for ACEJMC accreditation, it would be best if there were a mission statement for the Mediated Programs. The statement for the core classes comes closest to this broader statement, but it would be advisable to have a discussion with the faculty from all of the programs to develop a broad mission statement for this side of the division. There are four student learning outcomes attached to the core mission statement. These outcomes are fairly inclusive of the 11 professional values and competencies expected by ACEJMC. They particularly address the need to:

- understand theory, principles and concepts of communications;
- acquire skills related to research, writing and analysis;
- clearly and effectively express messages through multiple media;
- and to understand the ethical theories and principles applied to the professions.

What are not explicitly included in these four outcomes statement are outcomes pertaining to:

- the understanding of the history and role of professionals and institutions in shaping communications;
- an understanding of diversity of groups in a global society;
- apply tools and technologies appropriate for their respective professions

These outcomes may be occurring within the curriculum, but not explicitly stated as expected results of the curriculum. The diversity outcomes definitely appear in all of the program level outcomes, so it might be more genuine to also put into the core learning outcomes.

Everyone I spoke with enjoyed Dr. Waters’ leadership style and commented on the faculty involvement and governance of the department. Several people were involved in putting together the self-study report. I didn’t hear anything that would cause alarm or concern regarding the governance of the division.

Conclusion
This standard would be found in compliance, but would be stronger with a comprehensive mission statement that unifies the mediated programs, a published strategic plan, and evidence of faculty governance, including policies found in a faculty handbook. These things might exist, but were not a part of the report provided.

Standard 2: Curriculum and Instruction

Overall, the curriculum provides a good balance among theory, principles and skills. There is a strong professional orientation to the programs, with experienced full-time and adjunct faculty. Theory, ethics, writing, storytelling and production are in place for each program. Again, what might need to be addressed more explicitly in the curriculum is history, diversity, and appreciating the freedoms expressed in the First Amendment. Since it would be difficult to add courses to the curriculum, the programs could teach these elements across the curriculum. However, it would be important to explicitly build these topics into several courses. Most accredited programs have a diversity plan that requires each course to have an element contributing to the outcomes of diversity.

The current curriculum in the Mediated Programs would meet the ACEJMC requirement for 80 hours outside of the programs and 65 within the liberal arts (known as the 80/65 rule). Each of the programs require 44 credits out of 128 required for graduation. The programs would need to develop advising sheets that clearly identify the 65 credits in liberal arts required. The programs would need to go through the course offerings in the Seaver College to determine which would qualify for liberal arts. Generally, ACEJMC does not recognize business courses (other than economics), engineering, computer science, and other applied courses as liberal arts. This would also need careful planning with the required outside concentration of 9-12 credits in an area outside of the programs. If the Mediated Programs would like to seek accreditation, you would need to begin enforcing these requirements and provide evidence that at least 95 percent of the graduating students met this standards in the two academic years prior to the accreditation visit.

ACEJMC strongly recommends that skills and laboratory courses, such as writing courses, should be capped at 15 students, and should never exceed 20 students per section. The writing course in the core meets that standard over the last year. The division would want to ensure that all skills classes were meeting that standard for two years prior to the accreditation visit.

The programs require internships, and this meets the expectation of ACEJMC. The internships are a strength of the programs. Proximity to a phenomenal market for media internships is a definite advantage of these
programs. The internship coordinator, a faculty member in advertising, works hard to help place students in meaningful internships. Students are supervised by media professionals and report experiences to a faculty coordinator.

**Advertising**
The advertising program provides a solid foundation for advertising principles and practices. Dedicated and experienced faculty are admired by the advertising students and current practices are being taught. Most of the courses that are focused on advertising occur in the senior year (according to the schedule map provided). It might be worth considering ways of pushing some of the courses into the junior year.

Students appreciate having the real world experience of working with real clients. The campaign course is truly a capstone of learning for the students. Students are expected to develop and design their own product or service and completely develop an advertising/marketing strategy as an individual project. Some students mentioned that doing this as a group project would be more reflective of what occurs in the industry. The course is very demanding for students and the faculty member teaching the course.

Faculty and students expressed interest in a creative track or at least more creative courses. Considering the current number of faculty teaching in advertising, this doesn’t look like a possibility. Enterprising students that are interested in the creative track have found ways of taking courses in design from the Art Division, although others expressed that there is limited access to these courses. Students also have access to excellent internships that can help them develop their skills.

**Journalism**
The two journalism emphases allow for significant integration between the two. In fact, the difference between the print-online and video/broadcast news emphasis can be as little as one course. Students take at least two journalism writing courses, and there is a very positive reaction to the addition of COM 205 Storytelling Through Media course. Students feel that the program is going in the right direction, but print students expressed the need for more online and video content to be introduced earlier in the curriculum. Students are learning newer information channels such as blogs and social media.

The practicum courses provide good experience for students to work with student media, either in *The Graphic*, or on the student radio and television programs. These opportunities are well resourced, and students take the primary responsibility for producing the content under mentored supervision.

**Public Relations**
This program appears to be getting a jumpstart with a new faculty member who brings experience and knowledge of public relations curriculum. There are more concerns about this program than the others. Students, as evidenced by assessment measures, and reinforced in interviews, do not have a firm understanding of public relations purposes and practices. The students associate public relations only with publicity and event planning. They told me that the first time they get a full picture of the practice is in their senior year.

There was a lot of concern expressed about PR 380 Public Relations Writing. Apparently, it is too focused on traditional journalism writing, AP style, and is not keeping up with current PR writing practices, such as writing for a variety of channels including social media, visual media, etc. This course needs to be revised to
meet current expectations of ACEJMC and the Committee on Public Relations Education (CPRE).

When students take the PR 455, 505, and 555 courses they begin to see how the elements of strategic communication planning come together. But, they lack that context when they are taking the Communications Research and PR Writing courses. These concepts need to be taught earlier in the program. One possible problem is the reliance upon MSCO 220 to teach public relations principles. This course could be focusing too much on marketing and advertising to provide PR students with a good understanding of how the practice is a management function that helps organizations with all of its key stakeholders, not just a marketing support function.

With only one full-time tenure-track faculty member teaching 120 PR majors, there is too much reliance on adjunct faculty. The students expressed appreciation for the adjunct faculty who bring experience to the classroom, but reliance on these resources doesn’t provide a predictable and fully invested effort to guide the program.

*Integrated Marketing Communication*

This interdisciplinary program appears to be a holdover from an effort to integrate business and communications programs to give students business knowledge and communication skills. It might serve the business students better than it is currently serving the communications students. Faculty raised concerns that the IMCO major was requiring precious faculty resources to teach when these resources would be better served teaching in the advertising and public relations majors. Students didn't see a need for the major because students interested in the business and marketing side of their programs, whether in advertising or public relations, can take the courses as part of their required outside concentration.

Students might also be better served by taking an introductory course that focused more on the strategic use of communication, perhaps with an even mix of advertising and public relation, or discipline specific introductory courses. Students in public relations and advertising are allowed to take courses across these two programs, which allows for natural integration. Another possibility is to create a course in social and digital media where both PR and advertising are playing in the same sandbox to reach audiences. This would create a planned integration in the curriculum that reflects the realities of the current practice.

*Conclusion*

Overall, this standard would be found in compliance. Strengthening the public relations program would be the primary recommendation. With your recent hire, you are already taking steps in this direction. An additional tenure-track position is needed in this area. Adjunct faculty with more recent experience should be considered for some of the skills classes, such as PR writing. I would also recommend eliminating IMC as a program and focusing your resources on creating updated courses in social media and digital production of content.

*Standard 3: Diversity and Inclusiveness*

Diversity is an aspect of the learning outcomes for the mediated programs. ACEJMC will look for a department-level diversity plan, lessons on diversity in each syllabus, and at the diversity of the faculty and student population.
Generally, it is expected that the faculty and students will reflect the diversity of the population eligible to enroll in institutions of higher education in the region or population it serves. As reported in the self-study, 59% of the known student ethnicity is white, non-Hispanic in the division. Nearly 70% of the students are female. The divisions draw students from California as well as from around the world as a Church of Christ sponsored university. However, only 15% of the students are members of the sponsoring church. Therefore, it is important that the division can demonstrate that the diversity of its student population is reflective of that of the region or state.

The division has done a good job of recruiting more full-time female faculty, increasing from 5 in 2005 to 14 in 2010. However, the faculty are not representative of the minority percentages found in the student body. In fact, I don’t believe there is a minority faculty member among the full-time faculty.

The division should make a stronger effort to recruit minority faculty for visiting and adjunct positions. You will also want to keep a record of guest speakers that add to the diversity of student experiences.

**Conclusion**

The division has a 50/50 chance of being found in compliance with this standard. The site team would be inclined to find it out of compliance based on the current make up of the faculty, especially compared to percentage of minorities in the student body and region. Additional steps would need to be shown about how the division is addressing diversity in its learning outcomes, course content, adjunct faculty, and guest speakers.

**Standard 4: Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty**

ACEJMC expects that full-time faculty have the primary responsibility for teaching and learning within programs. The full-time tenure-track faculty taught 47% of courses in Fall 2011 and 39% in Spring 2012. Visiting faculty taught 40% of courses in Fall 2011 and 47% in Spring 2012. The visiting faculty are full-time, and some are on extended appointments while others are on short appointments. Adjunct faculty teach a small percentage of classes each semester.

Currently, there is an overreliance on visiting faculty and adjunct faculty. In some programs, the lack of full-time faculty is startling. For example, the Public Relations program has only one full-time faculty member, a tenure-track associate professor, for 113 students. It’s not hard to calculate the student to faculty ratio and determine that it 500% higher than a comfortable 20:1 ratio. Similar problems exist in the Advertising and Media Production programs. While there are excellent adjunct faculty to draw upon, the need for full-time faculty is felt with the loads for student advising, internship supervision, division service, and having a long-term commitment to the success of the programs.

Below is the list of faculty in the mediated programs:

- Advertising: two full-time faculty members, one tenured and one extended appointment visiting, and three adjunct faculty for an average of 147 majors in 2011. Responsibilities include advising the advertising majors and directing internships for all mediated programs, about 200 annually.

- Public Relations: one full-time faculty member, two adjunct faculty for an average of 113 majors in 2011. The full-time faculty member is also the director of the graduate programs.
• Journalism: four full time faculty members, three tenured and one extended appointment visiting for an average of 47 majors in 2011. The visiting faculty member is also the faculty advisor for the student newspaper. This is where the department is the deepest in terms of faculty.

• Media Production: one full-time faculty member, an extended visiting professor, and three to four adjunct faculty, for about 80 majors (now that the broadcast students have moved over to journalism).

Conclusion
The division would likely be found not in compliance with this standard. Not because of the quality and effort of the current faculty, but because they are stretched too thin and the student to faculty ratio is too high for comfort. Generally, mass communication programs have high demand and limited faculty resources, but the situation at Pepperdine is dirier than others I have reviewed. The strongest recommendation from this report is to increase the number of full-time faculty, particularly the tenure-track faculty in advertising and public relations.

Standard 5: Scholarship

The accrediting standard for scholarship is for faculty members to “contribute to the advancement of scholarly and professional knowledge and engage in scholarship (research, creative and professional activity) that contributes to their development.”

Units are expected to require, support, and reward faculty scholarship. The expectations for research should be specified in hiring letters and tenure and promotion documents.

The primary responsibility of faculty hired in the Communications Division is teaching, but there is an expectation that at least 25% of their time will be devoted to scholarship. When tenure-track faculty are hired they learn that they should publish at least a book or three articles as a minimum for tenure.

The Division has a $15,000 budget to support faculty travel for research presentations. This usually allows all tenure-track/tenured faculty to attend at least one conference. The faculty also are encouraged to apply for college grants for research and travel, and the faculty in the mediated programs have been competitive in receiving them.

In the last five years, about half of the tenure-track faculty have published up to the expectation. Below is a list of faculty scholarship since 2007 according to the vitas provided.

• Ferguson: 2 peer-reviewed articles, 4 chapters or encyclopedia entries, 2 conference proceedings, 7 conference presentations, 4 conference panels.
• Murrie: 1 book chapter, 2 conference presentations, 1 column in trade journal, 4 video productions.
• Rosenkrans: 2 peer-reviewed articles, 3 book chapters, and several grants.
• Shores: nothing
• Stivers: 1 conference proceeding, 1 conference presentation
• Waters: 3 book chapters, 2 academic presentations, 1 professional presentation.

Conclusion
The primary mission of the Communications Division is teaching undergraduates in its mediated programs. Advising also takes considerable faculty time. Current teaching and service loads seem to be interfering with the Division’s stated scholarship expectation for tenure-track faculty. Using the Division's stated expectation, about half of the faculty are not meeting this standard. **This would jeopardize the Division’s ability to be found compliant with this standard.** Considering the balance in the curriculum between theory and skills, there should be more scholarship produced by the faculty.

**Standard 6: Student Services**

Faculty have the primary responsibility for academic advising. Each student must meet with a faculty advisor each semester before registering for classes. Some of the faculty are assigned a very large number of advisees, between 80-100. When students cannot reach faculty to ask questions about registration, they frequently drop by the main office and meet with Esther O'Connor, the office manager. It appears that most of the faculty take advising seriously, but discussing the process with students, I got the impression that it's a little bit hit and miss. With the reliance upon just a few full time faculty, academic advising is requiring a lot of faculty time and is viewed as a burden by some.

The weekly student newspaper, radio programs, and biweekly television newscast provide excellent opportunities for students to apply their journalism skills and knowledge. The public relations students can join PRSSA, and the advertising students can join the AAF chapter, to give them professional opportunities.

The PRSSA chapter is being revitalized with the recent arrival of Dr. Ferguson. Students on the executive board are very optimistic about the future of the chapter, but realize that it has a long way to go to become fully functioning. Considering that Dr. Ferguson is the only tenure-track faculty member in public relations and is also serving as the graduate program chair, additional support is needed to help the chapter thrive.

The Division has recent data on its students, including enrollments, retention, and graduation rates. Each of the programs track students and they have data from the last five years.

**Conclusion**

The Division would likely be found **in compliance** on this standard. The only recommendation is to consider offloading academic advising to a more standardized and centralized function. There might be several options available worth exploring, such as hiring a full-time academic advisor.

**Standard 7: Resources, Facilities and Equipment**

Pepperdine is a private university and didn't provide me with budget information, so I cannot make a determination whether the budget for the mediated programs is fair in relation to those provided to other divisions in the Seaver College.

The building and facilities are sufficient and up-to-date. Classrooms are equipped with technology to teach, computer labs are relatively up to date with equipment and software. In fact, the media production lab just converted to an AVID system that is so new that not everyone knows how to use it. The media production studio is updated to the latest HD equipment, and, thanks to a donation from Sony, has a control room that
would be the envy of many programs and professional studios.

Space is made available to host and support the co-curricular news services, *The Graphic* and *NewsWaves*. If it were possible to bring the two labs closer together, that would be optimal and would reinforce the converged curriculum in place.

**Conclusion**

Based on the information available to me, this standard would be found **in compliance**.

**Standard 8: Professional and Public Service**

I don’t have enough information to provide a full evaluation of this standard. This standard was outside of my scope for this external review.

The indicators for this standard are the following:

a) The unit is actively engaged with alumni, professionals and professional associations to keep curriculum and teaching current and to promote the exchange of ideas.
b) The unit provides leadership in the development of high standards of professional practice through such activities as offering continuing education, promoting professional ethics, evaluating professional performance and addressing communication issues of public consequence and concern.
c) The unit contributes to the improvement of journalism and mass communication as academic disciplines by supporting the faculty’s involvement in academic associations and related activities.
d) The unit contributes to its communities through service projects, internship and job placements, and faculty involvement in civic activities related to journalism and mass communication.
e) The unit supports scholastic journalism through such activities as faculty workshops, visiting lectures and critiques of student work.

**Standard 9: Assessment of Learning Outcomes**

Program level assessment usually is done in five steps: Identify learning outcomes, map out where the outcomes will be learned in the curriculum, gather data from direct and indirect measures to assess learning, analyze the data to evaluate student learning, and use the assessment to take steps to improve learning. The Communications Division has completed these stages with its mediated programs.

The Division has defined the learning outcomes for its core and program curricula. These encompass most of the outcomes identified by ACEJMC as Professional Values and Competencies. Those values and competencies are the following:

- understand and apply the principles and laws of freedom of speech and press for the country in which the institution that invites ACEJMC is located, as well as receive instruction in and understand the range of systems of freedom of expression around the world, including the right to dissent, to monitor and criticize power, and to assemble and petition for redress of grievances;
- demonstrate an understanding of the history and role of professionals and institutions in shaping communications;
- demonstrate an understanding of gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation and, as appropriate, other forms of diversity in domestic society in relation to mass communications;
• demonstrate an understanding of the diversity of peoples and cultures and of the significance and impact of mass communications in a global society;
• understand concepts and apply theories in the use and presentation of images and information;
• demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles and work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity;
• think critically, creatively and independently;
• conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communications professions in which they work;
• write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communications professions, audiences and purposes they serve;
• critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style and grammatical correctness;
• apply basic numerical and statistical concepts;
• apply tools and technologies appropriate for the communications professions in which they work.

As noted previously, outcomes focused on diversity, history, and appreciation for the First Amendment, should be considered for the core outcomes. They are found in some of the program outcomes, but they aren’t consistent across the board. The learning outcomes of the journalism program come the closest to meeting all of these values.

The core learning outcomes and the program outcomes have been mapped out against the curriculum, identifying where they are introduced, developed and mastered.

The mediated programs in the division have developed assessment plans using direct and indirect measures of learning.

Direct:
• A knowledge survey is conducted with incoming majors and graduating seniors to test cognitive retention of information. This pre/post test of knowledge has helped the division find areas that need to be improved in the curriculum.
• Rubrics have been developed to evaluate students skills in writing, presentation, and research.
• Certain questions have been embedded throughout courses in the curriculum to test whether students are learning and retaining certain knowledge.
• In certain classes, such as the advertising capstone, student work is evaluated by external reviewers.

Indirect:
• Survey of alumni about their learning experience in the Communications Division.
• Student self-assessment surveys are distributed in some classes, such as the research methods class.
• Focus groups with seniors have been conducted in some programs.

The faculty in the mediated programs have used regular and special meetings to discuss the evaluations of assessment data. The self-study for this internal review has also prompted faculty to look carefully at assessment data and to consider where it can improve. The Communications Division has revised the core curriculum by including a “Storytelling Through Media” class, revised the journalism curriculum to make it more converged and up-to-date with digital media, and is continuing to revise courses based on data.
collected through assessment measures. In assessment language this is called “closing the loop,” and it is the most important part of assessment.

**Conclusion**

The mediated programs in the Division of Communications has stated its learning outcomes, devised an assessment plan, collected data, and has made revisions to its curriculum to improve student learning. Because there is evidence that the programs have closed the assessment loop, it would likely be found in compliance on this standard. However, it should continue to seek ways of improving its assessment efforts. For example, too much emphasis is placed on the direct measure that tests student knowledge retention. Portfolio reviews and including more external reviewers, particularly professionals, might provide much more useful data.

**Summary**

The mediated programs in the Communications Division provide a very good education to the Pepperdine students. The faculty work hard, bring professional experience and opportunities to students, and care about student learning. The Division provides students with good equipment and co-curricular experiences to enhance their classroom experience. Access to one of the world's largest media markets is an especially unique strength.

**Overall Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations:**

**Strengths**

- A good balance between theory and skills in the curriculum.
- Hard working and dedicated faculty that are putting in long hours to provide quality professional and academic experiences for students.
- Faculty bring professional experience and a network of professional opportunities.
- Proximity to a city that can provide exceptional professional learning experiences. This resource provides exceptional internships, guest speakers, and career development.
- Good equipment in labs, particularly the media production facilities. Hardware and software are up to date and allow students to produce high quality messages.
- Student media opportunities with the Graphic and News Waves, that are produced by and for students. Strong student leadership skills are enhanced by these opportunities.
- Journalism program is moving in the right direction with recent changes.
- Assessment loop has been completed, and programs are making good use of data related to knowledge assessment.

**Weaknesses**

- Not enough full-time tenure-track faculty for the number of majors.
- IMC program takes resources away from advertising and public relations programs.
- Public relations program needs strengthening, particularly with preparing students with social and digital media skills.
- Limited diversity within the full-time faculty, especially compared to the student body and the region.
- Assessment could include more direct measures of skills and values, particularly by external reviewers who could help the program find its strengths and areas necessary for improvement. Advertising program has been doing this well.
Recommendations

- Hire more faculty in the advertising and public relations programs.
- Consider developing a more formal interdisciplinary relationship with graphic design in the development of a creative track. You don’t have enough resources for two tracks in advertising right now.
- Reduce IMC program to a minor. For marketing students, it would be a minor in Communications. For Communications students it would be a minor in marketing.
- Revise introductory course in advertising and public relations to be more focused on communications and less on marketing. The public relations portion of the class is particularly weak at this time.
- Update PR curriculum, particularly with social and digital media skills. Take a hard look at the PR writing class to ensure that it is up to date.

If the mediated programs decided to pursue accreditation, I would recommend that only the journalism, advertising, and public relations programs be reviewed. The programs would be found compliant on five of the nine standards, out of compliance on at least one standard (faculty), and could be found out of compliance on two others (diversity and research). On one standard I did not have enough information to provide an accurate evaluation.

For an initial accreditation review, a program could be accredited if found out of compliance in one standard. However, if it is found out of compliance on a critical standard, such as curriculum or faculty, there is a smaller possibility of being accredited.

Whether the mediated programs decide to pursue accreditation or not, the standards provided by ACEJMC are good benchmarks to evaluate mediated programs. I would strongly recommend that the division, college, and university consider the recommendations provided in this review. The greatest need is for more tenure-track faculty in advertising and public relations.
Advertising Program’s Response to External Review from Brad L. Rawlins
May 15, 2012

Brad Rawlins’ Site Visit: March 22-23, 2012

Standard 1: Mission, Governance and Administration
The Advertising Program agrees with Rawlins’ suggestion to provide a general mission statement for the Mediated Programs. Faculty from Mediated Programs would need to convene to develop a broad mission statement for the Mediated side of the Communication Division.

Standard 2: Curriculum and Instruction
The Advertising Program agrees with Rawlins that the advertising program provides a solid foundation for advertising principles and practices and that it might consider ways to push some advertising courses into the junior year because most of the courses that are focused on advertising occur in the senior year. The Ad Major concurs with Rawlins that the campaign course is a capstone of learning for the students where students are expected to develop and design their own product or service and completely develop an advertising strategy as an individual project. One suggestion is to move the capstone course project as a group project, which would be more reflective of what occurs in the industry. The course as it is developed is very demanding for students and the faculty member teaching the course.

Although faculty and students expressed interest in a creative track or at least more creative courses, Rawlins indicates this does not look like a possibility considering the current number of faculty teaching in advertising. There are a variety of ways, according to Rawlins, where students interested in a creative track have found ways to take courses in design from the Art Division and internships that can help them develop their skills. Another suggestion by he external reviewer is to consider developing a more formal interdisciplinary relationship with graphic design in the development of a creative track. The Ad Major Program would like to have two tracks (Media Management and Creative) to keep competitive in industry and allow students to take courses in both media and creative with a concentration in one of them. This will result in the need to hire more faculty.

The Advertising Program agrees with Rawlins about the recommendation of eliminating IMC as a program because it takes resources away from advertising and public relations programs. This will allow the Advertising Program to focus its resources on creating updated courses in social media and digital production of content. Additionally, the Advertising Program agrees with the External Reviewer that the IMC Program could be reduced to a minor by having Advertising Major students
or other Mediated Communication Major students take a minor in Marketing. And for marketing students, it would be a minor in Communication. Further, eliminated the IMC Program would allow for the external reviewer’s recommendation of revising the introductory course in advertising to be more focused on communication and less on marketing.

The Ad Program agrees with the External Reviewer that most of the courses focused on advertising occur in the senior year (according to the schedule map provided) and that it might be worth considering ways of pushing some of the courses into the junior year.

The Ad Major agrees with the External Reviewer that access to one of the world’s largest media markets is a strength. Proximity to a city that can provide exceptional professional learning experiences. This resource provides exceptional internships, guest speakers, and career development.

The External Reviewer suggests creating a course in social and digital media where both PR and advertising are playing in the same sandbox to reach audiences. This would create a planned integration in the curriculum that reflects the realities of the current practice. The Ad Program concurs with this suggestion.

**Standard 3: Diversity and Inclusiveness**
Rawlins indicates that additional steps would need to be shown about how the Communication Division is addressing diversity in its learning outcomes, course content, adjunct faculty, and guest speakers. For example, the Advertising Program could keep a record of guest speakers that add to the diversity of student experiences. Note: Many guest speakers add diversity to the Ad Program.

**Standard 4: Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty**
The Advertising Program agrees with Rawlins that currently there is an overreliance on visiting faculty and adjunct faculty. The need for full-time faculty is felt with the loads for student academic advising, internship supervision, division service, and having a long-term commitment to the success of the Advertising Programs. The Advertising Program fully supports Rawlins’ strongest recommendation from his report to increase the number of full-time faculty, particularly the tenure-track faculty in advertising and public relations.

**Standard 5: Scholarship**
The Advertising Program agrees that scholarship from full-time tenure/tenure-track faculty is essential, and with the current situation of student advising this takes considerable faculty time along with the current teaching and service loads that seem to be interfering with the Mediated Communication Division’s stated scholarship expectation for tenure-track faculty. Hiring more full-time faculty would allow for more scholarship produced by the faculty. Additionally, Rawlins recommended hiring a full-time academic advisor.
Standard 6: Student Services
Faculty have the primary responsibility for academic advising. The Ad Program agrees with Rawlins that with the reliance upon just a few full-time faculty, academic advising is requiring a lot of faculty time and is viewed as a burden by some. Rawlins suggests exploring various options, such as hiring a full-time academic advisor.

Standard 7: Resources, Facilities and Equipment
The Ad Program agrees with the external reviewer’s notes that the Communication Division’s building and facilities are sufficient and up-to-date. For example, classrooms are equipped with technology to teach, and computer labs are relatively up to date with equipment and software.

Standard 8: Professional and Public Service
The Ad Program agrees with Rawlins that the Major is actively engaged with alumni, professionals and professional associations to keep curriculum and teaching current and to promote the exchange of ideas.

Standard 9: Assessment of Learning Outcomes
The Ad Program agrees with the external reviewer report that learning outcomes are stated, an assessment plan is devised, data collected, and revisions made to its curriculum to improve student learning. One of the direct measure strengths is student work in the ADV 575 capstone course and ADV 475 course are evaluated by external reviewers. Rawlins states the “advertising program has been doing this well.” An additional suggestion is to use portfolio reviews, which is done in MSCO 371, but also include more external reviewers, particularly professionals, who might provide more useful data.

The Ad Program concurs with Rawlins that the assessment loop has been completed, and the program is making good use of data related to knowledge assessment.

Final Reviewer Comments
Rawlins concludes in his review of the mediated programs that “one the greatest needs is for more tenure-track faculty in advertising and public relations.” The Ad Major fully concurs with this recommendation.
Proposed Quality Improvement Plan

Advertising Program

Action 1: Revise introductory course in advertising and public relations to be more focused on communication and less on marketing.

Evidence to support action: Recommended by External Reviewer and 5-year Assessment Report (see report). External reviewer recommended reducing IMC program to a minor. For marketing students, it would be a minor in Communication. For Communication students it would be a minor in marketing.

Expected outcome: Allows for more coverage on advertising and enhances student learning in advertising and less on marketing. Allows for optimum use of resources.

Timeline for action: Fall 2013

Type of action: _xx_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (e.g., cost, resource implications, source of funds, other resources):

Action 2: Hire more tenure-track faculty in advertising

Evidence to support action: Recommended by External Reviewer and 5-year Assessment Report (see report). Presently the advertising major has two full-time faculty members, one tenured and one extended appointment visiting whose duties are split between teaching and directing internships, and three adjunct faculty for an average of 147 majors in 2011. Responsibilities include advising the advertising majors and overseeing internships for the ad majors. For the tenured professor, responsibilities include advising ad majors, internship advising, research, and service to Division, University and Profession.

Expected outcome: Long-term commitment to the success of the Advertising Program.

Timeline for action: Fall 2013

Type of action: ___ Resource neutral _xx_ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):
This will require the hiring of a tenure track assistant professor of advertising. We hope the division can work with the dean to identify current visiting positions that were originally tenure track and can be returned to tenure track status.

Action 3: Revise pre-requisites and replace COM 301 with COM 205 to allow for students to take more advertising classes in the junior year and to allow students to become more equipped in digital media.

Evidence to support action: Most of the courses focused on advertising occur in the senior year and the external reviewer suggested it might be worth considering ways of pushing some of the courses into the junior year. Additionally, with the replacement of COM 301 with COM 205, students will become more equipped in digital media (see 5-year-review Ad Assessment Report)

Expected outcome: Expands learning.

Timeline for action: Fall 2013

Type of action:   _xx_ Resource neutral     ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Action 4: Create a course in digital media where both PR and advertising are “playing in the same sandbox to reach audiences” (Brad Rawlins, 2012 Assessment Report).

Evidence to support action: Assessment data for the past several years from External Evaluators in ADV 475 and ADV 575 indicate a need (see 5-year assessment report) and the External Review Report from Brad Rawlins also indicates it.

Expected outcome: This would create a planned integration in the curriculum that reflects the realities of the current practice.

Timeline for action: 2013

Type of action:     ___ Resource neutral     _xx_ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

This will require an adjunct or full time professor to teach the class.
Action 5: Create an advertising major curriculum that includes two tracks: Media Management and Creative.

Evidence to support action: Assessment data (see 5-year assessment report). Challenge, according to Brad Rawlins: Lack of faculty resources.

Expected outcome: This would prepare students in both media and creative and allow them to select media or creative to specialize/concentrate in one of these areas.


Type of action: ___ Resource neutral  _xx_ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

More faculty will be needed to have two tracks in advertising.

Ginger Rosenkrans  5-21-12
Program Director/Chair  Date
REPORSE TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEW FROM THE INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATION PROGRAM

Prepared by Ken Waters

May 29, 2012

The Communication Division is thankful for the insightful and encouraging words provided by the external reviewer of our mediated programs. This response is to his comments regarding the future of our integrated marketing communication major.

As a reminder, this major is only a few years old and grew out of a desire of both the Business Administration and Communication Divisions to bring some consistency to an increasing number of students asking for contract majors blending advertising, public relations and marketing. While a group of faculty from both divisions hammered out the curriculum, no faculty member was put in charge of advising students, monitoring the curriculum or assessing the results of student learning. At the moment the major consists of about 80 students. They are advised by Dr. Don Shores, professor of broadcasting, who also advises a similar number of advertising and public relations students.

Our external reviewer, Dr. Brad Rawlins from Brigham Young University, advises the division to drop the IMC major and push students who want an IMC experience to major in either advertising of public relations with a minor in marketing, or major in Business Administration with a minor in advertising of public relations.

The Division is considering Dr. Rawlins’ suggestions and a group of media professors met for several hours on May 21 to consider the wisdom of dropping the IMC major. From that meeting,

1. We agree that the IMC major cannot continue without a faculty member advising students, teaching a re-worked introductory class, teaching a capstone class, and assessing the major.
2. We agree that currently the IMC major drains valuable resources from larger communication programs, namely public relations and advertising. These programs are already struggling to maintain quality because they have precious little faculty coverage (two tenure track, one visiting) for their combined 250 plus majors.
3. We are persuaded, however, that rather than immediately dropping the major we should work with the Seaver College administration to try to provide adequate faculty resources for the major. This is a popular program, one that prospective students and parents mention often as a desired major.
4. We are aware that we are one of the few schools in the United States to offer this degree. This means that other universities agree with Dr. Rawlins suggestions that students major in a strategic communication program (advertising/PR) and minor in marketing. On the other hand, this is the reason prospective students and parents consider Pepperdine. They find the major to be unique and “practical.”
5. The May 21 group agreed that we need to work this summer on ways to better explain our strategic communication majors and how a combination of majoring in advertising or PR, combined with a minor in marketing, is a superior learning experience to an IMC degree.
6. We also agreed to explore some way for the students’ diplomas to reflect this combination of strategic and marketing communication foci.
Dr. Rawlins mentions that students may not see the need for the major. That may be true for advertising and PR majors, but IMC majors have stated in exit surveys that they are very content with the level of learning and the overall experience in their major. This argues for its continuance, but only if a faculty member oversees the major and ensuring its rigor and assessing student learning.

In short, we understand Dr. Rawlins concern that the IMC major is depleting valuable resources from our larger and more established programs in advertising and public relations. Before dropping the major, we would like to explore with our administration a strategy that might allow us to provide adequate faculty coverage to IMC and to the seriously depleted majors of advertising and public relations.
Proposed Quality Improvement Plan

Integrated Marketing Communication

Action 1: Explore with the Seaver dean the possibility of adding a tenure track faculty to oversee the IMC major.

Evidence to support action: Five Year Assessment report of the division. The External Reviewer’s report

Expected outcome: Improving the quality of the IMC major course offerings; providing academic advising to its 80 majors; and assessing results of student learning.

Timeline for action: 2012-2013 academic year-- begin search for new faculty member

Type of action: ___ Resource neutral   _XX__ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (e.g., cost, resource implications, source of funds, other resources):

There may be enough visiting faculty and open tenure track slots in the division to accomplish this goal. It is possible that a faculty member can teach both marketing communication and advertising, allowing us to cover two gaping holes with one hire.

_____________________________________________________________________

Action 2: Drop the IMC major

Evidence to support action: Strong recommendation of the External Reviewer. Lack of assessment data gathered because no faculty member is in charge of curriculum in that area.

Expected outcome: Negative student reaction; loss of 80 majors in the communication division and a loss of potential students in future years. Increased faculty focus on advertising and public relations leading to quality improvement in those majors.

Timeline for action: 2012-2013 academic year

Type of action: XX__ Resource neutral   ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Program Director/Chair    Date
Response to external review regarding the journalism program

Prepared by Dr. Michael Murrie

The review was clear and helpful. I appreciate how it followed the form of a typical external program review done by reviewers for the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC).

The most important finding seems to be a simple matter to address. We need to adjust our program learning outcomes to more explicitly follow the 11 ACEJMC accreditation standards, especially with regard to journalism history and principles of diversity and the First Amendment. I believe these are covered in our existing courses, but they need to be more clearly articulated in both the program and course learning outcomes as well as in the matrix of which courses cover which outcomes. I would expect COM 260 to address media and journalism history. This may be difficult because some instructors for the course may lack backgrounds in journalism history. I wonder how many of our faculty members have ever had a journalism history class. The media law class, MSCO 571, should be the primary vehicle for building appreciation for First Amendment values. Diversity should be evident in several courses, but I wonder if it might be primary in Com 400, Communication Ethics? Other classes may include learning outcomes related to diversity, history and the First Amendment. We would need to have a meeting to clarify which course learning outcomes should address the adjusted program learning outcomes and whether to include a strong element of diversity in Com 400.

Now that we’ve at least started to conquer assessment, we should start to prioritize scholarship. We have isolated ourselves when it comes to scholarship. If we cooperate at all, it is only informally. We rarely intentionally collaborate to improve scholarship. The external review makes it clear we need to take scholarship seriously by creating some structures for facilitating it. We have new, well-trained tenure track professors who need support and who have fresh expertise. We have started to tailor our graduate program to better support scholarship. I believe if we compared notes – so to speak – about our scholarship more often by sharing our needs, our expertise and our weaknesses, we could make great progress.

Our student media fairied well in the external review. We do still need to coordinate news reporting. Ours is a small program with relatively few students with many other interests. We still seem to have difficulty with work flow. The online news course last spring never was sufficiently successful at submitting its stories to the Online Graphic. The television students’ coverage rarely coordinates with the Graphic coverage. If there is any radio news, one or two student make feeble efforts uncoordinated with other news gathering. It is possible that combining Graphic and Newswaves operations in to one newsroom might help this coordination. The student publications newsroom, however, has had increased use the last few years as more students get involved. Any additional use must be carefully considered by student leaders, faculty and support staff.
We should probably decide in the next few months whether to pursue ACEJMC accreditation. This is a rare opportunity to move forward on accreditation because we now have a preliminary estimate of what needs to be done. It would, however, require coordination among the various programs, leadership and more tenure track faculty in advertising and public relations.

The next time we do portfolio assessment we should recruit a professional external reviewer. This is a simple matter that would improve validity. Although not mentioned in the external review, we might even want to advance another idea that has been around for some time, the development of an advisory council.

This is not really part of the journalism program, but I agree that arrangements should be made for better advising. I also agree that our only public relations professor should not also be graduate director at the same time she serves as the only public relations professor to so many majors.
Proposed Quality Improvement Plan

Journalism

Action 1: Adjust learning outcomes to better reflect AEJMC 11 accreditation standards, especially history, First Amendment and diversity.

Evidence to support action: External review comments about AEJMC Standards 2 and 3, curriculum and diversity

Expected outcome: Learning outcome at the program and course levels include journalism history and principles regarding diversity and the First Amendment. Courses with these outcomes should include COM 260, MSCO 571 and COM 400. History, diversity and First Amendment outcomes may also be added to other courses such as JOUR 330, 345 or 561.

Timeline for action: Complete revision of program learning outcomes in the summer of 2012 for incorporation in syllabi in the fall of 2012

Type of action: \_x__ Resource neutral \_x__ Resources necessary

Action 2: Establish research collaboration forum and plan for ongoing, cooperative development of scholarship. This might begin as a survey followed by a division level half-day session of brief presentations, discussion and planning. It would be followed by regular progress reports and discussions, perhaps at lunches.

Evidence to support action: External review concludes that the scholarship of tenured and tenure track professors in mediated majors (AEJMC Standard 5) would be insufficient to be judged in compliance.

Expected outcome: Tenure and tenure track faculty would meet to discuss ongoing scholarship, identify ways to support each other and fill gaps, cooperate in seeking funds, and establish mechanisms and schedules for completing specific projects.

Timeline for action: Begin in summer. Establish schedules for individual projects. Process should be ongoing.

Type of action: \_x__ Resource neutral \_x__ Resources necessary

Action 3: Enlist external professional reviewer to join next portfolio review at the program level.

Evidence to support action: External review recommendation.
Expected outcome: Improved validity in program assessment.

Timeline for action: Spring 2013

Type of action: _x_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

______________________________________________________________

Action 4: Explore and plan consolidating Graphic and Newswaves newsrooms.

Evidence to support action: Increased students, especially film, using CCB 112. Also suggested by external review.

Expected outcome: Greater cooperation and quality in reporting for online, newspaper, television and perhaps radio news. Better allocation of space. Fewer conflicts among students requiring editing facilities.

Timeline for action: TBA

Type of action: _x_ Resource neutral _x_ Resources necessary?

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

NOTE: The planning may be resource neutral. Execution may involve purchasing additional software and workstations. It may also involve improving network connections between the publications newsroom and the television master control room.

______________________________________________________________

Action 5: Seek AEJMC accreditation in coordination with advertising and public relations.

Evidence to support action: External review suggests it would be feasible and within reach with certain improvements. More than 100 universities have accredited journalism and mass communication programs including Baylor, the only aspirational university with a comparable journalism program and Abeline Christian, a sister university associated with Churches of Christ.

Expected outcome: Improved program quality. External validation for needs. Improved opportunities for external funds and scholarships.

Timeline for action: 2012-13, begin to address clear deficiencies; prepare application materials and schedule review. 2013-14, continue to address deficiencies. 2014 host site visit.

Type of action: ___ Resource neutral _x_ Resources necessary
If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.): Application and site visits would be one-time expenses of about $10,000. Offsetting deficiencies would probably mean adding at least two tenure track faculty members in advertising and public relations, at least $200,000 ongoing.

__________________________  ____________
Program Director/Chair        Date
Media Production Major

Reaction to Outside Evaluator Report

Prepared by Susan Salas and Ken Waters

May 24, 2012

The Media Production Major did not have an outside evaluator visit for the major, but the Media Production full time faculty did have an opportunity to meet with the outside evaluator for the mediated majors (Public Relations, Journalism, Integrated Marketing Communication and Advertising) which gave some insight to the current and future issues faced by the major. It should be noted that the mediated programs are considering accreditation by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC) and the Media Production major will not be a part of this accreditation process. As the outside reviewer Brad Rawlins stated in his assessment review, however, “the standards provided by ACEJMC are good benchmarks to evaluate mediated programs.”

During an hour-long tour of the media production facilities on the first floor of the CCB, and other meetings with media production faculty, several informal and formal (see the External Review report) observations are in order.

1. The CCB studio facilities support majors in three different divisions—Communication (both media production and journalism), Fine Arts (Theatre and Media Production) and Humanities and Teacher Education (Film Studies/digital production). Over the past two years the Media Production major changed significantly to accommodate a felt need within the Film Studies program for more explicit courses in media production. Thus the names and sequencing of most media production courses are changing in August of 2012. In addition, in recognition that Telecommunications was an outdated and inaccurate description of what occurred in our courses, we changed the name of the major from Telecommunications to Media Production. As our external reviewer pointed out to us, this has resulted in an identity crisis for students and faculty in the area. Alumni have been quick to point this out also, asking that Pepperdine not abandon its historic commitment to teaching students about the television industry because this has been a strength of the major since it began in the late 1970s. As a result of this latest change to accommodate other divisions, the media production major itself is experiencing an identity crisis. Meeting with students in an informal, information gathering session both current faculty and the outside reviewer noted that graduating seniors shared this opinion as well.

2. While praising the up-to-date facilities of our production studio, and our decision to move from Final Cut Pro to an AVID editing system, the external reviewer noted that not all faculty and students know how to use the new software. The software change was necessitated by the fact that Apple decided not to support Final Cut Pro, sending all the media editing world into a frenzy and resulting in our decision to return to an old television standard, AVID. In both our assessment reviews and student feedback, we’ve noted a loss of quality in the
sound and lighting of senior capstone projects. So while we do have a quality facility, we are still lacking in the ability to teach students a skill set that speaks to a quality production degree. Thus we need to add a more specific production course, with most agreeing an additional course in editing should be added to the curriculum. The external reviewer noted that we could accomplish this additional course to the major if we did not seek ACEJMC accreditation because of that body’s guidelines for the number of liberal arts vs. skills classes. Adding a further skills class to our curriculum might make us a few units shy of meeting those accrediting guidelines.

3. The external reviewer noted that the preferred number of students in a skills class is 15. We average somewhere closer to the accrediting guidelines maximum number of students—20.

4. One reason for this is a lack of faculty, particularly full-time tenure track faculty. We agree with the reviewer that one long-term visiting faculty member Susan Salas (with additional responsibilities to run the media studio) and one tenured faculty in Don Shores (who advises at least 100 PR and IMC students in addition to athletes and sports broadcasting majors) is insufficient for creating a quality learning environment for our students. Craig Detweiler, who is technically a professor in media production, teaches only one or two courses per year in the major and has been primarily involved with helping create the master’s program in media production. We have been able to maintain a modicum of quality through hiring professional film makers and TV executives to teach some of our skills classes, but this is a less than ideal situation in terms of continuity of learning for students and assessment. In addition, our only tenured faculty member is currently advising more than 100 public relations and integrated marketing communication students in addition to helping advise the 80 media production majors. This leaves all assessment and curriculum coordination duties to a long-term visiting professor that is also teaching a heavy load while overseeing the creation and airing of at least five student-produced television shows each semester.

5. We agree that the program needs to be more explicit in teaching media history and diversity of audiences. We plan to incorporate these modules, plus more media theory and effects, into the Intro to Media course sometime in the future. We disagree that we do not teach freedoms expressed in the First Amendment since that is the major premise underlying the four-unit Media Law class required of our majors.

6. We are pleased that students and the external reviewer are reacting favorably to the new course called Storytelling Through Media. We plan to monitor and assess the students now taking this course as they progress through the next few years of their academic career.

7. We feel that the only way to achieve faculty diversity in our area is to hire a faculty member from an under-represented minority. We will also be more pro-active in seeking ethnic diversity in our hiring of adjuncts, although the pool of media professionals in Southern California with the requisite experience is relatively small.

8. Obviously our major is not producing scholarship at the moment, with the exception of Craig Detweiler (recently tenured) who teaches only one or two courses per year for the Communication Division. Don Shores is stretched way too thin with advising, leading the division’s curriculum committee, and his university work with Athletics to have time to resurrect his scholarly publishing career. Our other full-time faculty member is not encouraged nor expected to produce published research although she maintains an active involvement in producing and executive producing work of students and other professionals. In many university media programs, this is considered a tenurable form of publication. The only way to ramp up publication and scholarship in the major is to hire a new tenure track professor.
9. We agree with the external reviewer that we need to involve working professionals in the evaluation and assessment process of final media projects created in our capstone classes. To date we have concentrated most of our assessment efforts on improving our introductory field video class.
Proposed Quality Improvement Plan

Media Production Major

Action 1: Hire full-time tenure track faculty in Media Production Major

Evidence to support action:
Assessment report and review from outside evaluator

Expected outcome: Greater quality of teaching, better advising for students, increased reputation for division and Pepperdine resulting from scholarly activities, a new person to assist with curriculum review and assessment

Timeline for action: 2013-2014

Type of action: ___ Resource neutral  _x_ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (e.g., cost, resource implications, source of funds, other resources):

This will require an additional faculty member being given to the division, or shuffling around of the many short-term visiting positions to create a tenure track position in media production.

Action 2: Explore the addition of a production course focused on advanced instruction in the theory and practice of lighting, sound and composition.

Evidence to support action:
Assessment data from five year and one-year reports.

Expected outcome:
Improved quality of student productions and increased ability of students to secure production jobs upon graduation.

Timeline for action: Spring 2013

Type of action: ___ Resource neutral  _XX_ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

$4000 to hire an adjunct professor.
Action 3:
Explore with other media faculty the idea of including media theory and history into Com 260, Introduction to Media

Evidence to support action:
External reviewer's report noting we lack sufficient teaching of diversity and media history; additional comments from the external reviewer for the Communication major programs who suggested we drop our introduction to Communication Theory course and include theory in the introductory course for each specific major.

Expected outcome:
Better student appreciation of history and diversity in the media

Timeline for action:
Discuss during the 2012-2013 school year. Implement, if feasible, in the following year.

Type of action: XX__ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Action 4:
Create a Communication Division production “festival” to display student work to a panel of professional judges.

Evidence to support action:
This deliberate form of direct assessment is missing somewhat from our current efforts.

Expected outcome:
Additional professional respect and visibility for the skills of our seniors. Direct assessment data gathered.

Timeline for action:
2012-2013 school year.

Type of action: ___ Resource neutral _XX__ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):
It would be wonderful to find a professional sponsor for this event to help offset the costs for refreshments, programs and the like.
Public Relations Program’s Response to External Review from Brad L. Rawlins
May 15, 2012

Brad Rawlins’ Site Visit: March 22-23, 2012

The external review of the Public Relations program by Brad Rawlins revealed insights about strengths and weaknesses that are consistent with direct and indirect assessment data; with comparisons to public relations undergraduate education standards held by AEJMC (Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, PRSSA (the Public Relations Student Society of America), and CPRE (Commission on Public Relations Education, of which I am a member), and with observations by the current full-time faculty director, mediated communication faculty members, and the chair of the Communication Divisions. Dr. Rawlins contributed to our efforts at assessment and improvement by his tangible and attainable suggestions. His review indicated a thorough understanding of our programs.

This response will follow Dr. Rawlins’ structure of discussing each of the AEJMC standards for accreditation in turn.

**Standard 1: Mission, Governance and Administration**
While mediated communication is central to many areas of the discipline and profession of public relations, the field actually reaches across to other areas of communication study and practice represented in the Communication Division. It would be more accurate and appropriate to develop a mission statement for the public relations program, or to develop a joint mission statement for the disciplines that are connected through strategic communication (public relations, advertising, IMC, and possibly organizational communication). If it is the decision of the division to seek AEJMC accreditation and the public relations program joins that effort, I agree that developing a mediated communication mission statement to unify the disciplines and present a strong case for accreditation would be appropriate.

Dr. Rawlins’ observation that learning outcomes related to history, role of the profession, diversity, and applying tools and technologies are not explicitly mentioned in the public relations program learning outcomes was accurate. However, “the understanding of the history and role of professionals and institutions in shaping communications” is addressed through student learning outcomes in the gateway course, MSCO 220, Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication; PR 380, Public Relations Writing; PR 505, Public Relations Management, and in PR 555, Advanced Cases in Public Relations. “An understanding of diversity of groups in a global society” is addressed through student learning outcomes in MSCO 220; PR 455, Public Relations Techniques and Campaigns. Likewise, “apply tools and technologies appropriate for their respective professions” is addressed through student learning outcomes in MSCO 220, PR 380, PR 455, and PR 555.

Public relations faculty agree with Dr. Rawlins’ favorable report about division chair Ken Waters’
leadership.

**Standard 2: Curriculum and Instruction**

We agree that the public relations curriculum “provides a good balance among theory, principles and skills,” with a focus on “theory, ethics, writing, storytelling and production” as well as professional practice. These observations indicate that Dr. Rawlins understands our program, its philosophy and scope, well.

Dr. Rawlins notes that “history, diversity, and appreciating the freedoms expressed in the First Amendment” should be more explicitly addressed in curriculum. MSCO 220 covers these topics, and diversity is addressed in multiple courses (see Standard 1). PR 380 would be a natural course for strengthening the teaching about the First Amendment; it’s actually surprising that this is not built explicitly into the student learning outcomes. Our assessment data revealed that students in the capstone course are not able to identify key figures and events in the history of public relations, so clearly there should be additional attention to history and events formative to the profession in classes subsequent to MSCO 220.

It is reported that “each of the programs require 44 credits” and that “ACEJMC does not recognize business courses . . . as liberal arts.” Actually, the current public relations curriculum requires 49-52 total hours, if the 9-12 outside concentration hours are included. Of course, those 9-12 hours may be in the liberal arts. However, this AEJMC standard conflicts with the recommendations of PRSSA and CPRE, which recommend strongly that public relations students take business-related courses. For this reason, we are contemplating creating a business/organization track or emphasis. In addition, changes in the proposed curriculum would increase the number of units in the public relations major to 46-47 plus the 9-12 unit outside concentration.

We agree that twenty students in a writing-intensive course are too many for thorough attention by the instructor, which is required for students to truly improve as writers by the end of the course. The same could be argued for design courses (e.g., MSCO 371).

We strongly concur that the internship program is a strength that cannot be overestimated. The strong preparation in knowledge and skills, the program’s positive reputation, and proximity to a “phenomenal market” offer our students “dream” internship opportunities with leading organizations in our profession, and result in approximately 80% of Pepperdine public relations interns receiving full-time job offers.

The multiple concerns about the public relations curriculum and instruction have been recognized and discussed at length by the current (new) program director, instructors, and division chair. We concur that formal and informal assessment reveal that students do not have a full or accurate “understanding of public relations purposes and practices,” and they tend to describe public relations narrowly as publicity and event planning. Assessment of seniors’ understanding of the field, history, and theoretical foundations identified alarming insufficiencies, which must be addressed throughout the curriculum. Likewise, connections between the core communication
classes and application to public relations need to be made across the public relations curriculum.

Rawlins’ review, student feedback, the program director and division chair consistently identify PR 380 (Public Relations Writing) as the course most urgently requiring revision. We agree that the content is out of date, improvement in instruction is essential, and significant changes are being made to integrate current tools, technologies, and styles of writing (particularly in social and digital media). The five-year program review emphasized the problems with the introductory course, MSCO 220 Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication, and Rawlins concurs. It is essential that public relations majors gain a comprehensive foundation in the field, and this is simply not occurring in the present curriculum. We are proposing a return to the Principles of Public Relations gateway course, which will address the reality of integrated marketing and advertising, but without sacrificing foundational competencies required by curriculum standards of AEJMC, PRSSA, and CPRE.

We strongly concur that the public relations major is underserved by only one full-time tenure-track faculty member and the heavy reliance on adjunct professors. The five-year review emphasized the problems with the major related to the lack of long-term stability and consistency of faculty and instruction.

The public relations program agrees with Rawlins about the recommendation of eliminating IMC as a major (perhaps retaining as a minor or recommend that public relations major minor in marketing in the Business Division) because it takes resources away from advertising and public relations programs. IMC is not a discipline with a distinct history and theoretical foundation, but is a method of delivery that is the current professional reality in public relations and advertising. A course in social media and digital production of content that the advertising program is creating (which Dr. Rawlins suggests) will provide students with opportunities for integrated marketing communication experience in the upper level of the curriculum. Further, eliminating the IMC program would allow for the external reviewer’s recommendation of revising the introductory course in advertising to be more focused on communication and less on marketing.

**Standard 3: Diversity and Inclusiveness**
Rawlins indicates that additional steps would need to be shown about how the Communication Division is addressing diversity in its learning outcomes, course content, adjunct faculty, and guest speakers. For example, the public relations program could keep a record of guest speakers that add to the diversity of student experiences, and direct and indirect methods of assessment of diversity issues could be added as course assignments. Also, we could make a concerted effort at hiring diverse adjunct faculty.

**Standard 4: Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty**
The public relations program agrees with Rawlins that currently there is an overreliance on adjunct faculty. The need for full-time faculty is urgent, given the loads for student academic advising and
instruction for 113 student majors (as Rawlins notes), internship supervision, scholarship, advising of the Pepperdine PRSSA chapter, division service, and the effort to improve the curriculum and reputation of the program and maintain a long-term commitment to its success. As Rawlins notes, the current director of the program also has responsibilities as chair of the Communication Division graduate programs. The public relations program fully supports Rawlins’ strongest recommendation from his report to increase the number of full-time faculty, particularly the tenure-track faculty in advertising and public relations. It is surprising that the program continues to maintain the high numbers of majors, given the student feedback and limited faculty.

**Standard 5: Scholarship**
The public relations program agrees that scholarship from full-time tenure-track faculty is essential and enhances instruction, and that the current scope of responsibilities (discussed in Standard 4) interferes with AEJMC’s scholarship expectation for tenure-track faculty in accredited programs. Hiring more full-time faculty to share in program responsibilities would allow all full-time faculty members more time for scholarly activities, and improve their success in rank and tenure application. The only reason the program director had as much scholarly output this past year as Rawlins reported as that much of it was already in the pipeline before arriving at Pepperdine in fall 2011; given the two-fold responsibilities as program director and chair of the graduate programs in communication, there would have been little time to devote to new scholarship.

**Standard 6: Student Services**
The public relations program agrees with Dr. Rawlins that with the reliance upon just a few full-time faculty, academic advising is requiring a lot of faculty time and is viewed as a burden by some. Like Dr. Rawlins states, “faculty have the primary responsibility for academic advising.” It is my position that public relations majors are entitled to the advising oversight and involvement of their academic advisor, at least regarding their major and concentration courses, internship and international study options, and career planning and mentoring. I realize that other faculty members may disagree, and I do not suggest that this responsibility should be imposed on others. With only one full-time public relations faculty member for 113 students, this kind of advising and mentoring is unmanageable. If another full-time faculty member were hired, students would be more likely to receive the academic advising that would facilitate their success in the program, their on-time completion, their positive evaluation of their experience as public relations majors, and loyalty and support the program as alumni. Rawlins suggests exploring various options, such as hiring a full-time academic advisor. This staff person could provide advising for courses outside the major and for processing various approvals and other paperwork.

As Dr. Rawlins notes, the PRSSA chapter began rebuilding in 2011-12 after a few years of inattention. There is a small but dedicated core of students who have been involved and shown leadership, and an impressive array of professionals were guest speakers at membership meetings. Many of the 2011-12 student officers are returning in fall 2013, and we are anticipating continued efforts at recruiting new members and rebuilding the chapter to its former strength. The creation of the division’s Communication Bureau, which will integrate media, advertising, and public relations
into a student firm, will provide another vehicle for strengthening PRSSA, opportunities for professional experience, and preparing them for competitive internship and professional positions.

**Standard 7: Resources, Facilities and Equipment**
The public relations program agrees with the external reviewer’s notes that the Communication Division’s building and facilities are sufficient and up-to-date. For example, classrooms are equipped with technology to teach, and computer labs are relatively up to date with equipment and software.

**Standard 8: Professional and Public Service**
The new public relations program director is building a network with Pepperdine alumni and Los-Angeles area professionals and professional associations to keep curriculum and teaching current and to promote the exchange of ideas about our program and professional trends. Adjunct faculty members are very beneficial professional resources, and bring with them many professional contacts who come to campus as guest speakers or possible internship placements. The new program director is one of a select group of international professionals and teachers-scholars who serve on the Commission on Public Relations Education, is an active member of PRSSA and the National Communication Association as a former chair of the Public Relations Division, and has a wide network of academic and professional contacts beyond Los Angeles area. Information from these sources has informed the five-year program review, and the analysis, and development of proposed changes to the program. We are anticipating creating a professional advisory board to provide important input into the public relations program, and to form yet another group of professional resources for our students and faculty.

In addition, the public relations program does contribute to communities in Ventura and Los Angeles counties, and to the Pepperdine community, through service-learning projects in multiple courses each semester. Examples from 2011-12 include Boys and Girls Club of Malibu, Interface Children and Family Services, The Greater Contribution, Hats Off for Cancer, Synergy Academies, and Pepperdine Women’s Soccer.

**Standard 9: Assessment of Learning Outcomes**
The public relations program agrees with the external reviewer report that learning outcomes are stated, an assessment plan is devised, data collected, and revisions made to its curriculum to improve student learning. As noted in the review of Standard 1, learning outcomes related to history, role of the profession, diversity, and applying tools and technologies may need to be explicitly mentioned in the public relations program learning outcomes. Campaign proposals and implementation, with feedback from clients, are strong direct measures in multiple classes (only PR 555, the capstone, requires implementation). A direct measure that may be added would be to require students to submit a portfolio of representative work from their public relations courses in the PR 555 capstone course, which would be evaluated by external reviewers.

The public relations program concurs with Rawlins that there is ample assessment data through
multiple direct and indirect methods, resulting in several recurring strengths and weaknesses, and that the assessment loop is being completed with the program using the data as support for needed improvements.

Final Reviewer Comments
Rawlins concludes in his review of the mediated programs that “one the greatest needs is for more tenure-track faculty in advertising and public relations.” The public relations program fully concurs with this recommendation.
Proposed Quality Improvement Plan

Public Relations Program

Action 1: Drop MSCO 220 as a requirement for the public relations major. Instead, return to the previous PR 255, Principles of Public Relations, as the required gateway course to the major. This course will be proposed to the Seaver Curriculum Committee by September 2012.

Evidence to support action: Recommended by External Reviewer and 5-year Assessment Report (see report). External reviewer recommended reducing IMC program to a minor. For public relations students, advise a minor in marketing as a track, as recommended by PRSSA and CPRE.

Expected outcome: Allows meeting public relations program learning outcomes and builds community with majors. Allows for optimum use of resources, and improved strength and student perceptions of the program.

Timeline for action: Fall 2013

Type of action: _xx_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (e.g., cost, resource implications, source of funds, other resources):

Action 2: Hire more tenure-track faculty in public relations

Evidence to support action: Recommended by External Reviewer and 5-year Assessment Report (see report). Presently the public relations major, with 113 students, is operated by one full-time tenure-track faculty member (who also teaches in and chairs the graduate program) and two adjunct faculty. Responsibilities for an additional tenure-track professor would include advising public relations majors, overseeing public relations internships, contributing to curriculum assessment and improvement, co-advising the PRSSA chapter, research, and service to division, university and profession.

Expected outcome: Long-term commitment to the success of the public relations program.

Timeline for action: Fall 2013

Type of action: ___ Resource neutral _xx_ Resources necessary

Note: You may propose fewer than four actions or more than four actions, but acting on fewer changes is likely more realistic than acting on numerous changes at one time.
If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.).

Action 3: Revise PR 555, Advanced Cases in Public Relations, to capstone that centers on campaign planning and implementation for an off-campus client organization, and increase units from 3 to 4 to reflect the increased demands of the course. The prerequisite will be changed from PR 455 to PR 505, to prevent students from taking PR 505 and PR 555 concurrently. The course description, student learning outcomes, and graded elements are under review and changes will be proposed to Seaver Curriculum Committee by September 2012.

Evidence to support action: Recommended by External Reviewer and 5-year Assessment Report (see report), and by PRSSA and CPRE curriculum standards. No other major course should be taken concurrently with the capstone.

Expected outcome: Allows meeting public relations program learning outcomes and capstone culmination of undergraduate knowledge and skills. Improves student perceptions and student perceptions of the program, and contributes to University outcome of commitment to service learning and community service.

Timeline for action: Fall 2013

Type of action: _xx_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Action 4: Revise PR 380, Public Relations Writing, to reflect the changes noted in the 5-Year Assessment Report that are urgently needed. The course description, student learning outcomes, and graded elements are under review and changes will be proposed to Seaver Curriculum Committee by September 2012.

Evidence to support action: Recommended by External Reviewer and 5-year Assessment Report (see report), and by PRSSA and CPRE curriculum standards.

Expected outcome: Allows meeting public relations program learning outcomes and better prepares students for internships and current professional practice. Improves student perceptions and strength of the program.

Timeline for action: Fall 2013

Type of action: _xx_ Resource neutral ___ Resources necessary
If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc):

____________________________________

Action 5: Replace COM 301 with COM 205 to allow students to become more equipped in digital media and to better prepare them for MSCO 371.

Evidence to support action: Students will become more equipped in digital media (see 5-year-review Ad Assessment Report). Also, due to changes in COM 301 that have made it primarily rhetoric-focused, COM 205 is a more relevant and appropriate course.

Expected outcome: Expands learning.

Timeline for action: Fall 2013

Type of action: \_
\_
\_

Resource neutral

\_
\_

Resources necessary

If resources are necessary, provide more information on the nature of resources requested (i.e., cost, resource implications, source of funds, staffing, etc.):

Denise P. Ferguson_________________________ May 25, 2013______________
Program Director/Chair

Date
Internship Assessment

Prepared by Ken Waters, Chair of the Communication Division, with assistance from Debbie Wideroe, visiting professor of advertising; Denise Ferguson, associate professor of communication; Ginger Rosenkrans, professor of Communication; Greg Daum, visiting professor of communication; Elizabeth Smith, visiting professor of journalism; and John Jones, professor of communication.

For the past 30 years, Communication Division students have had the option of extending their educational experience by taking an internship with a qualified company or organization. When the current curriculum was adopted in 1999, the voluntary completion of a one unit of internship for credit/no credit became a mandatory requirement. The internship was established as a “deliberative form of learning” that enhances the student learning experience. Since then, more than 1000 students have successfully completed internships through the division. The Communication Division internship pre-dates the establishment of an internship function within the Career Center. We do cooperate with the Career Center’s operation and rely on them to gather site supervisor evaluations and provide guidance on best practices in the administration of internships. We also cooperate with the Seaver Dean’s office, which runs the summer school internship program using different criteria than those used in our division.

The division’s internship program attempts to model its student learning outcomes and criteria to meet the standards first expressed by Kuh in his 2008 monograph *High Impact Educational Practices: What they Are, Who has Access To Them, and Why They Matter* (Washington D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities). Those who teach in the Communication Division consider their internship program to be both High Impact and deep learning and to be one of the distinctive niches (along with co-curricular programs) that distinguish a Pepperdine Communication degree from that at other similar-sized colleges and universities.

In 2011, the division received a sizeable grant to begin offering student interns reimbursement for the costs of commuting to their internships and paying for parking and other incidental expenses. An annual reception honoring student interns is being planned to allow those interns to share with the faculty and the donor about their learning experiences.

**Internship Requirements**

The internship requirements are clearly outlined on our forms, syllabi, and "fast facts" sheet available to students. These are also posted online.

1. Students receiving internship credit must have completed several courses in their major and maintain strong academic status in order to receive approval from the Communication Division and their advisor to take an internship. We thus ensure students we send into the
workplace will represent both Pepperdine and the Communication Division positively through their work ethic and knowledge.

2. The student needs to work the hours (predicated by the units), keep a daily work journal, turn in a reflection paper at the end, as well as turn in to their faculty advisor any other project and/or paper requested by that advisor. Advisors often ask for a portfolio of work if an intern is involved in creating news stories, press releases, ads, evaluations of scripts or music submissions, organizational consulting memos, etc. In addition, the students do a mid-point evaluation, ask for and usually receive constructive criticism from their boss, as well as interview an employee in another department of the company and write up a report on what they learned.

3. To ensure the best possible experience for the students, and to keep them from being exploited by their site supervisors, Prof. Wideroe conducts a twice-monthly meeting with all enrolled interns. Topics include The Internship Process, Effective Communication Styles, The Art of Office Etiquette, Dealing with Difficult People/Conflict in the Work Place, Interview Techniques and Landing a Job. Because of their relationship with Prof. Wideroe, students often “drop in” during office hours to talk with about their internships, experiences and futures. Students are not shy to speak up when a job isn’t a good experience, and, if need be, Prof. Wideroe pulls the student from the site, and we discontinue our relationship with that company and supervisor. Prof. Wideroe maintains contact with the student's faculty advisers ... Conversely, maintaining good relations with internship site supervisors means occasional visits to the site to conduct damage control if a student has not acted in a professional manner.

Process

Most students begin their internship hunt when they return to campus in the fall or spring. We do encourage them to begin their search earlier, but most are either working throughout the summer or enjoying Christmas vacation. The process goes something like this:

1. Once students decide to pursue an internship, they consult the Communication Division listing of possible internships. Students also receive the necessary paperwork from the division office or Website.
2. Students must also meet with their faculty advisor and then Prof. Wideroe to discuss internship possibilities and goodness of fit. Each of these meetings can take 10-20 minutes per student.
3. Students must then apply directly with each company. They interview by phone first and then interview in person with the internship supervisors. If they do get selected to intern, the students then complete additional paperwork with their site supervisor, secure their faculty advisor’s signature and approval, and return this paperwork to the division office for registration. This process generally takes two to four weeks, depending on the level of competition for the internship, the schedule of the internship supervisor, and the availability of the student to travel from Malibu to the Los Angeles area for interviews.
4. Once a student begins the internship, Prof Wideroe maintains contact with both the student and the site supervisor through e-mail and/or site visits.
Competition for internships in Southern California is intense as students from UCLA, USC, California State Northridge, California State Long Beach, California Lutheran University and others compete for coveted spots, especially at major TV and movie production companies and international PR and advertising firms. For this reason our students sometimes must interview several times at a site. The need for Pepperdine to account for the registration of students according to the Pepperdine academic calendar sometimes puts our students at a disadvantage as they must forgo internship possibilities. This arises because out of fairness to other Southern California university students, internship supervisors sometimes delay hiring our students until students from other universities have returned from their summer and holiday breaks. Many of those schools start several weeks later than Pepperdine. Because of this, challenges to registration, including late adds and drops or withdraws requiring petitions to the college Credits Committee have created an untenable administrative problem for the division.

**Supervision Details**

1. Communication Division faculty are responsible for assigning student grades (CR/NC during the academic year; graded during summer school) and serving as part of a network of support for the students. Division Internship Coordinator Debbie Wideroe (ME Harvard) maintains an extensive network of sites around the nation and is in periodic contact with site supervisors to ensure the relationship is properly maintained. She works closely with faculty advisers throughout the internship process. Faculty advisers are not paid for oversight of internships. Prof. Wideroe, a long-term visiting professor, receive a small stipend and a two course per year reduction in her teaching load (bringing it to a 3-3 requirement).

2. The communication division faculty and Prof. Wideroe assist students in choosing an appropriate internship by meeting with students in advance of the application process to suggest a “goodness of fit” between the student and the potential internship opportunities. This helps us avoid one criticism of internship programs nationally (see CAS/AAC and U 2007).

3. Because of the division’s minimum requirements for student internships, the site supervisors know they were hiring a student who had completed 75 units of course work with an acceptable GPA, and a developing ability to think critically, write, and perform in an ethical fashion. This puts our students at a distinct advantage in the highly competitive market for interns in Southern California.

4. Prof. Wideroe has developed an interactive course for all students registered in an internship. Students must attend two 2-hour Wednesday morning sessions. This time is dedicated to discussions about professional conduct, resume writing, interviewing techniques and troubleshooting should students encounter an unpleasant experience in the workplace.

5. For practical reasons, the faculty in the Communication Division feels a credit-no credit grade is sufficient. Other internship offices on campus and the summer school program administered by the Seaver Dean's office prefer a letter grade. No stipend is offered to faculty members overseeing internships during the fall and spring academic terms. Faculty overseeing summer internships do receive a stipend.
The Educational Value of the Internship Program

An internship program fits Kuh’s definition of a High Impact Learning experience if certain criteria are met. The following chart shows how the Communication Division’s practices stack up against Kuh’s criteria. Impact compares to Kuh’s criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kuh’s criteria for quality</th>
<th>How we attempt to meet</th>
<th>Assessment data used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are effortful—demand time devoted to purposeful tasks</td>
<td>Interns are placed in sites selected by Com Division internship coordinator. Sites are visited regularly to ensure proper learning environment.</td>
<td>Communication Division keeps notebook of sites selected by the internship coordinator. Only high quality sites are considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students build substantive relationships with faculty, staff, co-workers</td>
<td>Students encouraged to interview their supervisors at the site for advice; students meet every two weeks with internship coordinator for 1 ½ hour discussions with others doing an internship.</td>
<td>Site supervisor assessment of the student’s performance and student reflection paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students work with people different from themselves.</td>
<td>Internships in Los Angeles area almost always expose students to diversity in all its forms.</td>
<td>Again, student reflection papers provide this data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide new ways of thinking inside and outside classroom</td>
<td>Students are exposed to a business or nonprofit environment and asked by their site supervisors and peers to make meaningful contributions.</td>
<td>Reflection paper and diary indicate the extent to which students are applying knowledge to new situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide rich feedback to students</td>
<td>Students receive interim and final feedback from site supervisors; they also receive peer and internship coordinator feedback during class sessions on campus.</td>
<td>Aggregated data from site supervisor evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students apply what they are learning in new situations. Integrate, synthesize, apply knowledge.</td>
<td>Each student’s experience is different, but because we pre-select possible sites, we ensure a challenging learning experience.</td>
<td>Aggregated site supervisor evaluation and reflection paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to reflect on what they are becoming.</td>
<td>Students assigned a reflection paper and encouraged to keep a diary.</td>
<td>Rubric analyzes student reflections integrating internship with curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Role of the Communication Division Internship Supervisor in Meeting Internship “best practices”

As mentioned, Prof Debbie Wideroe coordinates the internships for the Communication Division, receiving a two-course per year reduction in her teaching load. The role has primarily been defined by Prof. Wideroe and has evolved into a much more complex undertaking the past few years. The division is fortunate that Prof Wideroe has experience as an executive (hiring hundreds over the decades), and as both an intern and an internship supervisor for her own company of 45 employees and 250 team members at Warner Bros. This experience has led her to conduct the internship coordination in a manner few other universities utilize.

Prof. Wideroe takes a proactive role in securing dynamic sites and then nurturing each of these relationships by keeping track of even the smallest details to help differentiate us from all of the other university programs. This occasionally means sending wedding or baby gifts, or paying (sometimes out of her own pocket) for lunches, dinners, or coffee when she is meeting with site supervisors.

During the summer of 2010, Prof. Wideroe spent two days in both New York City and Boston recruiting new internship sites. New site supervisors were astounded that we would come to them and take such an active role. In fact, Warner Music Group in NYC said that they wish we could fill all 200 internship openings they have in NYC, Nashville, Burbank and Santa Monica!

The benefits of this type of careful attention to maintaining strong relations with internship sites and supervisors is that Prof. Wideroe is uniquely positioned to help the Communication Division form major-specific advisory boards consisting of internship site coordinators and their supervisors, as well as alumni of our majors. The forming of advisory boards is usually a foundational exercise in cultivating long-term advisers and donors to academic programs and institutions. Thus Prof. Wideroe’s role as internship coordinator, seen in light of a longer-term Communication Division strategy, is to leverage the internship role into a friend-making and eventually a fund-raising role.
## Benchmarking

### INTERNSHIP REQUIREMENTS AT SOME OTHER SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Grade/CNC</th>
<th># students per semester</th>
<th>Internship oversight?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calvin College</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Communication Department</td>
<td>Graded by site supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occidental</td>
<td>CR/NC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>College office</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>CR/NC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>College office</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of San Diego</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>50-65</td>
<td>Communication Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>10 per division</td>
<td>College office</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>CR/NC</td>
<td>½ campus</td>
<td>College office</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>College office</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>CR/NC</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>Communication Department</td>
<td>Required for Com majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Communication Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPPERDINE</td>
<td>CR/NC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Grade/CNC</th>
<th># students per semester</th>
<th>Internship oversight?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>CR/NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication Department</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>CNC</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: The Communication Division considers Elon University’s School of Communication in North Carolina as its primary aspirational program. That school requires all majors to complete an internship. A full-time internship coordinator, employed by the School of Communication, oversees the program and assigns grades for students.

The Pepperdine Communication Division is rare in that it requires an internship for graduation. Also, the number of Pepperdine students completing an internship each year is far more than the number at our peer and aspirational schools. Some schools provide a letter grade for internships while others provide a credit-no credit grade.

**Grading vs. Credit/No Credit**

One source of discussion on campus the past few years has been whether providing a letter grade for an internship creates a more meaningful educational experience. Within Pepperdine this issue has been hotly debated with the suggestion that perhaps the Communication Division internship would be strengthened if letter grades were assigned. Our peer and aspirational institutions differ in their practices on this point. For the sake of expediency, and because the faculty aren’t convinced a letter grade provides any further incentive for the student to excel at the internship, the Communication Division hopes to continue to use the credit/no credit grade. The issue of grading raises several concerns among the division faculty.

1. Adding a grade would place a time burden on professors. Each semester approximately 100 students undertake internships, but a disproportionate share of internship supervision falls to a handful of advisors. During the spring of 2010, for instance, Don Shores supervised 27 interns, Susan Salas supervised 20, and Debbie Wideroe supervised 27, which included 11 Randall interns. While the materials students provide to the faculty are the same whether that internship is graded or not graded, faculty would still need to budget extra time to carefully fill out the rubric and assign a grade to the student’s final diary.

2. If faculty did grade internships, what objective measurement would be used to determine if the educational objectives had been met in a way justifying a grade? Rubrics analyzing a student diary, interviews with the student, attendance at internship “classes,” and an analysis of the site supervisor’s comments are all subjective measures. These are the criteria we now use to assess CR/NC.

3. Given the time pressure to turn in grades at the end of the semester, most professors will default to a grade of A, which means, “the student completed the requirements of the internship and they have reflected on the experience.” An increasing number of A’s, even for only one unit, contributed to grade inflation in the past and that is one reason why we stopped using graded internships in 1999.

4. While faculty may be open to supervising graded internships during the summer, they are opposed to undertaking graded internships during the fall and spring semesters unless they receive compensation or release time.
Internship Program Student participation

* GSGS refers to internships administered by the college’s Career Center.

Note: The Randall Internship is a specialized internship program available to a select group of students who receive some reimbursement for their internship expenses. They attend more frequent class meetings and receive a letter grade for their internship. This is a college wide program that the Communication Division participates in on a limited basis.

Spring enrollment is usually higher than in the fall because some students wait until their final semester to fulfill the internship requirement. Summer enrollment has remained steady. Students majoring in Journalism and Media Production are encouraged to complete their internships during the summer to allow for a longer and more intense learning experience than is possible during an
academic term where classes and other activities limit the amount of time available to do an internship.

**Student Learning Outcomes (Excerpted from the summer syllabus)**

**GOALS:**

The Communication Internship is an opportunity for students to apply their liberal arts education and practical skills in a work setting as they learn through observation and practice. This will result in an improvement in the interpersonal communication, leadership, teamwork, time management, and skills relevant to the workplace and the student’s career interest. This is accomplished as the student also observes potential ethical dilemmas and how they are handled in the workplace.

**SLOs:**

By the end of the internship students will:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of worksite expectations and norms: punctuality, consistency, reliability, proper dress and etiquette, resume writing, the value of a strong work ethics, group relationships and problem solving, maintaining strong interpersonal relationships and attentiveness to ethical issues in the workplace.

2. Demonstrate an understanding of professional values: truth, accuracy, fairness, ethics, diversity, creative thinking and problem solving.

3. Apply theories of chosen major and acquired classroom skills to professional career settings: This includes research and evaluation of information, the use of appropriate technology, writing clearly and accurately, improving personal and mediated presentation skills, etc.

The Student Learning Outcomes of the Internship generally relate to PLO number 2 and 3 of the program learning outcomes for each of our majors and emphases. Additionally, students and site supervisors are asked to comment on the degree to which students increased their personal values and ethics, which is PLO 4.
Assessment of Communication Internships

Student Survey Responses

Two-hundred-sixty-seven student surveys were collected from 2008 to 2011. The surveys were created by the Pepperdine Career Center. Students completed the statement, “The internship had a positive impact on my...”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>SLO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.0599</td>
<td>.87797</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work as a team player</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>.88286</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of strengths</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.3708</td>
<td>.80012</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.3858</td>
<td>.78823</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.1948</td>
<td>.94565</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal communication</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.3895</td>
<td>.85288</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical &amp; critical thinking</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.1760</td>
<td>.90264</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal values &amp; ethics</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3.9700</td>
<td>.99200</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational direction</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.0412</td>
<td>1.06649</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The statistics showed that there were no significant differences between the responses of students in the different communication majors. Therefore, this sample is comprised of students from all of the division’s majors.

- These indirect measures provide good insight into the perceptions of students over the past five years. These perceptions are very positive.

Supervisor Survey Responses

From the period of January 2009 to December of 2011, Pepperdine received 156 useable site supervisor evaluation forms. Supervisors were asked to rate students on their skills, communication ability, growth and areas for improvement. Internship supervisors were asked to rate their students’ performance in a variety of areas. Their survey options included: 1-Marginal, 2-Acceptable, & 3-Excellent. Additional space was added for comments. You can see that they
overwhelmingly rated their interns as “excellent.”

### Skills & Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Interaction with peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development on the job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contribution to the workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Marginal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Over the past three-plus years, an overwhelming number of the site supervisors rated our students as excellent, with the rest rated acceptable. This data supports more anecdotal conversations among site supervisors, the division’s internship coordinator, faculty and the students. The results of this assessment confirm that the division’s insistence that students have completed at least 75 units before taking an internship is a valid way to ensure students are mature and in possession of some skills that can ensure a strong internship experience for both the student and the site supervisors. The worksite supervisor evaluations are considered a strong direct assessment tool. “Worksite supervisor evaluations offer a reality check by an important external stakeholder” (Williams, L. “Assessment of Student Learning Through Journalism and Mass Communication Internships. Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education, vol. 2, Fall 2010, 23-38). Verney, et. al assert, “If employers are satisfied with their intern(s), it is generally assumed the institution’s curriculum meets or even surpasses employers’ needs.”

The high marks given to the Communication Division interns would suggest that students are learning the skills needed in the workplace prior to the completion of their degrees from Pepperdine.

Direct Evidence: Reflection papers

Kuh (2007) and O’Neill (2010) assert that the difference between a vocational experience and a true internship is that in an internship students reflect on their own experience in a way that integrates their classroom learning and their job site experiences. The most common way to achieve this is to have students write a reflection paper. Professors then assess the extent to which the student integrated their classroom learning with their internship experience, and whether the student felt they had improved their ability to think critically through the internship then use that paper.
Students completing an internship in the Communication Division provide both a diary and a reflection paper to the faculty. A rubric for evaluating the reflection papers was created several years ago. Frankly, it has been used sparingly as the requirements for a credit/no credit type of grade precluded the need for the use of the rubric as a grading tool. The rubric is reproduced below:

**The Internship Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Below expectation</th>
<th>Not even mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1: worksite expectations; interpersonal interactions</td>
<td>Detailed discussion of duties and workgroup interactions</td>
<td>Mentions duties and workgroup interactions</td>
<td>Vague reference to duties and working with others</td>
<td>Not even mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2: Values and ethics</td>
<td>Detailed reflection on an ethical dilemma faced or observed</td>
<td>Mentions the presence of some ethical issues observed at work</td>
<td>Vague reference to ethics and values in the workplace</td>
<td>No reflection on ethics or values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 3: critical thinking and problem solving</td>
<td>Detailed story about facing a problem and contributing to solving it.</td>
<td>Mentions some incident in which he/she needed to solve a problem</td>
<td>Vague reference to facing issues, but no details given</td>
<td>Doesn’t mention critical thinking or problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 4: integration of coursework to internship experiences</td>
<td>Reflects in a genuine manner on how classes enlightened understanding and skills</td>
<td>Mentions classwork as having some effect on internship experience</td>
<td>Vague reference to classes; maybe even that classes were useless</td>
<td>No integration about classes and the workplace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the sake of establishing a benchmark for future assessments of internships, the rubric was used during the February of 2012 by a group of four faculty who read and assessed 52 randomly selected two to four-page reflection papers submitted by students during the years of 2008-2011. The rubric and the results are reported below.
Direct Evidence of Student Learning: A Pilot Study’s Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectation</th>
<th>Not even mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1: worksite expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 (67%)</td>
<td>17 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2: Values &amp; ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
<td>13 (25%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
<td>17 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 3: Critical thinking, problem solving</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
<td>21 (40%)</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 4: integration with courses</td>
<td>11 (21%)</td>
<td>6 (11%)</td>
<td>18 (35%)</td>
<td>17 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 (34%)</td>
<td>57 (27%)</td>
<td>41 (19%)</td>
<td>42 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

This pilot test of applying a rubric to gauge student learning outcomes would, at first glance, indicate that the internship is a failure in meeting the main learning outcomes.

The data indicates:

* 60 percent did not adequately integrate ethics and values into their observations.
* One-third didn’t talk about problem solving or critical thinking
* Two-thirds did not see any integration of their internship with what they learned in their courses.

But this information is unaided reflections, devoid of any question prompts that might better direct students toward a consideration of the learning outcomes, even though those outcomes are stated on the syllabus and the student and the site supervisor work out several specific objectives that are then entered onto the internship sign-up form signed by the student and the site supervisor. In the future, the reflection papers will contain several prompts to encourage students to consider the learning outcomes of their experience.

A second issue that might explain the findings is that a training session was not held with the
faculty assessing the internship reflections. It was assumed that since the five faculty members had read previous internships with the rubric in mind that they would come to similar conclusions about what students had learned. Their answers show some dissimilarity in their “grading” of the reflection papers. In the future, a training session will be held to familiarize all faculty who are supervising internships.

Closing the Loop

While the evidence presented here indicates that the High Impact Practice of requiring internships is enhancing student learning, several improvements are needed:

1. The division needs to streamline the process of assessing the rich data provided by students in their reflection papers. The improvements needed on our part are providing students with prompts to help them better reflect on the integration of their course learning and their internship experiences. Also, our summer school grading rubric needs to be rewritten to reflect the changes in the prompt question.
2. The SLOs for the internship need to be modified to tie them more closely to the PLOs of each of the majors.
3. If possible, an e-portoflio system needs to be developed to allow students to post their reflection papers and any creations from the internship. This will cut down on the paperwork, improve faculty access to the reflection papers for assessment purposes, and give students the opportunity to feature their accomplishments to potential employers.
**HIGH IMPACT PRACTICES:**

**“CO-CURRICULAR” ASSESSMENT**

The weekly student newspaper, *Graphic*, first appeared on the Pepperdine campus in 1938, the inaugural year of George Pepperdine College. The paper has been published ever since, joined in more recent years by an online *Graphic, Currents* magazine (published once per semester) and, until 2008, the yearbook *Impressions*. In the late 1970s, an FCC-licensed radio station was added to the co-curricular mix, with a television station distributed through local cable following a few years later. The Pepperdine debate squad debuted in the 1980s and has consistently placed among the top 25 in a variety of national competitions.

While not specifically recognized as such in Kuh’s groundbreaking work on assessment of the co-curricular, these division-sponsored activities are High Impact Practices and are considered by incoming students and parents as a top reason for choosing to attend Pepperdine. Accrediting agencies and educational experts praise college and university programs that allow students to practice what they are learning. The visibility of these programs is consistently praised by alumni who were able to hone their job skills by applying classroom knowledge to the creation, production and management of newspapers, magazines, television talk and news programs, and a variety of radio programming. That is evident in their responses to the most recent alumni survey, the results of which are reported below. Students have also learned valuable logical reasoning and speaking skills through competing in debate programs around the nation. In deciding how to report on these activities, however, the division faced a dilemma: should the assessment reports be included in individual program reports most closely related to the co-curricular activity? Or should the entire co-curricular program be assessed separately. We decided during this cycle to assess the co-curricular separate from the programs they might be associated with. The reasons were:

1. The division wanted to analyze the co-curricular programs as a coherent whole to find similarities in the use of PLOs, rubrics, knowledge surveys, portfolios and other tools.
2. We also wanted to establish expectations and benchmarks.
3. Nearly one-third of the students involved in co-curricular activities offered by the Communication Division are not communication majors. Thus we felt it might be more instructive to assess the co-curricular as a program offered to students throughout the campus.
4. Isolating the Co-curricular assessment from the program assessment allows us to more easily focus on the benefits of the co-curricular to students and to be prepared to plead our case should the programs, which are comparatively expensive, be targeted for reprioritization in the future.

As the five-year assessment cycle began, faculty involved in the co-curricular debated what type of assessment tools to use. The co-curricular activities connected to the Communication Division require students to apply knowledge and skills gained in the classroom as they create newspapers, magazines, television programs and strategic debate messages. Students majoring in
journalism and media production are now required to take at least one unit of coursework involved in a student media outlet.

The co-curricular programs in journalism (print and broadcast) and media production (TV, narrative and sports broadcasting) tie to the curriculum through a series of practicum courses. The catalog describes the journalism courses (JOUR 251, Publications Production and JOUR 351 Advanced Publications Production) in the following way:

An independent study course designed to give the student a variety of journalism laboratory experiences, including special projects in newspaper, magazine, news bureau, photography and production activities (A student may accumulate a maximum of four units in this course.)

Prerequisite: Com 200 or consent of instructor. Cr/NC grading only.

The assessment process is muddied by the fact that each student is assigned a particular role—writer, editor, photographer, videographer, producer, on-air announcer, etc. Each student’s learning experience will be different; hence the need for differentiated learning outcomes. That is problematic. Portfolios and reflection papers represent the best opportunity to assess a student product. This report contains results of a pilot study aimed at determining if using student reflection papers is a valid way to assess student learning.

Graphic Assessment

JOUR 251/351

Fall 2011/Spring 2012

History of the Graphic:

The history of the award-winning Graphic is as long as the history of Pepperdine University itself. The first issue of the Graphic was published in the fall of 1937. In the past 75 years, it has become one of the oldest and longest-running student organizations at Pepperdine. The name “Graphic” was devised by the students on the staff and is based on the abbreviation of the college’s earliest name: GPC (George Pepperdine College).

During the Civil Rights era, Pepperdine (like most universities at the time) struggled some with integration and equality issues. Likewise, the school’s move from South L.A. to Malibu was exciting and challenging, redefining the school’s image and presence. The Graphic was valiant in recording these diverse eras of Pepperdine’s history and has become a noted source of historical information in Pepperdine’s history.

The Online Graphic was established in 1996. It has migrated through three URLs in its life span, and has (for the most part) been maintained largely through student web designers and
content managers. The website transitioned to the Graphic Online Daily in January of 2012, when it began to have daily featured content.

Students develop, edit and produce each edition of the Graphic; advisers use the newsroom throughout the process as a learning lab to help train reporters, editors, designers and photographers. The Graphic has always operated with a blended budget that contains some funds from the university and some from advertising revenue. Student editors, photographers and videographers have always been compensated for their work through merit-based scholarship awards. Student advertising representatives are compensated for their work through a blend of student employment wages and commission.

In November, the leadership staff of the Graphic created Pepperdine Graphic Media (PGM), a media group that links the branding of the newspaper, Currents Magazine, Graphic Online Daily and advertising supplements such as the Housing Guide and Senior Section.

Currently, more than 110 students work for PGM. This number includes reporters, editors, photographers, videographers, artists, designers and sales representatives.

**Awards & Affiliations:**

Since 1937, the Graphic has won more than 20 Pacemaker Awards, landing it into the Associated Collegiate Press Hall of Fame. Most recently, the Graphic won a Pacemaker in 2005. The Graphic is an active member of the following:

- Associated Collegiate Press
- College Media Advisers
- California College Media Association
- Society of Professional Journalists
- California Newspaper Publishers

Any Seaver student is invited to participate in the Graphic, Graphic Online Daily and Currents Magazine. Scholarships and editorial positions are awarded based on interviews (that include students and advisers) and past performance (if applicable). Freshmen and new transfers are eligible to apply for any position. Participating in the journalism major is not a requirement for involvement in the co-curricular, although journalism majors are recruited the summer before their freshman year. Students who are appointed to editorial positions and are enrolled in fewer than 18 units and more than 12 units are asked to enroll in either JOUR 251 or JOUR 351. Beginning this semester, everyone enrolled in JOUR 251/351 will be required to write a 2 to 3 page reflection paper and fill out an evaluative survey at the end of the semester.
Assessment:

In order to assess the Student Learning Outcomes, five articles from the fall 2011 semester were selected for evaluation. These articles all were published on A1 between August 29, 2011 and Nov. 17, 2011., and covered a diversity of news topics. The student reporters of the articles fall within the following classifications:

- Freshman: 1
- Sophomore: 1
- Junior: 1
- Seniors: 2

The news articles were evaluated by PGM advisers Director of Student Journalism Elizabeth Smith and Asst. Director of Student Journalism Courtenay Stallings. The outcomes for these evaluations are listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Sources (diversity, authority and ethical use of sources)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (grabs the readers attention, sets appropriate tone of the story)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure (logical, good use of transitions, appropriate placement of quotes and anecdotes, supports declarative)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Limitations:**

Our assessment of the co-curricular is in its formative stages. A more thorough evaluation of the journalism co-curricular is being planned. This will include professional evaluations of the publications and students’ reflections of the learning process over the course of the semester. Beginning in the fall of 2012, the assessment will expand to include Currents Magazine, Graphic Online Daily and the Advertising Department (which works with all publications). As mentioned previously, this will also include student reflections, and a student survey to evaluate the learning process. The area that needs the most improvement is the use of sources. Beginning in the fall semester, editors will be required to post their suggestions for sources on the published budget. Reporters will then be required to post sources they have interviewed, as they are reporting on the story. This process should give editors and advisers the opportunity to critique the diversity, authority and ethical use of sources as the story is being reported.

**Emotional intelligence assessment plans**

Another area of recent scholarship regarding the co-curricular involves measuring emotional intelligence, “a set of aptitudes and competencies that increase the personal and interpersonal effectiveness of individuals who have them and, through their interpersonal relationships, the effectiveness of others as well” (Feldmann, et. al., 18). Researchers claim that students scoring high in emotional intelligence are more likely to be successful than those who lack in emotional intelligence. According to Feldmann and others, “there is a long history of theory and research that have identified non-cognitive outcomes that are desirable and prepare students for careers and life beyond college.” Leaders at Blackburn College recently devised an assessment measure to determine the extent to which students in the co-curricular exhibit emotional intelligence. The assessment measure looks asks student advisers to rate students on areas of leadership, moral values and adaptability or self reliance. This assessment measure is appealing to Pepperdine because most students receiving credit for working on a Communication Division student medium are in leadership positions, assigning articles, editing stories, determining the line-
up of broadcast news pieces, directing and producing entertainment programming...all positions that involve leading and managing fellow students. Thus the Pepperdine co-curricular programs provide valuable training for future leaders, an important learning experience that should be assessed if possible.

**Characteristics of students involved in co-curricular activities**

An assessment of students was conducted by our three major co-curricular area faculty in 2010. Of the approximately 300 students involved in a journalism, media production or debate program that year:

- 39 percent were majoring in a subject other than communication
- 44 percent male
- 56 percent female
- 24 percent ethnic minorities

**Direct Assessment**

Several PLOs for the journalism (2, 3 and 4) and media production (2, 3 and 4) programs mention the importance of students learning to conduct research and excel in reporting, collaboration and creativity. Curiously, the PLOs for journalism and media production, areas that sponsor the majority of the division’s co-curricular activities, only obliquely mention leadership development. *The faculty teaching in those areas need to address this deficiency in the PLOs for their programs.*

Results of the co-curricular assessment forms of “emotional intelligence” filled out by faculty

**Indirect Results**

As noted elsewhere, in January of 2012, an alumni survey was sent to approximately 750 valid email addresses of students who graduated with a Communication degree during the past ten years. One-hundred completed surveys were received. Three questions on the survey related to the co-curricular experiences of the alumni.

The first question asked which co-curricular activities students were involved with. Respondents were allowed to indicate more than one activity. Eighty-five respondents said they were involved in 172 activities, a strong indication that many students worked on more than one student media product or television program. Of those 172 responses,

* 38.4 percent indicated involvement with printed or online periodicals (the Graphic, online Graphic, Currents or the yearbook).
* 19.2 percent worked on an entertainment television or radio program.
* 15.3 percent worked on NewsWaves, twice-weekly 30 minute broadcast news program.
*3.4 percent worked with the Public Relations Student Society of America (PRSSA), and
*4.7 percent served with the Ad Club.

**Satisfaction Levels** show strong student satisfaction with the co-curricular experiences, with 72.8 percent indicating satisfaction or strong satisfaction with their experience.

**Career experience**: Finally, 56.5 percent said their co-curricular experience prepared them “reasonably well” for their careers, while 33.9 said the experience prepared them “extremely well.”
Appendix 1:

Dorothy C. Andreas

Seaver College, Communication Division
Pepperdine University

24255 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90263-4211

310-506-4430
dorothy.andreas@pepperdine.edu

I. EDUCATION

Texas A&M University, Department of Communication
Ph.D., August 2010 (Dissertation title: Characterization, Coordination, and Legitimation of Risk in Cross-Disciplinary Situations)
Advisor: J. Kevin Barge; Committee: Charles Conrad, Tarla Rai Peterson, Barbara Sharf

Texas State University-San Marcos, Department of Communication Studies
M. A., 2005 and Certificate in Corporate Training and Development
Advisor: Mary Hoffman

Texas A&M University, Education and Human Development
B. S., 1999
II. EXPERIENCE

Pepperdine University
Seaver College, Communication Division
Assistant Professor: August 2010-present

Texas A&M University
Department of Communication
Graduate Teaching Assistant: January 2008-August 2010; August 2006-May 2008
Graduate Assistant for Media Worlds Conference: August 2007-May 2008

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
Communication Specialist: June 2008-May 2010

Texas State University-San Marcos
Department of Communication Studies
Graduate Teaching Assistant: August 2005-December 2005

III. RESEARCH ACTIVITY

A. REFEREED JOURNALS


**B. CHAPTER IN EDITED BOOK**


**C. COMPETITIVELY SELECTED CONFERENCE PAPERS**


D. COMPETITIVELY SELECTED PANEL SESSION


E. WHITE PAPER


F. INSTITUTES AND WORKSHOPS

Competitively selected participant for Institute for Integration of Research on Climate Change and Hazards in the Americas. Panama City, Panama. June 14-25, 2010. Co-organized by the Association of American Geographers (AAG), the PanAmerican Institute for Geography and History (PAIGH) of the Organization of American States, the US Geological Survey (USGS), the National Communication Association (NCA), and the United Nations Environment Programme Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNEP).


G. RESPONDENT TO PANEL

Taste and see that the Lord is good: exploring agrarian theologies. (2011, June). Respondent to this panel at Christian Scholars Conference, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.
The role of narrative in gender-role discussions. (2011, June). Respondent to this panel at Christian Scholars Conference, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.

H. WORKS IN PROGRESS

Andreas, D. Coordinating tensions in cross-disciplinary risk communication. Manuscript in preparation for *Journal of Applied Communication Research*.


Andreas, D. Intertwined voices on message boards during the nuclear crisis at the Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant. Manuscript in preparation for *Journal of Environmental Communication*.

Andreas, D., Myers, P., & Myers, K. Risk perception and media coverage of Fukushima accident: An application of cultivation theory to risk perception and risk stigma research. Content analysis underway. Target journal is *Risk Analysis*.

Andreas, D. & Roesler, S. Evolution of conflict frames at Malibu Lagoon. Manuscript in preparation for *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

Efficacy of narratives in global health public health communication. White paper in preparation for U. S. Centers for Disease Control, Center for Global Health.

I. OTHER PUBLICATIONS


J. FUNDING


2011-2012 Mini-grant for Assessment

2010 U.S. Senator Phil Gramm Doctoral Fellowship. $5000.

2009 Texas A&M College of Liberal Arts Dissertation Fellowship. $4000

Texas A&M Department of Communication, Dissertation Mini-grant. $800 to support dissertation.

IV. TEACHING

A. Pepperdine University--Courses

GSCO 199 – Communication Meltdown? Exploring the Challenges of Nuclear Discourse, Fall 2011
Instructor for one section (14 students) about nuclear communication in a special, Keck-funded, first-year seminar that introduce freshman to original research. 5 students from this class were awarded mini-grants to conduct independent research.

COM 518 – Advanced Organizational Communication, Fall 2011
Instructor for one section (11 students) about topics related to meaningful work and civility in the workplace.

COM 610 – Proseminar in Communication Theory, Spring 2011, Spring 2012
Instructor for one section (11 graduate students) about meta-theoretical approaches to communication theory.

COM 519 – Communication and Conflict, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012
Instructor for one section (17-25 students) about the role of communication in a variety of conflict situations.

COM 418 – Communication in Organizations, Spring 2011
Instructor for one section (19 students) about theories of organizational communication.

COM 180 – Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis, Fall 2010
Instructor for two sections (~20 students each) about presentation skills and analysis of speeches.

B. Pepperdine University—Advising Undergraduate Research


This paper was a product of a research project in COM 519, Fall 2011.
Summer Undergraduate Research Program (SURP)—Summer 2011

Advised and partnered with a senior student to conduct research about a local environmental conflict.

C. Pepperdine University—Graduate Advising

- Jennifer Lewallen. Member of thesis committee in Spring 2012
- Kimberly Wu. Chair of comprehensive exam committee in Spring 2012
- Emily Korenburg. Chair of comprehensive exam committee in Spring 2012
- Samantha Troup. Member of comprehensive exam committee in Spring 2011

D. Texas A&M University

COMM 320 – Organizational Communication, Fall 2009

Instructor for one section (~90 students) about theories of organizational communication.

MGMT 439 - Negotiations, Spring 2009, Spring 2010

Instructor for three sections (~25 students) about negotiation principles and skills with emphasis on case studies.

COMM 205 - Communication for the Technical Professions, Fall 2007 and Spring 2008

Instructor for one section per semester (~25 students) about presentation principles for technical subjects.

COMM 210 - Small Group Communication, Summer 2007

Instructor for two sections (~20 students each) about small group principles and problem-solving.

COMM 203 - Public Speaking, Fall 2006, Spring 2007

Instructor for two sections a semester (~25 students each) about presentation skills.

E. Texas State University—San Marcos
Introduction to Communication, Fall 2005

Teaching assistant for three recitation sections (“30 students) of a hybrid course.

F. Invited Guest Speaker


G. Public School Teaching

7th-8th Grade Reading, Gus Garcia Middle School, Edgewood ISD, Spring 2003
4th Grade Self Contained, French Elementary School, Beaumont ISD, Fall 2002
2nd Grade Self-Contained, Franklin Elementary, Port Arthur ISD, Fall 2001-Spring 2002

V. SERVICE

• Graduate Committee for Communication Division—Fall 2010-current (Seaver College, Pepperdine University)
• Teaching and Learning Committee for Seaver Committee—Fall 2011-current
• Participated in assessment for first-year seminar vocation essays (February, 2012)
• Participated in Pepperdine Center for Faith and Learning Reading Group for Uncommon Decency: Christian Civility in an Uncivil World (Spring 2012)
• Participated in Pepperdine Center for Faith and Learning Reading Group for Cultivating the Spirit: How College Can Enhance Students’ Inner Lives(Fall 2011)
• Reviewer and volunteer for Southern California Conference on Undergraduate Research (November, 2010)
• Participated in Pepperdine Center for Faith and Learning Reading Group for Finding Calcutta: What Mother Teresa Taught Me about Meaningful Work and Service (Fall 2010)
• Service Chair on Communication Graduate Student Association (Fall 2009-Spring 2010)
• Texas A&M Honor Council (2007-2008)
• Department representative on Graduate Student Council (Fall 2006; Spring 2008)
• Judge for poster presentations at Student Research Week (2007)
• ESL Conversation Partner through church international ministry (2007-2008)
• Academic mentor to 50 members of the Texas A&M Corps of Cadets (Aug 2006-present)

VI. AWARDS AND HONORS

• 2010 U.S. Senator Phil Gramm Doctoral Fellowship
• 2010 Tiffany Hunnicut Outstanding Graduate Student, Communication Department
• 2009 Texas A&M College of Liberal Arts Dissertation Fellowship
• 2009 Performance Award at US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
• 2008 Performance Award at US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
• 2nd Place Presentation Award for Texas A&M Student Research Week (2007)
• Outstanding Corps of Cadets Academic Mentor (2006-2007)

VII. PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

• National Communication Association
• Western States Communication Association
• Society of Risk Analysis

VIII. INTERCULTURAL EXPERIENCES

• Pan-American Studies Institute on Climate Change and Hazards, Panama City, Panama (June 2010)
• Study Abroad in Oxford, England (Summer 2005)
• Volunteer in Russia working with orphans (Summer 2002, November 2003)
CURRICULUM VITA

Robert (Bert) L. Ballard Personal Data

Office Address: Pepperdine University Communication Division CCB 259
Home Address: 24501 Mariposa Circle Malibu, CA 90265

Mobile Phone: 970-449-3510
email: bert.ballard@pepperdine.edu

Education

Ph.D. June 2008 - Department of Human Communication Studies, University of Denver.
Concentration: Rhetoric & Communication Ethics
Cognate: Intercultural Communication
Dissertation: An Ethnographic and Philosophical Investigation into Patrol Officers: Communication Ethics as Critical Work
Advisor: Dr. Roy Wood

Graduate Certificate in Theology (30 hours of graduate coursework) - May 2005 – Denver Seminary

M.S. December 1999 - Department of Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism, Colorado State University.
Thesis: The Influence of Colorado State Welcome Centers on Vacation Decision Making
Advisor: Dr. Glenn Haas
B.S.  May 1997  Department of Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism, Colorado State University (Magna cum laude)

Awards, Honors, Accomplishments

Special Recognition for Outstanding Teaching Performance. (2011). By Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Student Valedictorian 2010-11 for Significant Impact, University of Waterloo.


Professional Employment

Assistant Professor, Communication Division, Seaver College, Pepperdine University (California), 2011-present.

Associate Director, Communication, Leadership, and Social Innovation, University of Waterloo (Ontario), 2008-2011.

Assistant Professor, Department of Drama and Speech Communication, University of Waterloo (Ontario), 2008-2011.

Associate Chair, Department of Drama and Speech Communication, University of Waterloo (Ontario), 2009-2010.

Adjunct Faculty, Department of Human Communication Studies, University of Denver, 2007-2008.

Independent Research Consultant, independent and in cooperation with the Department of Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism, Colorado State University, 1999-2000.

Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism, Colorado State University, 1998-1999.

Research/Curriculum Assistant, Department of Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism, Colorado State University, 1998.

**Peer Reviewed Publications**


doi:10.1177/026540751038441


**Non-Peer Reviewed Publications**


Work in Progress


**Education Guides/Curriculum Publications**


**Creative/Artistic Works**


Film Advisor and Cast Member. (2006 to 2008). “Operation Babylift: The Lost Children of Vietnam,” Against the Grain Productions: Dallas, TX.

**Competitive Paper and Panel Presentations**


today’s adopted teen. Competitively accepted panel presentation at the annual meeting of The Adoption Initiative, New York, NY, October 24-25, 2008.

Ballard, R. L. (2008). Performing cop: Ethics and access during ethnographic field work. Paper accepted for presentation at the annual meeting of the Qualitative Inquiry Congress, Urbana-Champaign, IL. (Did not present due to scheduling conflicts.)


Invited Presentations

Ballard, B. L., & Ballard, S. J. (2013, February 13). Interracial friendship, courtship, and marriage: How do we make it work? (or do we?). Pepperdine University, Boone Center for the Family, Relationship Week 2012, Special Convocation Presentation.

Keynote speech.


**Chair, Respondent, or Organizer of Conference Panels**


Chair and organizer for panel. (2010, September). With J. Leineweaver & M. Harrigan.


Chair and organizer for panel. (2010, July). National pride, voice, and the children: Politics and communication in international adoptions. With K. Coates & C. Holroyd (University of Waterloo). Panel presentation to be given at the Third International Conference on Adoption Research, Leiden, The Netherlands. Due to personal emergencies of other panel members, the papers were not presented.

Chair. (2009, November). Considering ethics in newspapers and public discourse. Panel presentation at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.


Chair and organizer. (2009, November). Ethical journeys of stability and change: Teaching communication ethics to undergraduates. With George, A., Songa, K. Rabley, R. Ramakrishnan, & A. Velanoff (all of University of Waterloo), Communication Ethics Division. Panel presentation at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.


communication pedagogy. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Division. Panel presentation at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, San Diego, California.


Grants and Funding

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (Canada) Aid to Research Workshops and Conferences. Intercountry Adoption Summit. Awarded $31,000 in May 2010 for the inaugural Intercountry Adoption Summit 2010, Stratford, ON. I was member of program committee that wrote and administered the grant. Principal investigator was Dr. Ken Coates, University of Waterloo.

Canadian Federal Public Service/Canadian Food Inspection Agency. Public Service Leadership Development Initiative: A Course Guide for University Professors. Awarded $14,250 in September 2009 to be part of an interdisciplinary and inter-sector team that would develop a leadership oriented curriculum for Canadian professors and instructors, Ottawa, ON.

University of Waterloo / Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (Canada) Travel Grant. Awarded $421.01 on December 4, 2008 to present a paper at the 9th Annual National Communication Association, San Diego, CA.
Courses Taught

Pepperdine University

COM 220: Interpersonal Communication
COM 300: Research Methods (service-learning)
COM 513: Intercultural Communication
COM 590: Seminar in Communication: Family Communication
COM 640: Communication Ethics and Values (graduate)

University of Waterloo (ON)

SPCOM 100: Interpersonal Communication
SPCOM 227: Leadership (service-learning)
SPCOM 228: Public Communication
SPCOM 323: Speechwriting
SPCOM 325: Organizational Communication (service-learning)
SPCOM 490: Special Topics: Communication Ethics
SPCOM 491: Special Topics: Family Communication
SPCOM 491: Special Topics: Communication, Identity and the Professional Self
SPCOM 491: Independent Undergraduate Research Project

Communication Apprehension and Small Group Communication
Communication Ethics and Organizational Culture in “Me to We”

University of Denver

CREX 1212: Speaking Out: Ideas That Matter
CREX 1214: Speaking Out: World Affairs
CREX 1216: Speaking Out: Technical Discourse
HCOM 1550: Communication in the Workplace (service-learning)
HCOM 2130: Introduction to Organizational Communication
HCOM 3850: Communication Ethics (undergraduate and graduate)
HCOM 4930: Qualitative Research Methods (graduate)
SOCS 1210: Foundations of Communication (honors)

Colorado State University

RR 363/380: Outdoor Recreation and Event Programming (service-learning)

Courses Developed

Pepperdine University

COM 220: Interpersonal Communication (re-developed)
COM 300: Research Methods (re-developed)
COM 590: Seminar in Communication: Family Communication
COM 640: Communication Ethics and Values (graduate) (re-developed)

University of Waterloo

SPCOM 100: Interpersonal Communication (re-developed)
SPCOM 227: Leadership (co-developed)
SPCOM 228: Public Communication (re-developed)
SPCOM 323: Speechwriting (re-developed)
SPCOM 324: Small Group Communication (co-developed)
SPCOM 490: Special Topics: Communication Ethics
SPCOM 490: Special Topics: Family Communication
SPCOM 491: Special Topics: Communication, Identity and the Professional Self

University of Denver

HCOM 1550: Communication in the Workplace (re-developed)
HCOM Proposed: Teaching Communication to College Students (proposed)

Colorado State University

RR 363/380: Outdoor Recreation and Event Programming (service-learning)

Graduate Student Supervision/Committee Roles:


Undergraduate Thesis Supervision


Public and Academic Lectures
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Ballard, B., & Ballard, S. (2012, February 13). Interracial friendship, courtship, and marriage: How do we make it work? (or do we?). Public lecture presented as part of Relationship Week, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.


Ballard, R. L., Fallesen, M., & Nixon, K. (2011, January 21). Everything you always wanted to know about being adopted but were afraid to ask. Panel presentation to University of Waterloo and Waterloo, Ontario community.


Ballard, R. L., & Ballard, S. J. (2009, January 31). What does(n’t) it mean to be adopted? Presented to
University of Waterloo and Waterloo, Ontario community.


**Other Research Experience**


**Professional/Disciplinary Service**

2nd Vice Chair, Communication Ethics Division, National Communication Association, 2011-present.

Editorial Board Member, Journal of Family Communication, 2009 to present.


Family Communication Expert, National Communication Association, Family and Interpersonal Communication – Adoption, 2009 to present.


Co-chair, Intercountry Adoption Summit, (2010, September 23-26), Stratford, Ontario. Inaugural gathering of top 150 international government, NGOs, scholars, and researchers to discuss intercountry adoption at a global level. Produced first-ever comprehensive series of action steps related to intercountry adoption in world. Stratford, Ontario.


Planner/Coordinator, Communication Ethics Division planning meeting, National Communication Association, 2005.

**University/Departmental Service**

Coordinator, Interpersonal Communication major program, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 2011-present.

- Author of five-year review for interpersonal communication major, 2011-2012.
  Graduate committee, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 2011-present.

Leader, International Adoption Club Convo (small group to promote faith and spirituality building for undergraduate students; students earn credit). Spring 2012

Leader, Stories, Narratives, the Bible, and the Self Club Convo ((small group to promote faith and spirituality building for undergraduate students; students earn credit). Spring 2012

Department website design committee, Department of Drama and Speech Communication, University of Waterloo, 2011.

Performance Review and Evaluation Committee Member, Department of Drama and Speech Communication, University of Waterloo, 2011.

Faculty advisor, Speech Communication Ambassador Program, Department of Drama and Speech Communication, University of Waterloo (Ontario), 2009-2011.

Faculty advisor, Speech Communication Student Society, Department of Drama and Speech
Communication, University of Waterloo (Ontario), 2009-2011.

Arts Admissions 2011 Recruitment Flyer, Research Profile, University of Waterloo, Faculty of Arts, 2010-2011. Only faculty member from Faculty of Arts featured in the flyer.

Co-founder/organizer, University of Waterloo Network for the Advancement of Qualitative Inquiry and Innovation, 2009 to 2011.

Undergraduate Adviser, Department of Drama and Speech Communication, University of Waterloo, 2009-2010.


Arts Recruitment spotlighted faculty “I am Arts!,” University of Waterloo, Faculty of Arts, 2008-2009.

Representative, Graduate Students of the Four Faculties, University of Denver, 2004-2005.

**Community Service**

Regular and on-going contributor to: Adoption Today, Children’s Bridge (adoption agency), Pact (adoption support), EMK Press Newsletter (adoption resource), China Connections, and Chicken Soup for the Adopted Soul. (On-going). 14 publications in past 3 years.

Member, Joint Council on International Children’s Services Grievance Board. (December 2009 to present). Joint Council on International Children’s Services, Washington, DC.


Speaker/Trainer. (2007 to 2008). “On being an international adoptee.” Adoption Alliance (adoption agency), Denver, CO.


Board of Directors.


**Professional Affiliations**

National Communication Association

North American Levinas Society

The Religious Communication Association

Alliance for the Study of Adoption
KELI L. FINNERTY-MYERS

GENERAL INFO

Business Address:

Center for Communication and Business
Pepperdine University
24255 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90263
(310) 506-6806
keli.myers@pepperdine.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D. University of Arizona – Communication. 2007.

Emphases: Mass communication theory, media effects.

Minor: Family Studies and Human Development.

Dissertation: Risky sexual intercourse on entertainment television: Comparing audience responses to different types of negative consequence portrayals.


Thesis: The relationship between fundamental motivations of young adults and their levels of parasocial interaction with reality television contestants.

Minor: Biblical Studies.

Universidad de Granada, España, 2000

Universidad Nacional Evangélica de la República Dominicana, 1998

RESEARCH

Journal Publications


**Manuscripts Under Review**


Rosenkrans, G., & Myers, K. (under review). *Targeted mobile advertising effectiveness.*

Rosenkrans, G., & Myers, K. (under review). *Optimizing online and print advertising media through local newspapers.*

Rosenkrans, G. and Myers, K. (under review). *Contextual relevancy effectiveness of online ads.*

**Conference Papers**


the International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada.


**TEACHING EXPERIENCE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy and Effects of Mass Communication</th>
<th>Public Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Statistics</td>
<td>Introduction to Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Communication Research Methods</td>
<td>Communication Internships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Communication Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vita

JUANIE N. WALKER

Communication Division
Pepperdine University
Malibu, California 90263
(310) 506-4036
E-mail: Juanie.Walker@pepperdine.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D.
Communication Arts & Sciences Department, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California. August 1994.

Major Area: Organizational Communication
Minor Areas: Small Group Research & Qualitative Research Methods

Dissertation: "Negotiated Control in Total Quality Management Teams: An Ethnography at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory;" Chair Dr. Patricia Riley, Dr. Michael Cody, and Dr. Elaine Draper.

Vice President, Communication Graduate Student Association, University of Southern California, 1993-1994.

M. A.
Communication Division, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California. April 1987.

Major Area: Organizational Communication

Thesis: "Roles of Communication Managers in Los Angeles Area Organizations: A Qualitative Field Study of Self-Perceptions;" Chair Dr. Dwayne VanRheenen, Dr. Fred Casmir, Dr. Warren Jones.

B. A.
Communication Division, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California. December 1984.

Major: Advertising and Journalism


ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Communication Division, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California

Associate Professor, 2001 to present.
Assistant Professor, 1994 to 2001.
Visiting Professor, Florence, Italy, Summer 2005.
Academic Advisor for Organizational Communication and Interpersonal Communication majors.
Courses taught.

M.A. program: master's thesis, qualitative communication research methods, organizational communication; directed studies in communication for master’s and undergraduate students (Chaos Theory, Gender in Organizational Communication, Computer-Mediated Communication)

B.A. program: communication ethics, organizational communication analysis, training and development, communication in organizations, communication in industries senior seminar, interpersonal communication, small group communication, public speaking and rhetorical analysis, first-year seminar (What’s your Story?: Discerning, Writing & Understanding Vocational Narrative., communication internship, Selected Studies (Emotional Management at Work), Seminar in Communication (Communication in Industries).

**Communication Arts & Sciences Department, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California**

Assistant Lecturer, Communication 1991 - 1994. public speaking, interpersonal communication, nonverbal communication, persuasion, small group communication, business and professional communication, organizational communication.

Teaching Assistant, 1994; persuasion course.

Teaching Assistant, Masters of Business Administration Program, Business School, Fall 1992; management communication course.

**PUBLICATIONS**


**CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS**


“Discerning the Right Calling.” Calling for a Change: Realizing the Communicative Power of

The Built to Change Missional Challenge for Built to Last Congregations Panelist, Christian Scholars Conference, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, June 2011.


Paradoxical Thinking in Transformational Organizations, Organizer and Chair, Panel for Organizational Communication Interest Group, Western States Communication Association, Monterey, CA, February 18 – 22, 2011.

The Diversity of Diversity—Representing Identity in Higher Education, Organizer and Chair Southern California Conference for Undergraduate Research (SCCUR), Pepperdine University, November 2010.


Introduction, Service Learning at Habitat for Humanity: Social Action in the Field, the Classroom, and the Construction Site, Organizational Communication and Instruction interest groups, Western States Communication Association Convention, Seattle, WA, February 20, 2007.

Introduction, Communicating Hope in Community Organizations and Service Learning, Organizational Communication Division, Western States Communication Association


“Telling and Interpreting our Stories: Theological Vocational Narratives as Enacted Calling,” Making Connections, Pepperdine University Faculty Conference, Malibu, California, October 2004.


“Reflections on participatory research about paradoxes at a Christian University,” Engaging the Culture: Spirituality and Communication Scholarship, National Communication Association Convention, Seattle, WA, November 2000.


"Exploring a Dialogic Model of Self-Directed Learning: Negotiated Order in Classroom Teams,"
Western States Communication Association Convention, Monterey, California, February 1997.


"Exploring a Postmodern Approach to Democratic Organizational Dialogue," Pepperdine University Annual Faculty Conference, Los Angeles, California, February 1996.


"How Politically Correct are College Students?: Factors and Predictors of Political Correctness in


INVITED LECTURES & DISCUSSIONS


Mission & Heritage Series: Purpose & Diversity at Pepperdine, invited panelist, Pepperdine University, October 19, 2011.

Calling or Career: How has the Pepperdine Voyage Project Changed Us? Panelist, Pepperdine University Faculty Conference, Malibu. CA, October 8, 2010.


“Thinking Vocationally: Breaking through Decision Paralysis and Malaise,”


“Ethnographic Research Methods: Team Analysis and a Narrative Study,” field research methods course for doctoral students, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, November 1997.

"Exploring a Postmodern Approach to Democratic Dialogue in Organizations," leadership course for educational doctorate students, Graduate School of Education and Psychology, Pepperdine University, Culver City, CA, May 1996.

"Summary of Organizational Team Research: Theoretical and Empirical Review," small group communication course for doctoral students, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, April 1996.

"Principles and Techniques in Conducting Ethnographic Observations," religious rhetoric senior seminar, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, February 1996.


Ethnicity and gender panel, Pepperdine University annual faculty conference, Long Beach, California, March 1995 (discussion leader and participant).
"Critical Theory and Postmodernism in Organizational Communication," organizational communication master's course, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, September, 1994.


"Ethnography of Team Consent Processes & Participatory Communication at an Engineering Research Lab," class lecture and department presentation at California State University, Los Angeles, CA, January, 1994.


"Ethnography of Team Consent Processes & Participatory Communication at an Engineering Research Lab," department presentation at the University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama, January, 1994.

**CURRENT RESEARCH**

Development of measure of Paradoxical Thinking in collaboration with Dr. Amy Ingram, Clemson University, South Carolina.

Paradoxes and Pedagogy, manuscript in progress for a theoretical book.

Christian Calling as Vocation, ongoing study with critical-case sampling of narratives of Pepperdine alumni, students, and faculty about vocation; submit manuscript to Christian higher education pedagogy journal.
SUPervision of Student Research

Communication Division Master’s Student Research


Assessment and training of paradoxical thinking of organizational managers (with undergraduate organizational communication students), in collaboration with Pepperdine University School of Business and Management, Spring 2012.

Adviser, master of science in communication comprehensive exam committee, Caroline Clavin, Fall 2010.


Member, thesis committee, Lauren Dieckmann, “How can Individuals be Influenced to adopt Exercise Behavior and how can they be Persuaded to Exercise Consistently?”, Spring 2007.

Analyses and service learning regarding stories and the meaning of home at the Ventura County Chapter of Habitat for Humanity, Fall 2006.
Analyses and service learning of hope and paradox (with undergraduate students) at New Horizons habilitation center for retarded citizens, North Hills, Fall 2005.

Assessment of communication ethics (with undergraduate students) among faculty and staff in Communication Division, Fall 2004.

Focus groups with communication alumni regarding vocational discernment, Spring 2004.

Research with Dr. Tim Warden, partner, Integrity Assessments, testing of Work Attitudes Questionnaire, Fall 2004.

Academic poster sessions (with undergraduate organizational communication students) presenting results of their research dealing with meaning of work and vocation, Pepperdine University, March 17, 2004.

Pepperdine Voyage Grant (with undergraduate organizational communication students), organizational vision for Standing on Stone ministries, Malibu, CA, Spring 2003.

Analyses and service learning regarding meaning of work and vocation as spiritual calling for non-profit organizations and corporations, Fall 2002.


Faculty Sponsor, “Surviving Graduate School,” panel of returning and alumni graduate students speaking to new graduate students, November 1997.


**Undergraduate Research/Service-Learning Projects/Community Engagement**

Training to increase worker satisfaction with communication and management and use of mental models, United Cerebral Palsy, Westlake Village, Spring 2012.

Analyses and service learning of worker satisfaction with communication and alignment of management work practices with organizational mission, United Cerebral Palsy, Westlake Village, Fall 2011.

Assessment of diversity at Pepperdine for Office of Assessment; and research with transformational, not-for-profit organizations (Standing on Stone Ministries, Union Rescue Mission, Westside Pregnancy Clinic, and Twelve Step organizations), Fall 2010.

Training and development for paradoxical thinking about diversity at Pepperdine University and in transformational nonprofit organizations.

Assessment of organizational communication major, Communication Division, Fall 2007.

Focus group research with alumni, Fall 2007.

Event planning and training and development for Comm Connection and the Ventura County Chapter of Habitat for Humanity house dedication, Spring 2007.

Group dialogues with communication alumni about vocation, Spring 2007, Fall 2006.

Focus group research with alumni, Communication and Vocation, Communication Division
Homecoming Program, February 17, 2006.

Service learning of analysis of hope and paradox at the Westside Pregnancy Resource Center, Santa Monica; Fall 2005.

Assessment of social responsibility at Patagonia, Green Home, and Starbucks, Fall 2004.

Focus groups with communication alumni regarding vocational discernment, Spring 2004.


Focus groups with communication alumni regarding vocational discernment, Fall 2003.

Analyses of meaning of work and vocation as spiritual calling for non-profit organizations and corporations, Fall 2002.

Analyses and service learning and training and development for the Ventura Chapter of the American Red Cross, 2000 - 2001.

Analyses and service learning and training and development for at Habitat for Humanity, Ventura; Union Rescue Mission, Los Angeles; National School Safety Center, Woodland Hills; Software.Com, Santa Barbara; Protocol Placement Services, Los Angeles; Drive Design graphic design company, Los Angeles; Stiletto Entertainment, Los Angeles; Futurestep Candidate Services Department, Sherman Oaks; Southern California Association of Governments, San Fernando Valley, 1999-2000.

Analyses of communication at Dae Woo Van Nuys, Boeing Rocketdyne, American Airlines, Disney, and a financial services company, 1998-1999.

Analyses of communication at for Camp Titan for underprivileged children, City of Malibu City Council, Diamante Christian Record Distributor, Newport Beach Fire and Marine Department, and Organizational Diversity at Seaver College, 1996-1997.


Analyses of communication for Malibu Yogurt, Webster Elementary School, and West Valley Food Pantry, 1995 - 1996.

Analyses of communication for Camp Congo indoor and outdoor children’s camp, Malibu Night ‘N’ Day answering service, National School Safety Center (NSSC), and Johnny’s Pizza, 1994-1995.
CONFERENCES

Academic Conferences

Christian Scholars Conference, Lipscomb University, Nashville, TN, June 7-9, 2012.


Christian Scholars Conference, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, June 2011.

Western States Communication Convention, Monterey, CA, February 18 – 22, 2011.

Christian apologetics series, Living Oaks Community Church, Fall 2010, Spring 2010, and Fall 2009.

Southern California Conference for Undergraduate Research (SCCUR), Pepperdine University, November 2010.

Western States Communication Convention, Phoenix, AZ, February 2009.

National Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL, November 2007.


Interdisciplinary Conversation about Story and Vocation, Comm Connection: Character, Calling, and Careers Conference 2007, February 14, 2007.

Western States Communication Association Convention, Palm Springs, CA, February 2006.

Faith, Hope & Work Conference, Pt. Loma Nazarene University, San Diego, CA, February 9, 2006.

Interdisciplinary Conversation about Hope and Vocation, Comm Connection: Character, Calling, and Careers Conference 2006, February 8, 2006.

Interdisciplinary Faculty Conversation about Vocation and the Liberal Arts, Comm Connection: Character, Calling, and Careers conference, March 17, 2004.


The Fourth Annual Conversation on the Liberal Arts, Vocation, Vocationalism, and the
Liberal Arts, Institute for the Liberal Arts, Westmont College Santa Barbara, California, February 6-7, 2004.


Western States Communication Association Convention, Salt Lake City, UT, February 2003

Western States Communication Association Convention, Long Beach, CA, February 2002.


Western States Communication Association Convention, Monterey, California, February 1997.

Speech Communication Association Convention, San Diego, California, November 1996.


Organizational Communication Conference, Austin, Texas, February 1996.
Western States Communication Association Convention, Pasadena, California, February 1996.


Western States Communication Association Convention, Portland, Oregon, February 1995.


Western States Communication Association Convention, San Jose, California, February 1994.

**Faculty Development Workshops**

Reading Group, Center for Faith and Learning, *Uncommon Decency*, Mouw, January 2012.

St. Johns Bible research and design, December 2011.

Reading Group, Center for Faith and Learning, faith and art: *Refractions*, Fujimura, November 2011.

Seminar, Center for Faith and Learning, narrative and theology, Contino and Highfield, August 2011.

WASC Assessment Outcome Workshop, August 2011.
Service Learning/Community Involvement Conference, Pepperdine University, May 2011.

Reading Group, Student Affairs Office, diversity in higher education, Smith, Spring 2011.

Spiritual Formation Conference, Student Affairs Office, March 2011.

Office of Institutional Research, Report on Retention Discussion, Fall 2010.

Reading Group, Center for Faith and Learning, *A Princess Found*, Culberson, Fall 2010.

Reading Group, Center for Faith and Learning, Jacob and Rhonda Jacobsen’s *American University in a Post-secular Age*, Spring 2010.

Imagining Christ in Art, Center for Faith and Learning, June 2009.

Reading Group, Center for Faith and Learning, *Can God be Trusted*, Stackhouse, Spring 2009.

Reading Group, Center for Faith and Learning, *Left to Tell*, Ilibagiza, Fall 2008.


*The Passionate Intellect*, Faith and Learning Faculty Conference, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, May 2007.
Pre- and Post- Theater Performance Discussion Group, *As it is in Heaven*, Fall 2006.

Faith, Hope & Work Conference, Pt. Loma Nazarene University, San Diego, CA, February 9, 2006.

Vocation Leadership Conference, Center for Faith and Learning, August 1 – 5, 2005.


Virtues in the University, School for Business and Management, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, May 2004.


The Fourth Annual Conversation on the Liberal Arts, Vocation, Vocationalism, and the Liberal Arts, Institute for the Liberal Arts, Westmont College Santa Barbara, California,

Vocation Leadership Conference, Center for Faith and Learning, August 1 – 5, 2005.

Virtue and Vocation, Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Center for Faith and Learning, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, May 2003.

A Narratable World: The Theological Implications of Story, National Conference Funded by the Lilly Endowment, Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, WA, November 2003.

Gender Reconciliation, Christians for Biblical Equality, Convention, Los Angeles, April 2002.

Leading Congregational Change: Managing Disputes that Arise in Ministry, Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution, Pepperdine University School of Law, Malibu, California, July, 2001.

Interdisciplinary faculty discussion group about issues of diversity in teaching and the profession, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, 1997 to 2000.

Faith and Learning Workshop, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, May 1999.


Service Learning Faculty Seminar, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, May 1997.

Interdisciplinary faculty research support group, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, 1996 to present.

The Future of Democracy at/in/for/beyond Work, Organizational Communication Division
Preconference Workshop, Speech Communication Association Convention, San Diego, California, November 1996.


Young Scholars Workshop, Pepperdine University, July 1995.


Teaching Portfolio Faculty Development, Pepperdine University, 1994-1995.


Pepperdine New Faculty Workshop, Pepperdine University, August 1994.

Pepperdine University annual off-campus Faculty Conference.

Seaver College annual on-campus Faculty Conference.

The Graduate Lecture Series of Seaver College off-campus speakers, Pepperdine University, periodic participation.

**Academic Professional Membership**

International Communication Association, 1990 to present.
National Communication Association, 1990 to present.

Religious Communication Association, National Communication Association Affiliate Organization, 1999 to present.

Western States Communication Association, 1990 to present.


International Association of Business Communicators (Educational Affiliation), 1995.

**SERVICE**

**Communication Division**

Mentor to new faculty, ongoing.

Principle Investigator, Organizational Communication major assessment, 2007 to present.

Organizer, Organizational Communication Alumni focus group discussion, March 2012.

Search Committee, Organizational Communication faculty member, 2009 – 2010.

Helped revise organizational communication curriculum, Spring 2008.


Strategic Planning review committee, Fall 2006.


Host, Alumni Symposium and Panel on Vocation and luncheon, Communication Division
Homecoming Program, February 17, 2006.

Faculty Sponsor, Pepperdine Communication Association (PCA) and Comm Connection student scholarship, 2005 - 2006.


Faculty Sponsor, Pepperdine Communication Association (PCA), Organizational Communication Major Reception, April 2004; Alumni Panel Discussion of Careers in Organizational Communication, December 2004.

Devotional Leader, Communication Division Faculty Retreat, various years.

Participant, Communication Division Faculty Retreat, 2004 to present.


Member, Graduate Committee, Communication Division, 2003 - 2004.

Member, Image and Identity Committee, Communication Division, 2003 - 2004.

Appointed Member, Communication Division Chair Search Committee, 2002-2003.

Member, Search Committee for Advertising and Public Relations tenure-track positions, 2002-2003.
Member, New Building Grand Opening Faculty Committee, 2001-2002.


Committee member for master’s comprehensive written and oral exams, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 1995 to present.

Committee member for master’s thesis mini-defenses, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 1995 to 2005.

Peer reviewer for faculty Rank, Tenure, and Promotion evaluations, 1995 to present.

Participant, Communication Division Program Review Faculty Retreat, May 2004.


Chair, Strategic Review Committee, human communication majors, 1996-1997.
Member, organizational communication faculty search committee, 1996-1997.

Rank, Tenure, & Promotion Divisional Candidate Meetings, 1996.

Member, committees to restructure graduate and undergraduate curricula, 1995-1997.

Member, rhetoric and debate coach search committee, 1994-1995.

Member, vision committee, 1994-1995.

**Student Activities:**

Orientation for students and parents in first-year seminar, Summer 2006 to present.

Faculty Sponsor, tour of Museum of Tolerance, Los Angeles, CA, 2008 to present.

Group Discussion Leader, Spiritual Discernment Retreat, Phillip Kenneson (speaker), Westlake Village, CA, March 31 – April 1, 2006.

Faculty Sponsor, Pepperdine Communication Association (PCA) for Human Communication Majors, 1996 to 2006; Organizational Communication Major Reception, April 2004; Alumni Panel Discussion of Careers in Organizational Communication, December 2004.

Faculty Sponsor, Student-Alumni Organizational Communication Informational Interviews Project, Spring 1998.

Adviser for Communication Division Master’s Program new student orientation, Fall 1997.

*Host, Organizational Communication Major Graduation Recognition Reception, 1996 to present.*

Mentor, Graduate Student Mentorship Program, 1996-1997.

Adviser for undergraduate organizational communication majors: curriculum planning, registration, career preparation.

Internship advisor for undergraduate organizational communication majors.

Advise undergraduate and graduate students regarding graduate school admission and write letters of recommendation.

**Seaver College**

Member, Diversity Council, 2011 to present.

Faculty Participant, Sophomore Retreat, Catalina Island, November 2011.

Prayer Leader, Celebration of Diversity for Seaver College Graduates, April 2011.

Co-Faculty Scheduler for Humanities, Southern California Conference for Undergraduate Research (SCCUR), Pepperdine University, November 2010.

Member, Seaver Faculty Association, Professional Problems Committee, 2010 to present.
Member, Credits Committee, 2009 – 2010.

Member, Academic Integrity Committee, 2008 – 2010.

Member, International Program Council, 2005 to 2008.

Proposed plan for assessing spiritual and personal learning in international programs.

Member, Committee on the Family, 2006 – 2007.

Co-adviser with Dr. Regan Schaffer, Habitat for Humanity house dedication, Oxnard, CA, March 31, 2007.


Presentation, representative for academic-related grants, Pepperdine University Voyage Grant report to Lilly Endowment Program Coordinator for Programs for the Theological Exploration of Vocation Kimberlee Maphis Early, February 2005.

Mentor, Faculty Mentor Program, Center for Teaching and Learning, 2003 – 2004; 1998 - 1999

Member, Academic Development Committee, 2002-2003.

Member, Ethics Committee, 1998 - 2000.


Interim Communication Division Representative, Faculty Executive Committee, Fall 1996.

Member, Rank, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, 1995-1996.

Faculty Judge, Career Center annual student resume contest, 1995-1996.

Speech Judge, chemistry course, Natural Science Division, 1995-1996.

**Pepperdine University**

Member, Search Committee, Assistant/Associate Provost, Pepperdine University, Spring – Summer 2011 to present.

Consulting Pepperdine University Diversity Office on using paradoxical thinking to reframe diversity at Pepperdine, Fall 2010 to present.

Participant, WASC Visit Faculty Discussion about Gender, Fall 2010.


Program Moderator and Planning Committee Member, “An Inclusive Culture,” Management Diversity Conference, June 1996. Helped plan, prepare proposal for funding, and served as program moderator for conference.


**Professional Service**


Assistance in co-sponsoring guest speaker Professor Linda Putnam from University of Santa Barbara with Business Division, Spring 2008.

Invited Panel Chair, An Organizational Communication Research Sampler, Organizational Communication Division, Western States Communication Association Convention in Palm Springs, Feb. 21, 2006.

Paper Reader, Organizational Communication Division, Western States Communication Association Convention, Organizational Communication Division, Western States Communication Association Convention in Palm Springs, Feb. 18 - 21, 2006.

Paper Reader, Organizational Communication Division, Western States Communication Association
Convention, Salt Lake City, Utah, February 2003.


Organizational Communication Interest Group, National Communication Association, Nomination for Secretary, 1999.

External Collegial Reviewer, John S. Seiter, Department of Language, Philosophy & Speech, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1998.


Member, new member welcoming committee, Organizational Communication Division, International Communication Association, 1994-1996.


**Community Service**
See Service Learning in Research with Master’s and Undergraduate Students, including Standing
on Stone Ministries, United Cerebral Palsy, Westside Pregnancy Center, Ventura County Habitat for
Humanity, New Horizons.

Volunteer, Standing on Stone Ministries for people in transition, Malibu, California, ongoing.

Volunteer, Sports Camp Outreach for underprivileged elementary school children, Oaks
Christian School, Westlake Village, California, March 2011.

Volunteer, Action Christmas Shoppe and Community Outreach, Ventura County, California,
2010 to present.

Volunteer, Lighthouse for Women and Children, Union Rescue Mission, Oxnard, California,
2010.


Participant, Living Oaks Community Church community events, 2007 to present.


Small group discussion leader, Women’s Retreat, Christian Church of Thousand Oaks, Santa
Barbara, California, March 17 – 19, 2007.


Women’s Tea Table Host, Christian Church of Thousand Oaks, Thousand Oaks, California, 2005 to present, October 2005.

Volunteer, 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> grade class, Wednesday nights, Christian Church of Thousand Oaks, Thousand Oaks, California, 2005 to 2007.


Volunteer, provide emergency meals to individual families, prepare food for annual Bethlehem Marketplace mission fundraiser, prepare communion, Christian Church of Thousand Oaks, 2003 to 2007.


Member, Children’s Ministry Team, Malibu Presbyterian Church, 2000.

Deaconess, Malibu Presbyterian Church, 1997 - 1998.

Small Group Bible Study Leadership Team, Malibu Presbyterian Church, 1997 - 1998.
Leader, New Members’ Orientation, Malibu Presbyterian Church, 1997.

Member, Marriage Retreat Planning Committee, Malibu Presbyterian Church, 1997.

Co-leader, Young Marrieds Bible Study Group, Malibu Presbyterian Church, 1997-1998.

Member, Women in Ministry, Pepperdine University, 1997.


Small Group Discussion Leader, Young Adults Class, Woodland Hills Church of Christ, 1994-1995.


Member, Finance Committee and Publicity Committee, Woodland Hills Church of Christ, 1992-1993.

RECOGNITION & AWARDS


Grant recipient, Development of Measure of Paradoxical Thinking, Pepperdine University Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) and the Advancement of Student Learning (ASLC), 2011-2012.

Grant recipient, Center for Faith and Learning and Intercultural Affairs Office, student field trip to Museum of Tolerance, Los Angeles, CA, Fall 2008 to present.
Faculty sponsor, student research awards sponsored by Center for Teaching Excellence, academic dean’s and provost’s offices to present research, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Academic Resource Conference, February 2012; Western States Communication Association Convention, February 2011 and 2006.

Voyage grant recipient, graduate student assistant for Comm Connection:


Grant recipient, Comm Connection, Center for Faith and Learning, 2006 – 2007.


Faculty recipient, service-learning classroom grant, Center for Teaching Excellence, Fall 2006.

Pepperdine University Teaching Excellence finalist and nominee, numerous years.

Who’s Who in Social Science Higher Education, multiple years.

Faculty Sponsor, Student-led Pepperdine Voyage Grant, organizational vision for Standing on Stone ministries, Malibu, CA, Spring 2003.


Pi Beta Phi Sorority, Outstanding Teacher's Recognition Award, 1999.


Outstanding Young Women of America, Outstanding Young Americans, 1997.


Research assistant support, costs underwritten for one master's student to work as a research assistant for pedagogical and organization teamwork, 1995-1996.

Reassigned time for Spring 1995, "Pragmatic-Critical Perspective of Employee Involvement Teams as Sites for Negotiated Control," manuscript development.


Correctness in Classroom Communication."

Graduate Student Fellowship, Women in Communications, Los Angeles Chapter, 1985; and Publicity Club of Los Angeles, 1985.

**OTHER EMPLOYMENT**

Foundations and Special Communications Department, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, 1987 - 1990

  - Assistant Director, May 1989 - August 1990
  - Acting Director, December 1988 - April 1990
  - Grant Writer, October 1987 - December 1988

Bateman Eichler, Hill Richards, Inc., Los Angeles, California, February - October 1987

  - Publications Coordinator at regional investment headquarters

American Newspaper Markets, Malibu, California, May - August 1985

  - Research and Production Manager, *Circulation*.

Intern, Hughes Aircraft, Canoga Park; and Free Arts Clinic, Malibu, 1985.
MILTON J. SHATZER, PH.D.

OFFICE ADDRESS:                                   HOME ADDRESS:

Communication Division                           24560 Via de Casa
Seaver College                                    Malibu, CA 90265
Pepperdine University
24255 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90263
(310) 506-4294
Fax: (310) 506-3083

Email: Milt.Shatzer@pepperdine.edu

EDUCATION:

1987    Ph.D.    Communication    Michigan State University

Dissertation:  *A Comparison of Japanese and North American Compliance-Gaining Styles* (Chair: Dr. Judee K. Burgoon)

1976    M.Miss.    Missiology    Abilene Christian University
1970  B.S.  Biology  University of Toledo

HONORS:

Golden Key National Honor Society, Faculty Inductee, 1996.

Tyler Teacher Award Nominee, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, 1996


Member of Phi Kappa Phi National Honor Society (inducted with 4.0 graduate GPA, Michigan State University Chapter), 1982.

Graduated from Abilene Christian University with 4.0 graduate GPA, 1976.

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS:

Professor, Communication Division, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, 1997 - present. Promoted to Full Professor, Level III (highest ranking at Professor level), 2009.

Visiting Faculty, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Heidelberg, Germany, Fall 2005 – Spring 2006
Interim Assistant Dean for Teaching, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Fall 2003–Spring 2004

Interim Director, Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Fall 2003-Spring, 2004

Interim Chairperson, Diversity Council, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Fall 2003 – Spring 2004

Chairperson, Communication Division, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, 1997-2003.

Interim Chairperson, Communication Division, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, 1996-7.

Awarded tenure as Associate Professor, Communication Division, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, 1995

Associate Professor, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 1990

Assistant Professor, Department of Telecommunications, University of Kentucky; 1986 to 1990

Visiting Professor, Department of Telecommunications, University of Kentucky; 1984-1985

Graduate teaching assistant, Department of Communication, Michigan State University; 1981 - 1984

Instructor of Technical and Scientific English, Technion University, Haifa, Israel (Nazareth Extension), 1979 - 1980

**COURSES TAUGHT AT PEPPERDINE:**

International Studies Senior Seminar (INTS 597)
Media Worldwide (COM 506)
International Communication and Negotiation (COM/INTS 514)
Communication Quantitative Research Methods (graduate) (COM 620)
Media Impact and U.S. Minorities (COM 512)
First-year Seminar (topics: (1) "Becoming a Traveler on the Information Superhighway," and (2) “Search for Peace in the Middle East”) (GSCO 199)
Communication and Planned Social Change (Diffusion of Innovations) (COM 590)
Philosophy and Effects of Mass Communication (MSCO 560)
Intercultural Communication: Case Studies (COM 515)
Intercultural Communication (COM 513)
Introduction to Communication Research (undergraduate) (COM 300)
Introduction to Mass Communication (MSCO 200)
Introduction to Sociology (Heidelberg, Germany [2005-6]; Tokyo, Japan [1992]) (SOC 200)

REFEREED PUBLICATIONS:


NON-REFEREED ARTICLES:


REFEREED CONVENTION PAPERS:


Shatzer, M. J. (1990, March). *The Effects of International News Exposure on Knowledge, Stereotype, and Social Distance: How influential are the media?* Presented at the annual meeting of the Broadcast Education Association, Atlanta, GA.


**NON-REFEREED CONVENTION PAPERS:**


**INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIA:**


**PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS (non-refereed):**


Presentation entitled “Using the World Wide Web and Netscape” presented to Young Scholars Conference, Pepperdine University, June, 1995

Presentation entitled “Using the Internet” presented to Pepperdine Librarians, Pepperdine University, December, 1994

Presentation entitled “Ministering to the culturally diverse campus” presented at the 1994 National Campus Ministries Seminar, Pepperdine University, August, 1994

**GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS:**

Advanced Irvine Workshop on Cultural Diversity, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, August, 1999
Teaching Scholars Workshop, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Summer, 1996

Multimedia Development Grant, Educational Technology, Seaver College, Summer, 1994

Christian Worldview Seminar, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Summer, 1993

Summer Faculty Research Fellowship, Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, University of Kentucky, 1989

RESEARCH INTERESTS:

The influence of study abroad programs on college undergraduates, Intercultural/international communications, social effects of telecommunications, the use of telecommunication technologies in development, and societal impact of new telecommunications technologies

CURRENT GRADUATE COMMITTEE SERVICE AT PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY:

John Osborne, Melissa Macaskill

PAST GRADUATE COMMITTEE SERVICE AT PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY: (Date in parenthesis indicates year student graduated.)


PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:

Textbook Reviewer for Intercultural Communication for Our Global Community, (1st Ed.), Thompson


Manuscript Reviewer for *Journal of Communication*, 1991

Nominated for Secretary of Intercultural and Development Division of the International Communication Association, Fall, 1994

Conference Paper Reviewer, Broadcast Education Association (BEA), New Technologies Division, Winter, 1993

Chair, Nomination Committee of Intercultural and Development Division, International Communication Association, 1989-1990

**UNIVERSITY SERVICE:**
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Visiting Faculty, Pepperdine University’s International Programs, Florence, Italy, Spring 2012.


Peer Reviewer for Dr. Sarah Stone Watt (3 year pre-tenure review), Spring, 2011.

Peer Reviewer for Dr. Steven Lemley (5-year evaluation of tenured faculty), Spring 2011.

Peer Reviewer for Dr. Keli Finnerty Myers (3 year pre-tenure review), Spring, 2010.

Member, Academic Affairs Committee, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, 2010 – present.

Peer Reviewer for Dr. Donald L. Shores (5-year evaluation of tenured faculty), Spring 2009.

Peer Reviewer for Dr. Kara Gould (3-year pre-tenure review), Spring 2009

Member, Search Committee for Faculty Positions in International Studies (Middle Eastern Studies and Jewish Studies), 2008-2009

Member, Council for International Studies, Seaver College, 2006-present

Member, Faculty Development Committee, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Fall 2006 – Spring 2007

Mentor, Seaver College New Faculty Mentors Program, Pepperdine University, Fall 2006 – Spring 2007

Visiting Faculty, Pepperdine University’s International Programs, Heidelberg, Germany, Fall 2005 – Spring 2006.

Planner, First Annual “Celebrate Teaching Day,” Seaver College, February 18, 2004
Member, Provost’s Committee for Teaching Excellence to select Howard A. White Outstanding Teaching Award, Spring, 2004

Interim Assistant Dean for Teaching, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Fall 2003 – Spring 2004

Interim Chairperson, Seaver College Diversity Council, Fall 2003 – Spring 2004

Mentor, Seaver College New Faculty Mentors Program, Pepperdine University, Fall 2001 – Spring 2002.

Planner, Center for Communication and Building New Building Dedication, Spring, 2002

Speaker, Seaver Board of Visitors Luncheon, Pepperdine University, September 26, 2002

Respondent, Graduate Student Research Colloquium, November 6, 2001

Member, Task Force to Explore On-Line Course Evaluations, Spring 2001

Participant in Seaver College Writing Across the Curriculum Workshop, Fall 2000 – Spring 2001

Member, Search Committee for Associate Dean of Research, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Fall 2001

Member, Search Committee for Seaver College Dean of Students, Pepperdine University, Fall 2001

WASC Task Force on Institutional Integrity, Pepperdine University, 1999.

Co-facilitator, Teaching Scholars Workshop, Seaver College, Summer 1997

Chairperson, Communication Division, Seaver College, 1997- 2003
Interim Chairperson, Communication Division, Seaver College, 1996-7

Rank, Tenure and Promotion Committee, Seaver College, Non-tenured member, 1994-5

Chair, Graduate Committee, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 1991-6

Member, Ad Hoc Human Subjects Committee, Seaver College, Spring, 1994 to present

Member, Seaver Graduate Advisory Council, Seaver College, 1992-6

Assisted Dr. William B. Phillips in conducting a workshop for faculty preparing to serve abroad in Pepperdine’s International Programs, Summer, 1992

Member, Special Faculty Task Force on Student Centered and Value Centered Education at Pepperdine University, Spring, 1991

COMMUNITY SERVICE:

Elder, University Church of Christ, Malibu, CA, 2001-2011.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

“COURSES Upgrade Informational Session – New Features,” Technology Workshop for Faculty, Pepperdine University, August 17, 2011.

“Enhancing Course-Based Assessment for Outcomes-Based Program Review,” Assessment Workshop, Pepperdine University, August 11, 2011.

iPad Workshop for Faculty, Malibu Campus, Pepperdine University, June 21, 2011.
Christian Scholars Conference, Pepperdine University, June, 2011.


Christian Scholars Conference, Lipscomb University, June, 2010.

Christian Scholars Conference, Lipscomb University, June, 2009.

Faculty Seminar on the Teaching of Writing, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, led by Theresa Flynn, May 14, 2009.

Faculty Seminar on using the Grade Center in Blackboard, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, led by Gerry Flynn, Spring, 2009.

Faculty Seminar on TurniTIn (in Blackboard), Seaver College, Pepperdine University, led by Alan Regan, Spring, 2009.

Annual Conference of the National Communication Association, San Diego, CA, November, 2008

Christian Scholars Conference, Lipscomb University, June, 2008.

“Recommendation Letters that Win”: A Faculty Workshop, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, January 24, 2007

“The War on Terrorism: Examining the Role of Congress, the President, and the Courts,” Pepperdine University School of Law, January 19, 2007
Monthly Lectures by Visiting Scholars, German American Institute (DAI), Heidelberg, Germany, 2005 – 2006

“Excel Grade Books,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, July 13-14, 2004

“Social Action and Justice in Los Angeles: Issues Involving Race, Class and Ethnicity in the Los Angeles Area,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, July 8-9, 2004

“Microsoft Outlook in Depth,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, July 6-7, 2004

“Proposal Development and Grant Administration,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 24-25, 2004

“Safe Computing: ‘Protect Your Stuff!’ & ‘Recovering from Disaster!’”, Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 17-18, 2004

“Everything You Wanted to Know About the RT&P Process but Were Afraid to Ask,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 14-15, 2004

“Creating Positive Learning Environments for your Students: Strategies for Teaching from the Psychology of Learning,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 10, 2004

“Blackboard 6.0 for Experienced Blackboard Users,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 7-8, 2004

“Blackboard 6.0 for Beginners,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 3-4, 2004
“Teaching for Different Learning Styles,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 1-2, 2004

“Developing and Maintaining a Personal Website,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, May 27-28, 2004

“Communicating with PowerPoint,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, May 24-25, 2004

“Using Library Electronic Resources Effectively,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, May 19-20, 2004

Annual Conference of the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NV, April, 2004

Equal Opportunity Conference & Staff Enrichment Day, Pepperdine University, Malibu Campus, March 24, 2004

Lilly Conference on College & University Teaching - West, Pomona, CA, March 19-20, 2004

“General Education and Assessment: Generating Commitment, Value, and Evidence,” Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U), Long Beach, CA, March 4-6, 2004

“Reinventing Peacemaking in the Middle East, Challenges & Prospects,” Seaver College, Pepperdine University, February 9, 2004


Annual Conference of the National Communication Association, Miami Beach, November, 2003
“Publish and Flourish: Write Well and Revise Rapidly,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, July 9, 2003


“Effective Advising,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, July 2, 2003

“Effective Use of Digital Photography in the Classroom,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 12 & 13, 2003

“Digital Portfolio Assessment Project 2003 – Assessing Faith and Learning Opportunities in Seaver College’s Curriculum and Climate,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 9, 10 & 11, 2003

“Pepperdine’s International Programs,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, June 4 & 5, 2003

“Junior Writing Portfolio,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, May 16, 2003

“Making Time for Good Teaching,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, May 15, 2003

Cultural Diversity Workshop, Tabatha Jones and Jaye Smith facilitators, Pepperdine University, Malibu Campus, May 5-9, 2003

“Service Learning,” Summer Faculty Development Workshop, Pepperdine University, April 28-29, 2003
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Diversity Council Retreat, Serra Retreat, Malibu, CA, April 21-22, 2003

Advising Workshop, Don Shores, facilitator, Pepperdine University, Malibu Campus, February, 2002

Presentation to Crest Associates Regarding Communication Programs and New Building, Pepperdine University, September, 2002

Conducting Effective Classroom Observations to Enhance Teaching, Barbara J. Mills facilitator, Pepperdine University, Malibu Campus, July, 2001


Equal Opportunity Conference, Pepperdine University, June 22, 2001

Getting Credit for What You Do: Making Your Teaching Count from Teaching Project to Course Portfolio to the Scholarship of Teaching, Laurie Richlin facilitator, Pepperdine University, Westlake Village Campus, June, 2001


Annual Conference of the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NV, April, 2001

Writing Across the Curriculum workshop, Pepperdine University, Lee Ann Carroll facilitator, Fall 2000 – Spring 2001

Annual Conference of the National Communication Association, Seattle, WA, November, 2000
AAHE 2000 Conference on Higher Education: Diversity and Learning, Anaheim, CA, March 29 – April 2, 2000

Irvine Foundation Luncheon, AAHE 2000 Conference on Higher Education, Anaheim, CA, April 1, 2000

Annual Conference of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL, November, 1999

Advanced Irvine Grant Cultural Diversity Workshop, Curricular Transformation Institute, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, August 11 – 17, 1999

Irvine Cultural Diversity Workshop, Pepperdine University, Malibu Campus, June, 1999

King’s College Course-Embedded Assessment Institute, Wilkes-Barre, PA, April 22-24, 1999

Annual Conference of the National Communication Association, New York, NY, November, 1998


Annual Conference of the National Communication Association (formerly Speech Communication Association), Chicago, IL, November, 1997

Annual Meeting, World Missions Workshop, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, October, 1997

Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Montreal, CANADA, May, 1997

Annual Conference of the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NV, April, 1996

Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL, May, 1996

Annual Conference of the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NV, April, 1995

Annual Meeting, World Missions Workshop, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX, October, 1995

Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Albuquerque, NM, May, 1995

Annual Conference of the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NV, April, 1995

Odyssey Teaching Workshop, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA; May 1994

Digital World Expo, Los Angeles Convention Center, Los Angeles, CA; June, 1994

Annual Conference of the Broadcast Education Association, Los Vegas, NV, April, 1993


Annual Conference of the Broadcast Education Association, Los Vegas, NV, April, 1992

Conference on Classroom Assessment, held by Thomas Angelo, Seaver College, May, 1991
Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL, May, 1991

Conference on Bibliographic Instruction, University of Redlands, Redlands, CA; March, 1991

Conference on Space Imagery in Newsgathering and Dissemination, Lexington, KY; February, 1989

Conference of Associated Information Managers, Boston, MA; April, 1986

Conference of Associated Information Managers, Washington, DC; May, 1987

Conference on Social Influence and Persuasion, Lexington, KY; April, 1986

Conference on Ethics in Journalism, Lexington, KY; Spring, 1985

Conference on Communication, Mass Media, and Development, Chicago, IL; October, 1983

Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Boston, MA, May, 1982

**PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:**

International Communication Association

National Communication Association

Broadcast Education Association (past member)

Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research, Internationale (past member)
Society for International Development (past member)

CONSULTING:


Research statistical analysis consultant, Quammen Marketing Service, Lexington, KY; Summer, 1989.

PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE:

Interim Associate Dean for Teaching, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, 2003-2004

Interim Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, 2003-2004

Chairperson, Communication Division, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, 1996-2003

Superintendent, Galilee Christian High School, A'ilaboun, Israel. Directed 17 members of faculty and staff and over 225 student enrollment. Fall 1976 - Spring 1980
Josh House
1692 Tiburon Ct.
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
(760) 429-5335
JLHouse22@gmail.com

EDUCATION

M.A., California State University Long Beach December 2010
Major Area: Rhetorical Theory and Criticism, G.P.A. 4.0

B.A., Purdue University May 2007
Major: Religious Studies
Minor: Sociology

TEACHING

Pepperdine University
• Designed and implemented activities, lectures, assignments, and exams.

• Designed and implemented activities, lectures, assignments, and exams.

- Designed and implemented activities, lectures, assignments, and exams.

**Southern New Hampshire University**

COMM 212: Public Speaking  

- Taught online for College of Online and Continuing Education. Lead students on discussion boards, graded speeches and assignments submitted electronically.

**California State University Long Beach**

COMM 131: Essentials of Argumentation  
Jan. 2011-May 2011

- Taught lab section on parliamentary debate, designed and facilitated activities.

COMM 411: Communication in Conflict Resolution  
Jan. 2011-May 2011

- Graded final papers

COMM 300: Survey of Rhetorical Theory  
Jan. 2011-May 2011

- Graded weekly reading responses, maintained attendance log, proctored exams, helped students with group projects, assisted with logistics

COMM 131: Essentials of Argumentation  
Aug. 2010-Dec. 2010

- Designed and implemented activities, lectures, assignments, and exams.

COMM 132: Small Group Discussion  
Aug. 2010-Dec. 2010

- Designed and implemented activities, lectures, assignments, and exams.

COMM 110: Interpersonal Communication  
Aug 2009-May 2010

- Taught lab section, facilitated activities, and proctored exams.

COMM 439: Communication & Popular Culture  
• Handled online wiki, assisted during lectures and with grading of final projects, Guest Lecture on Television.

COMM 130: Essentials of Public Speaking August 2007-May 2008

• Taught lab section, facilitated speeches and activities, and proctored exams.


• Coached parliamentary debate, coordinated travel to tournaments, tabulated debate results at the Jack Howe high school tournament.

SCHOLARSHIP

Publications


Conference Presentations


SERVICE

UAW 4123 Vice President Region 4 June 2010-Dec. 2010

• Represented the local at UAW National Constitutional Convention, performed membership outreach.

Lecturer/Lab Leader: Southern California Debate Cooperative August 2009-Aug 2010

• Designed and coordinated activities, oversaw research, lectured, and coached debate.

UAW 4123 Trustee and Bargaining Team Member January 2008-Dec. 2008

• Performed semi-annual financial audit of local, kept records and constructed negotiating strategy during bargaining with the University.

• Coached parliamentary debate, judged on behalf of the University.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

National Parliamentary Debate Association

National Communication Association

Western States Communication Association
Kimberly Stoltzfus
911 Lincoln Blvd, #5
Santa Monica, CA 90403
(805) 259-5818
kastoltzfus@yahoo.com
kimberly.stoltzfus@pepperdine.edu

EDUCATION

• Ph.D. (defense: 2012), Dept of Communication, University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) Technology and Society Emphasis, first graduate student to achieve at UCSB

Areas: Organizational Communication, Innovation and Change, Public Administration

Dissertation: Who really matters: Stakeholder paradoxes and inter-organizational information sharing change

Chair: Dr. Cynthia Stohl

Committee: Dr. David R. Seibold, Dr. Ron Rice, Dr. Bruce Bimber

• M.A., 1998, Communication, Washington State University, Edward R. Murrow School of Communication
Thesis: Reasons for non-use of the Internet: Psychological factors versus cost & access issues

• B.A., 1995, News Writing, Washington State University, Edward R. Murrow School of Communication
Minors in Political Science and History

Thesis Committee Member for:
Megan Farmer (Pepperdine University)
Theresa Fiddler (Pepperdine University)
AWARDS AND HONORS

Academic

- Top Four Paper at WSCA for a study introducing a stakeholder analysis methodology., 2012
- Co-author of paper named one of the top 50 accessed articles of MCQ, 2011
- Invitation to the Junior Faculty Conference on Industry Studies funded by the Sloan Foundation, 2011
- Graduate Division Dissertation Fellowship, 2009
- Invitation to be Grad Fellow with The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 2008-2009
- Communication Department Nomination for Outstanding Teaching Assistant at UCSB, 2009
- UCSB Dean's Fellowship, 2007-2008
- Technology and Society Emphasis, first graduate student to achieve at UCSB, 2008
- NSF-funded graduate research fellowship, Center for Nanotechnology in Society, 2006-2008
- NSF presentation on bridging social science with physical science research, 2007
- Outstanding Educator, UCSB, Gamma Phi Beta Annual Awards, 2005

Career

- Project Team Leader Award, Department of Homeland Security Modernization Project, 2004
- Compass Award (manager nominated), IRS Integrated Financial Systems Project, 2003
- Haas Foundation Scholarship for Outstanding Senior in Communication, 1995
- Kay Wight Scholarship for Outstanding Junior in News Broadcasting, 1994

RESEARCH

Research Fellowships/Grants/Stipends

- Graduate Division Dissertation Fellowship ($8,000)
- NSF-funded fellowship, UCSB Center for Nanotechnology in Society 2006 & 2007 ($25,000 granted/year)
- 2007-08 UCSB Dean’s Fellowship ($15,000)
- 2008 UCSB Dissertation Research Grant ($2,000 – max amount)

Refereed Journal Publications


**Book Chapter**


**National Report Contributor**


**Other Publication**


**Conferences**


**Tartu, Estonia.**


Myers, K., Stoltzfus, K., Jahn, J., & Gailliard, B. (2008, November). *Exploring girls’ and women’s propensity to study and enter careers in STEM disciplines: Vocational anticipatory socialization and communication research opportunities.* Paper to be presented at the National Communication Association (NCA) Annual Convention, San Diego, CA.


**Conference Roles**

667


**TEACHING**

**Visiting Instructor, Pepperdine University, Communication Division**

*August 2009 – present*

- Communication Research Methods – Com 300
- Message Creation and Effects – Com 301
- Introduction to Public Speaking – SPE 180
- Introduction to Organizational Communication – Com 418

**Teaching Associate**

**Instructor of Record, University of California, Santa Barbara**

- Strategic Communication and Organizational Change (Summer 2008)

**Teaching Assistantships**

**University of California, Santa Barbara (doctoral program)**

- Electronic Media Policy (Spring 2009)
  - Micro and Macro-Organizational Communication (Winter 2009)
  - Micro and Macro-Organizational Communication (Fall 2008)
  - Nonverbal Communication (Fall 2005)
  - Micro-Organizational Communication (Summer 2005)
  - Communication Theory (Spring 2005)
  - Introduction to Communication (Winter 2005)
  - Introduction to Communication (Fall 2004)

**Washington State University (master’s program)**

- New Communication Technology (grader) (Fall 1997 and Spring 1998)
- Quantitative Methods (Fall 1997 and Spring 1998)
- Introduction to Public Speaking (Fall 1996 and Spring 1997)
Teaching Certification

Completed Summer Teaching Institute for Associates (STIA)

Selected Guest Lectureships


Topic: “A Look Back at Internet History to Understand Internet Policy Today”

Media Policy Course, UCSB, May 2009

Topic: “Organizational Change and Innovation: Theories and Applications”

California State University, Northridge, 2007

Topic: "Nanotechnology: What It Is and What It Means For You"

Laguna High School Senior Assembly, Santa Barbara, 2007

Topic: “Broader Impacts of Nanotechnology: Diffusion and Ethics”

National Nanotechnology Infrastructure Network (NNIN), National Convocation, 2007

Topic: “A Day in the Life of a Graduate Student: How to Prepare and What to Expect”

Internships in Nanosystems Science, Engineering, and Technology (INSET), 2007

Topic: “Deciding on Graduate School: The Value, the Challenges, and the Considerations”

Lambda Pi Eta Communication Honor Society meeting, UCSB, 2007

Topic: “Digital Government Attributes and Visions”

The Technology and Society Seminar Series, UCSB, 2005

Topic: “Using Remote Response Devices in the University Classroom”

Department of Communication colloquium, UCSB, 2005

Topic: “Making the Most of Your Internship”

U.S. Department of State intern colloquium, Washington, DC, 2001 and 2002

Peer Reviews

- Reviewer for book manuscript on e-government for MIT Press & Cambridge University Press
• Reviewer for Communications of the Association of Computing Machinery (CACM)
• Reviewer for NCA 2009, 201, 2012 conference submissions, communication and technology area
• Reviewer for ICA 2008 conference submissions, communication and technology area
• Reviewer for Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS) 2010, 2011 submissions

Student Mentorship

• Selected among graduate student applications to mentor research for UCSB’s Summer Mentorship Program
• Nanosystems Science, Engineering, and Technology (INSET) research internship mentor
• Center for Nanotechnology in Society research internship mentor

SERVICE

Academic Organizational Service

• Representative, UCSB Career Services Committee, 2008-2009
• Docent, Nano Days at UCSB Center for NanoScience Institute, April 2008
• Representative, UCSB Major Events Committee, 2006-2007
• Event Planning Committee Santa Barbara Forum on Digital Transitions, Spring 2006

Community Service

• Several Running Events for Charity throughout California – 2004-present
• Various Pepperdine Volunteer Opportunities – New Student Mugging, First Fridays
• Violinist, Community Church Ensemble, Santa Barbara, 2007-2009
• Cheerleading coach, Santa Barbara Youth Football League, Santa Barbara, Summer-Fall 2006
• Junior high leadership team; Prison Fellowship team, Calvary Chapel, Santa Barbara, 2005
• Violinist, National Institute of Health (NIH) Community Orchestra, Bethesda, MD, 2003
• Teacher, People Without Borders, Washington, DC, 2003
• Violinist, Washington Symphony Community Orchestra, Washington, DC, 2001-2002
• Computer Trainer, Byte Back, Washington, DC, 2001

SELECT INDUSTRY EXPERIENCE

Senior Consultant
BearingPoint, Inc.

July 2002 – July 2004
Washington, DC

• Led the development and deployment of client communication strategy for modernizing the IRS
• Co-produced the overall training strategy and organizational change performance metrics strategy for the Department of Homeland Security’s Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Modernization
Provided guidance, analysis, writing, and editing support for campaign strategy for Government of Qatar (Middle East) Public Services e-government program

**Consultant**

**Technology Automation and Management, Inc.**

August 1999 – June 2002

**Washington, DC**

- Provided strategic communications support to the executive management of a multi-billion dollar, multi-year technology and business transformation program in government
- Coached various project teams on best approach to communicating change within the IRS

**Technology Policy Program Analyst**

Nov. 1998 - July 1999

**U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Technology Policy**

- Member of team that conducted town hall meetings between government, industry and academia regarding information technology workforce and regional economic issues
- Member of a team to plan and execute the Vice Presidential Summit on the Workforce of the 21st Century
- Analyzed results of research data as a contributor to a Commerce report on the IT workforce

**Internet and E-Commerce Training Specialist**

Summer 1998

**Palouse Economic Development Council**

- Traveled to rural areas across the Pacific Northwest to train small and medium-sized business owners, local government agencies, and non-profit organizations in web-based communication

**Pullman, WA**
Curriculum Vitae

Dr. John M. Jones

Professor
Blanche E. Seaver Professor
Communication Division
Pepperdine University
24255 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90263

Office: (310)-317-7522
Fax: (310)-456-3083

E-mail: John.Jones@pepperdine.edu

Emphases: Public Address, Political Communication, and Rhetorical Criticism

I. Educational Background

A. Post-Secondary Education

Doctor of Philosophy in Communication Studies, University of Kansas, 1999.

Master of Arts in Religion, Harding University Graduate School of Religion, 1998.
Master of Arts in Communication Studies, University of Kansas, 1996.

Bachelor of Science in Economics, With Honors, Southeast Missouri State University, 1987.

B. Honors and Awards

Blanche E. Seaver Professorship of Communication (August, 2011 to present).


Communication Division Award for Outstanding Teaching, Fall, 2008.

Sabbatical Leave, Pepperdine University, Fall, 2006.

Seaver Fellowship, Pepperdine University.

Alpha Kappa Psi Outstanding Senior in Economics, Southeast Missouri State University, 1987.

II. Professional Experience
Professor of Communication  
Pepperdine University  
August 2011 to present

Associate Professor of Communication  
Pepperdine University  
August 2005 to August 2011

Assistant Professor of Communication  
Pepperdine University  
August 1999 to August 2005

Instructor  
University of Missouri at Kansas City  
January 1998 to July 1999

Graduate Teaching Assistant  
University of Kansas  
August 1996 to May 1999

Minister, Southside Church of Christ  
Lawrence, KS  
August 1991 to August 1996

Minister, Church of Christ  
Clarksdale, MS  
June 1990 to August 1991

III. Academic and Professional Service

Seaver College Faculty President-Elect/President/Past President, Pepperdine University, August, 2007-2010.
Basic Speech Course Director, Pepperdine University, 2007-2011.

Reviewer for Sage Publications, ongoing.

Reviewer for Texas A&M Press, ongoing.

Reviewer for Presidential Studies Quarterly, ongoing.

Reviewer for Rhetoric and Public Affairs, ongoing.

Reviewer for Quarterly Journal of Speech, ongoing.

Reviewer for National Communication Association Political Communication Division, 2008-present.

Reviewer for National Communication Association Public Address Division, 2006.

Member, Academic Integrity Committee, 2010-present.

Member, Seaver Research Council, 2011-present.

Member, Divisional Graduate Admissions Committee, 2002-2005, 2007-present.

Faculty Sponsor, College Republicans, Pepperdine University, 2001-2007.
Faculty Sponsor, Public Relations Student Society of America, Pepperdine University, 2005-2006.

Member, Student Disciplinary Committee, Pepperdine University, July 2004-present.

Member, Admissions/Scholarships Committee, Pepperdine University, August 2004-2007.

Member, Professional Problems Committee, Pepperdine University, April 2002-2006.

Member, Faculty/Staff Scholarship Committee, Pepperdine University, January, 2001-2002.

Member, Faculty Development Committee, Pepperdine University, August, 2000-2002.

Library Liaison for Communication Division, Pepperdine University, August, 2000-2005.

Assistant to Dr. Diana Carlin, Acting Department Chair, University of Kansas August 1997 to May 1998.

Reviewer for National Communication Association Political Division, ongoing.

Graduate Student Representative to the Faculty, Communication Studies Department, University of Kansas, 1998.

IV. Undergraduate and Graduate Courses
A. Undergraduate and Graduate Courses

COM 630 Qualitative Research Methods, Pepperdine University.

SPE/COM 587 Rhetorical Theory, Pepperdine University.

COM 581 Contemporary Voices of Leadership, Pepperdine University.

COM 513 Intercultural Communication, Pepperdine University.

COM 400 Communication Ethics, Pepperdine University.

COM 301 Message Creation and Effects, Pepperdine University.

COM 220 Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication, Pepperdine University.

COM 200 Communication Theory, Pepperdine University.

GSCO 199 First-year Seminar on Rhetoric and Social Influence, Pepperdine University.

GSCO 199 First-year Seminar on the Life and Public Rhetoric of Ronald Reagan, Pepperdine University.

SPE/COM 180 Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis, Pepperdine University.

COMS 315 Fundamentals of Writing for the Media, University of Missouri, Kansas City.

COMS 110 Fundamentals of Effective Speaking and Listening, University of Missouri, Kansas City.

COMS 130 Speaker-Audience Communication, University of Kansas.
COMS 235 Rhetoric and Social Influence, University of Kansas (discussion leader).

COMS 603 Seminar in Presidential Rhetoric: Ronald Reagan, University of Kansas, (developed and co-taught this undergraduate/graduate course with Dr. Ellen Reid Gold).

V. Publications and Presentations

A. Books


B. Articles


C. Book Chapters


D. Book Reviews


E. Other Publications.


F. Presentations


“Reagan at Moscow State University: A Study of Value Appeals and Identification,” paper to be presented at the National Communication Association Convention in Boston,


Panelist for Discussion on “Rhetorical Criticism at the Crossroads,” at the Central States Communication Association Convention in Omaha, April, 2003.


“Perception or Reality: Do NCA Papers Ignore Republican and Conservative Voices?” paper presented to the National Communication Association Convention in New York City, November 1998 with Diana Carlin.


“When Terror Strikes: A Study of Recent Presidential Responses to Terrorist Attacks,”

G. Work in Progress


*Ronald Reagan and the Rhetoric of Restoration* (Book-length project on Reagan’s pre-presidential discourse).

*Reagan at Moscow State University* (Book-length project on Reagan’s trip to Moscow in May, 1988, including an analysis of his speeches from the Moscow trip).


H. Invited Lectures


VI. Other Research
A. Doctoral Dissertation


B. Master’s Thesis


VII. Professional Associations

A. National Communication Association

B. Western States Communication Association

C. Southern Communication Association

D. Central States Communication Association

E. Center for the Study of the Presidency

F. International Society for the History of Rhetoric

G. Rhetoric Society of America

H. Kenneth Burke Society

I. Western Political Science Association

J. American Political Science Association
VIII. Advising

A. M.A. Advisees


Tom Durham, in progress.


Ms. Thompson is completing her Ph.D. in Communication Studies at the University of Texas.

Donald Waisanen, “Clinton and Bush in the Comic Frame: A Rhetorical Analysis of
Dr. Waisanen completed his Ph.D. in Communication at the University of Southern California and is an Assistant Professor of Communication at Baruch College in New York.

B. Thesis Committee Member

Sue Lowrie (Communication—graduated 2002)
Anthony King (Communication—graduated 2002)
Greg Daum (Religion and Communication—graduated 2002)
Stacey Gallarde (Communication—graduated 2010)
Jackie Alvarez (Communication—graduated 2010)
Gavin Humes (Communication, in progress)
Kelly Bishop (Communication, in progress)

C. Undergraduate Advising

Over 80 undergraduate students have been advised, 1999-present.

Over twenty undergraduate Independent Study projects have been directed, 1999-present.
Teresa M. de los Santos

Curriculum Vitae

Department of Communication
943 14th Street, Unit 3

Social Sciences and Media Studies - 4114
Santa Monica, CA 90403

University of California
(310) 633-3609
tdelossantos@umail.ucsb.edu

Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4020

EDUCATION

In Progress
Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Expected 2012
Emphasis – Media Communication

Dissertation Committee: Dr. Robin L. Nabi (Chair/Advisor)
Dr. W. James Potter
Dr. Miriam Metzger

2006 - 2008
M.A. in Communication, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA
Emphasis – Mass Mediated Communication

1997 - 2001
B.A. in Broadcast Journalism, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA
Concentration – Political Science

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Mass media effects and the role of emotion in processing media messages with a focus on framing; news content and channels of news dissemination; and underrepresented groups
RESEARCH

Book Chapter:

Nabi, So, & de los Santos (2011). Tracing the course of research on reality TV. In E. Scharrer (Ed.), *Media effects/media psychology*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Conference Papers and Presentations:


Articles in Preparation:


AWARDS & HONORS

2010 National Science Foundation Research Support Grant ($460.00)

2009-2010 National Science Foundation Grant, National SBES Alliances,
Advanced Odum Institute for Research in Social Science
Statistical Workshop, UNC-Chapel Hill

2008 – 2009 National Science Foundation Grant, National SBES Alliances,
Beginning/Intermediate Odum Institute for Research in Social
Science Statistical Workshop, UNC-Chapel Hill

2008 – 2009 National Science Foundation Summer Research Grant, Diversity
Initiative for Graduate Study in the Social Sciences (UC DIGSS)

2006 – 2008 Broadcast News Assistantship Scholarship, Pepperdine University

2004 Emmy, Best Hour Long Newscast, National Academy of
Television Arts & Sciences, Pacific Southwest Chapter

2001 Most Outstanding Graduate Award, Communication Division
Pepperdine University

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Winter 2012 Teaching Assistant, Communication and Emotion, UCSB, Department of
Communication

Spring 2012 Adjunct Professor of Communication Research Methods, Pepperdine
University, Communication Division

Fall 2011 Adjunct Professor of Communication Research Methods and Business
and Professional Communication, Pepperdine University, Communication Division

Fall 2011 Teaching Assistant, Persuasion, UCSB, Department of Communication

Summer 2011 Teaching Assistant, Intro to Communication Theory, UCSB,
Department of Communication
Spring 2011  Teaching Assistant, Media and the Individual, UCSB, Department of Communication

Winter 2011  Teaching Assistant, Media and Social Influence, UCSB, Department of Communication

Fall 2010  Adjunct Professor of Communication Research Methods and Business and Professional Communication, Pepperdine University, Communication Division

Fall 2010  Teaching Assistant, Gender and Communication, UCSB, Department of Communication

Spring 2010  Teaching Assistant, Media Businesses, UCSB, Department of Communication

Winter 2010  Teaching Assistant, Intro to Communication Theory, UCSB, Department of Communication

Fall 2009  Teaching Assistant, Research Methods, UCSB, Department of Communication

Winter/Spring 2009  Teaching Assistant, Intro to Communication Theory, UCSB, Department of Communication

2006 – 2008  Teaching Assistant, Advanced Reporting and Writing for Broadcast Journalism, Pepperdine University, Communication Division

2006 – 2008  Advisor, Pepperdine University Bi-Weekly Student Newscast

INVITED TALKS
Summer 2011/ Intro to Communication Theory

Winter 2010 “Considering the Media’s Framing and Agenda-Setting Roles”
University of California, Santa Barbara

Fall 2009 Undergraduate Communication Association Featured Speaker
“Breaking into the Broadcast News Industry”
University of California, Santa Barbara

RELATED EMPLOYMENT

2004 - 2009 Producer, Morning News/Good Day Los Angeles, FOX 11 News (KTTV), Los Angeles, CA

2002 – 2005 Producer, 10 pm Newscast, FOX 6 News (XETV), San Diego, CA

2001 – 2002 Associate Producer/Assignment Editor, ABC – News13 (KRDO), Colorado Springs, CO

SERVICE

2011 UCSB Communication Department Search Committee, Graduate Student Representative

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

National Communication Association, Mass Communication Division

International Communication Association, Mass Communication Division

National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians
CURRICULUM VITAE

Gary S. Selby

Blanche E. Seaver Professor of Communication

Chair, Graduate Program in Communication

(Updated 8-25-2011)

CONTACT INFORMATION: Communication Division, Seaver College
Pepperdine University
24255 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90263-4211

Phone: 310-506-4930
Email: gary.selby@pepperdine.edu

EDUCATION:

Undergraduate: Harding University
Searcy, Arkansas
Bachelor of Arts in Social Science, Magna Cum Laude
Teacher Certification in Secondary Social Studies and French
1980
Graduate: Harding University Graduate School of Religion
Memphis, Tennessee
Master of Theology
1984

Wesley Theological Seminary
Washington, D.C.
Special Studies in the Philosophy of Religion,
New Testament Studies
1983

University of Maryland
Professor Robert N. Gaines, Advisor
College Park, Maryland
Doctor of Philosophy in Public Communication
1996

Areas of Focus: Rhetorical Theory and Criticism,
Research Methodologies, History of Public Address,
English Literature/Composition

UNIVERSITY APPOINTMENTS:

Pepperdine University
Malibu, CA

Professor of Communication
(August 2011-present)

**Associate Professor of Communication**

(2005 to 2011; tenure awarded May 2009)

**Blanche E. Seaver Professor of Communication**

(August 2007 to July 2011)

Courses Taught: Rhetorical Theory; Rhetorical Criticism; Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Attitude Change; Intercultural Communication; Communication Ethics; Communication Research Methods (Quantitative and Qualitative); Interpersonal Communication; Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis;

Graduate Qualitative Research Methods

**Founding Director, Pepperdine University East Africa Study Abroad Program**, annual summer study abroad program-service learning program in Uganda, Rwanda, and Tanzania, established summer 2008.

**Visiting Faculty Member, Pepperdine University** Heidelberg Study Abroad Program, AY 2009-2010

**Chair, Graduate Program in Communication**

(2006 to 2011)

Responsibilities: Administration of the Communication Division's Master of Arts and Masters of Science degrees, including managing student recruitment and admissions, facilitating curriculum development and program reviews, and coordinating graduate faculty teaching and thesis committee assignments.
**Director, Pepperdine University Center for Faith and Learning** (August 2008 to Present)

Responsibilities: Overall leadership and management of programs designed to enhance the integration of the University's academic mission and its religious identity, across the University as a whole. Specific duties include managing budget, developing and hosting a yearly calendar of special “Faith and Learning” events, and planning and facilitating an annual New Faculty Retreat.

**The George Washington University**

Washington, D. C.

Associate Professor of Communication (with tenure)

(May 2004 to May 2005)

Assistant Professor of Communication

(September 1998 to May 2004)

Courses Taught: Research Methods, Small Group Communication, Communication Criticism, Rhetoric of Social Movements and Organizations, Internship in Communication, Senior Seminar in Communication

**The George Washington University**

Washington, D. C.

Assistant Professorial Lecturer

(August 1996 to September 1998)
Charles County Community College
La Plata, Maryland

Adjunct Instructor of Speech Communication

(January 1995 to December 1996)

Courses Taught: Basic Principles of Speech Communication, Interpersonal Communication

MINISTRY APPOINTMENTS:

Silver Spring Church of Christ
Silver Spring, Maryland
Associate Minister
August 1983 – September 1986

Columbia Church of Christ
Columbia, Maryland
Founding Minister
Minister of Preaching and Worship
September 1986 – July 2005

COMMUNICATION-RELATED CONSULTING:

American Council on Education (ACE)
Responsibilities include examining and making college credit recommendations for formal courses offered outside college and university degree programs.

1999 – 2002
Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene,
AIDS Administration

Faculty Member in Continuing Education

Responsibilities: Developing and presenting workshops (3-4 times per year) on subjects related to counseling AIDS patients and dealing with occupational stress among caseworkers.

1993-1995

Communications Satellite Corporation (COMSAT)

"Presenting For Impact" training course in presentation skills, for COMSAT's Management Development Series

1990

HONORS AND AWARDS:

Communication Division Outstanding Teaching Award
Pepperdine University
Spring 2011

Communication Division Outstanding Teaching Award
Pepperdine University
Spring 2008

Communication Division Outstanding Service Award
Pepperdine University
Fall 2006

Blanche E. Seaver Professorship
Pepperdine University
July 2006

Finalist, 2006 Rose B. Johnson Outstanding Southern Communication Journal Article Award
(“Scoffing at the Enemy: The Burlesque Frame in the Rhetoric of Ralph David Abernathy”)

Top Paper Award
Rhetoric and Public Address Division
Southern States Communication Association Annual Convention
April 2006

Top Paper Award
Rhetoric and Public Address Division
Southern States Communication Association Annual Convention
April 2005

Top Paper Award
Rhetoric and Public Address Division
Southern States Communication Association Annual Convention
April 2003
Rhetoric and Public Address Interest Group

Eastern Communication Association Convention

April 2001

Morton A. Bender University Teaching Award, 1999
The George Washington University

Outstanding Dissertation Award, 1995-96
American Society for the History of Rhetoric

Christian Scholarship Foundation Graduate Fellowship Award, 1991-92

Alpha Chi (Undergraduate Academic Honor Society)

Phi Alpha Theta (Undergraduate History Honor Society)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:

National Communication Association
Western States Communication Association
Southern States Communication Association
International Society for the History of Rhetoric

EDITORSHIP/JOURNAL REVIEWING ACTIVITIES:

MA THESIS ADVISING:

MA Thesis Chair:


Francesca M. Smith, ”White Man’s World, Black Woman’s Power: Condoleezza Rice’s Rhetorical Identity at the Intersection of Presidentiality, Gender, and Race.” April 2008. Placement: PhD Program in Communication, University of Southern California.

MA Thesis Committee Member:


SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS/RESEARCH: (Asterisk indicates publication in a peer-reviewed journal.)


*G. Selby. “‘Blameless at His Coming’: The Discursive Construction of Eschatological Reality in 1 Thessalonians.” Rhetorica 17 (Fall 1999): 385-410.


POPULAR PUBLICATIONS:


CONFERENCE/PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS:

G. Selby. Presented at the 2011 Rochester College Opening Sessions, Rochester, Michigan, August 22,
2011:

Session One: "What Makes a Christian College Christian?"

Session Two: "In Search of Wisdom: A Hopeful Prospect for Higher Education"

Session Three: "In Search of Wisdom: Shaping Wisdom, Pedagogy, and the Life of the Teacher"


Thompson, D., Tippens, D., Selby, G., & Krumrei, E. "Mentoring Sophomore Students in Vocational Discernment: The Role of Faculty Members." Presented at the 2011 Network for Vocation in Undergraduate Education Conference, Indianapolis, IN, March 10-12, 2011.


G. Selby. “The Hermeneutic Circle: Myth and ‘History’ in Martin Luther King Jr.’s ‘Birth of a New Nation’ Sermon.” Presented at the 2006 Southern States Communication Association Annual Convention, Dallas, TX, April 2006. (Winner, Top Paper Award, Rhetoric and Public Address Division.)


G. Selby. “(Em)bodying the Faith: Baptism as Ritual Communication.” Presented at the Annual Christian Scholars Conference, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, July 2005.

G. Selby. “The Red Sea has Opened: Narrative and the Creation of Movement Consciousness in Martin Luther King’s ‘Death of Evil on the Seashore’ Sermon.” Presented at the 2005 Southern States Communication Association Annual Convention, Baton Rouge, LA, April 2005. (Winner, Top Paper Award,


G. Selby. “Scoffing at the Enemy: The Burlesque Frame in the Rhetoric of Ralph David Abernathy.” Presented at the 2003 Southern States Communication Association Annual Convention, Birmingham, AL, April 2003. (Winner, Top Paper Award, Rhetoric and Public Address Division; finalist for the Bostrom Outstanding Young Scholar Award.)


CURRICULUM VITA Sarah J. Ballard

24501 Mariposa Circle Malibu, CA 90264 (970) 449-3594
sballardca@gmail.com

Education

M.A. December 2005 – Professional Program in Community Counseling, Denver Seminary

Graduate Certificate in Systemic Play Therapy December 2005 – Family Therapy/Play Therapy Institute, Denver, CO


Professional Credentials

Registered Play Therapist (RPT), 2007-2011.

Licensed Professional Counselor in Colorado (LPC), 2007-current.

SAFE (Structured Analyses Family Evaluation) Homestudy Certified, 2006-current.

Certified Systemic Play Therapist (CSPT), 2005-current.


Related Professional Employment

Sessional Instructor, Department of Drama and Speech Communication, University of Waterloo (Ontario), 2008-present.


Counseling Intern, Family Therapy/Play Therapy Institute, Denver, CO, 2004. Practicum Counseling Student, Shepherd’s Gate Counseling Center, Denver, CO, 2002. Director of Education, Alpha Center


**Work in Progress**


**Competitive Paper and Panel Presentations**


**Invited Paper Presentations**


**Courses Taught**

University of Waterloo (ON) SPCOM 100: Interpersonal Communication SPCOM 223: Public Speaking SPCOM 324: Small Group Communication SPCOM 432: Conflict Management SPCOM 491: Special Topics: Family Communication (co-taught)

**Courses Developed**

University of Waterloo (ON) SPCOM 490: Special Topics: Family Communication (co-developed)

**Public and Academic Lectures**


adoption group, London, ON.


Other Research Experience


Professional Service

Volunteer Event Coordinator. Intercountry Adoption Summit, (2010, September 23-26), Stratford, Ontario. Inaugural gathering of top 150 international government, NGOs, scholars, and researchers to discuss intercountry adoption at a global level. Produced first-ever comprehensive series of action steps related to intercountry adoption in world. Stratford, Ontario.


Community Service


Trainer. Transracial Adoption. Ontario Ministry of Children and Youth Services, Adoption Resource
Exchange Training Conference, Toronto, ON, April 28, 2009.


**Professional Affiliations**


**Faith Based Service**

Erb Street Mennonite Church, Waterloo, ON (2008 to present) Adult Sunday School Teacher

Children's Sunday School Teacher Children's Ministry
Cherry Hills Community Church, Cherry Creek, CO (2007) Adult Sunday School Teacher

Homecomings Adoption Ministry Speaker

Mission Hills Church, Greenwood Village, CO (2004 to 2005) Adult Sunday School Teacher

Support group facilitator: *Divorced teen support group*. Trainer: *Safe touch and how to avoid child abuse*. Trainer: *Effects of divorce on children and the importance of therapy*.

Vineyard Christian Fellowship/Church in the City, Greeley, CO (2001 to 2003) Guest Preacher

Missionary Team Leader Young Adult Ministry
APPENDIX I – FACULTY CURRICULUM VITAE

Denise Perry Ferguson, Ph.D., APR
Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Programs in Communication
Pepperdine University
24255 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90263
310-506-6868
310-456-3083 (FAX)
denise.ferguson@pepperdine.edu

Academic Degrees

Ph.D.  Purdue University, Fall 1995-May 1999
Major: Public Affairs and Issues Management
Minor: Mass Media and Society
Dissertation Chair and Major Professor: Carl Botan
Title: Rhetorical Public Relations and Issues Management Strategies of Social
Movement Organizations: The Communication of Values and Policy
Preferences

University of Arizona, 1986-1987
Major: Interpersonal Communication
Advisor and Major Professor: Judee K. Burgoon

M.A.  Bowling Green State University, August 1983-1984
Major: Speech Communication

Thesis: Self-Disclosure as a Relationship Disengagement Strategy: A Replication

Major Professor: James Wilcox

B.S. Indiana State University, August 1977-1980

Major: Speech Communication Minor: Journalism

Academic Experience

Director, Graduate Programs in Communication and Associate Professor of Communication, Pepperdine University, 2011-present

Direct MA and MS programs in Communication, with responsibilities for leading development and assessment of curriculum, maintaining academic rigor, and mentoring students’ progress toward degree completion. Also direct undergraduate program in Public Relations, with responsibilities for leading development and assessment of program, advising PRSSA chapter, maintaining professional networks, and mentoring students in career preparation.

Chair, Division of Communication (formerly Coordinator, Communication Arts Department), Indiana Wesleyan University, 2005-2011

Associate Professor of Communication (formerly Associate Professor of Journalism and Public Relations), 2004-2011

As Chair reported to the Associate Dean for the School of Arts and Humanities in the College of Arts and Sciences, providing oversight of the Communication Division which administers majors and minors in Communication Studies, Journalism, Media Communication, Public Relations, and Theatre. The division has an enrollment of more than 150 student majors and eight full-time faculty members, plus adjunct instructors. Specific responsibilities included providing leadership and vision; strategic long-term and short-term planning; team building and identity shaping; conflict management and negotiation; curriculum review; teaching assignments and scheduling; assessment of division, program, and course student learning outcomes; marketing and recruitment; maintaining relationships with alumni; chairing faculty search committees; mentoring new faculty; oversight of budget and equipment proposal and monitoring expenditures, evaluation and professional development of faculty; and supervision of support staff.

Responsibilities as Associate Professor of Communication included directing the division’s Public Relations major and minor, advising the IWU Chapter of the Public Relations Student Society of America, revising curriculum and teaching courses (e.g., Public Relations Campaigns and Cases, Public Relations Writing, Principles of Public Relations, Research Methods in Communication). Previously as Associate Professor of Journalism and Public Relations, advised The Sojourn, the university’s award winning newspaper in print and online, initiated transition from a student organization to
integration in academic department and integration with Journalism curriculum, led change from tabloid to broadsheet format, revised curriculum and taught courses (e.g., Advanced Newswriting, Media Law and Ethics, Magazine Writing, Introduction to Newswriting, Introduction to Mass Communication).

Additional duties included serving on academic leadership committees in the College of Arts and Sciences, serving on university committees, advising students, acting as external spokesperson and representative of the Division of Communication, cultivating relationships with Public Relations and Journalism professionals, participating in professional and academic organizations, as well as maintaining an active research agenda.

Visiting Guest Professor, Pepperdine University, June term 2005-2011
Responsibilities included designing curriculum and teaching 500-level courses in international public relations and communication and conflict, and teaching a department core course in persuasive media messages and campaigns.

Adjunct Faculty, Indiana Wesleyan University, College of Adult and Professional Studies, July 2003- July 2004
Responsibilities included teaching ENG 140, English Composition and Writing, and ENG 141, Business Communication.

Associate Faculty, Indiana University School of Journalism, IUPUI, January 2003-May 2004
Responsibilities included teaching introductory mass communication and newswriting, reporting, and editing courses.

Assistant Professor of Communication, Pepperdine University, 2000-2002
Responsibilities in this tenure-track position included teaching courses in the Communication Division’s public relations major and in other communication curriculum, including communication theory and message creation and design. In this capacity, I redesigned existing courses (e.g., public relations writing); served on the Graduate Committee and Rank, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria Committee; advised internships, and graduate and undergraduate students; co-advised the Pepperdine chapter of the Public Relations Student Society of America; cultivated relationships with Los Angeles-area public relations professionals; and participated in professional and academic organizations.

Assistant Professor of Communication, University of Indianapolis, 1998-2000
Responsibilities in this tenure-track position included directing the department’s journalism and public relations programs in the Department of Communication, and redesigning and teaching courses in both disciplines (e.g., newswriting, magazine journalism, graphic communication, introduction to public relations, and public relations campaigns), as well as advising the university’s student-run newspaper, The Reflector. In addition, I advised students, served on university committees, coordinated internship assignments, cultivated relationships with Indianapolis-area public relations and journalism professionals, and participated in professional and academic organizations.
Graduate Teaching Assistant, Purdue University, 1996-1998
Adjunct Faculty, Butler University, 1995-1997
Adjunct Faculty, Marian College, 1991
Graduate Teaching Assistant, University of Arizona, 1987-1988
Graduate Research Assistant to Judee K. Burgoon, University of Arizona, 1988
Graduate Teaching Assistant, Bowling Green State University, 1983-1984

Publications


Ferguson, D. (1999). Rhetorical public relations and issues management strategies of social movement organizations: The communication of values and policy preferences. Published dissertation, Purdue University.


**Conference Papers**


**Conference Panels**


Ferguson, D. (2005). Faith and Communication: The Relationship Between Foster’s Six Historical Traditions and the Communication Discipline. Religious Communication Association Pre-


Grants, Awards and Honors

Accredited in Public Relations (APR), Public Relations Society of America, 2010-present
Commission on Public Relations Education, 2009-present
Hinds Research Fellowship, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2010-2011
Leadership Development for Women, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2010-2011
Religious Communication Association, Executive Council and Media Unit Chair, 2010-present
Lilly Scholarship Fund, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2008-2009
PRSA Educators Academy Top Faculty Paper, 2008
Chair, National Communication Association Public Relations Division, 2008-2009
Vice Chair and 2007 Annual Conference Program Planner, National Communication Association, 2007-2008
Faculty Advisory Committee, Indiana Collegiate Press Association, 2007-2008
Secretary, National Communication Association, 2001-2004
Indiana University Faculty Professional Development Research Grant, 2003
Pepperdine University Research Fellow, 2001
Judge, Project XL, Writing Category, 2000
University of Indianapolis selected representative to Wye Faculty Seminar, 1999
Dissertation nominated for the 1999 International Communication Association Dissertation of the Year, Public Relations Division
Alan H. Monroe Graduate Scholar Award, Purdue University, 1998
Purdue Research Foundation Summer Research Grant, 1998

Academic and Professional Leadership and Service

Director of Graduate Programs in Communication, Pepperdine University, 2011-present
Seaver Academic Council, 2011-present
Public Relations Student Society of America Pepperdine Chapter, Faculty Advisor, 2011-present
Seaver College, Communication Division Curriculum Council, 2011-present
Chair, Division of Communication, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2005-2011
Public Relations Student Society of America IWU Chapter, Faculty Advisor, 2009-2011
College of Arts and Sciences Academic Leadership Council, 2009-2100
Lilly Research Release and World Changing Faculty Member Awards Committee Chair, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2006-2011
College of Arts and Sciences Nominating Committee, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2009-2011
Theatre Advisory Board, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2005-2011
Media Advisory Council, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2005-2011
HLC Self Study Steering Committee and Communications Subcommittee Chair, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2008-2010
Associate Dean, School of Arts and Humanities, Search Committee member, Indiana, 2009-2010
Assistant Vice President for Marketing and Communication, Search Committee member, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2009-2010
Image/Branding Task Force, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2007-2009
University Structure Task Force, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2007-2008
John Wesley Honors College Committee member, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2006-2008
Academic Leaders, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2004-2005
Academic Facilities Committee, Indiana Wesleyan University, 2004-2007
Graduate Committee, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 1999-2000
Teaching and Learning Committee, Pepperdine University, 1999-2000
Search Committee, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 1999-2000
Rank, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria Committee, Communication Division, Pepperdine
University, 1999-2000
Public Relations Student Society of America, Pepperdine University chapter, 1998-2000
Graduate thesis committees, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 1999-
Graduate program advisor, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 1999-2000
Magazine Division National Judge, American Legion Fourth Estate Journalism Award, 1998

Community Service
PRSA-LA, Quality Time with PR Minds, 2011
Marion Philharmonic Orchestra Board of Directors, 2010-11
Project Leadership, 2010-
Marion-Grant Co. Chamber of Commerce, 2007
Grant and Delaware counties “Move the Mountain” leadership committee, 2005-2006
Service learning in numerous community organizations and small businesses (e.g., Marion Philharmonic Orchestra, YWCA of Grant County, Grant Co. Chapter of the American Red Cross, Grant Co. Child Health and Safety Coalition, Grant Co. Convention and Visitors Bureau, Grant County Chamber of Commerce, Julian Center of Indianapolis, World Gospel Mission, Grace House for Recovery)

Professional Experience
Publication Specialist, 1991-1994, Traders Point Christian Church, Indianapolis, IN
Reported to Minster of Administration. Responsible for designing and producing internal and external communications, including bi-monthly 1,300-distribution newsletter and weekly Sunday Bulletin, brochures, news releases, and special event publicity.

Director of Public Relations, 1989-1990, Marian College, Indianapolis, IN
Reported to President. Responsible for all external communications designed strategically to promote awareness and a favorable image of the college, and responsible for internal communications designed to foster a sense of community and college pride. To this end, maintained close liaison with news media through, for example, distribution of regular story and photo ideas, and oversaw all advertising production and strategic media placement.

Advertising & Sales Promotion Coordinator, 1984-1986, Dana Corporation, Toledo, OH
Reported to Advertising Manager. Coordinated development, production, and implementation of divisional printed literature and audiovisual materials in support of advertising, sales, service, technical and training functions. Specifically, wrote and oversaw production of division video and slide presentations, and wrote and distributed all news releases to local and industry print media.

Copy Editor, 1981, Del Rio Guide, Del Rio, TX
Reported to Owner/Editor. Edited all copy for this regional (Southwest Texas) magazine, proofread, and planned design and layout of monthly issues. Wrote feature articles about upcoming events.

Reported to Owner/President. Wrote copy for display advertisements, brochures, and product promotion for consumer and industrial accounts. Bought space and time in national print and broadcast media, and maintained relationships with media representatives.

Affiliations

Member, National Communication Association

Member, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication

Member, Public Relations Society of America

Member, Religious Communication Association
GINGER ROSENKRANS

Associate Professor of Advertising in the Communication Division at Pepperdine University.

PhD in Information Systems from the Graduate School of Computer and Information Sciences at Nova Southeastern University with specialization and research interests that include interactive advertising, online advertising effectiveness, online advertising metrics and Web analytics, and online ad design and interactivity.

B.A. Pepperdine University

The following are courses I teach or have taught:


The following are professional organizations in which I am a member:

Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE); Association for Computing Machinery (ACM); Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC); Society of News Design (SND); American Academy of Advertising (AAA); House Rabbit Society; American Advertising Federation (AAF); Western States Communication Association (WSCA)


Rosenkrans, Ginger (2005, Fall). Online auctions as advertising revenue in the media mix. *Journal of*


Academic Research in Progress Rosenkrans, G. (2008-present). Online newspapers and advertising. Received one research grant for this study. Rosenkrans, G. (May 2008-present). Cross media optimization to enhance community awareness. Received one research grant for this study. Rosenkrans, G. (2009-present). Cross media optimization involving interactive and print advertising Received one research grant for this study.


Susan P. Salas
Pepperdine University
Communication Division
Curriculum Vita

BA, University of Iowa
MFA, American Film Institute

Courses Taught

GSCO 199 Myth and the Movies
MSCO 280 Writing for the Mass Media
TC 270 Video Field Production
MPRD 260 (TC 250) The Telecommunications Industry
MPRD/THEA 32 Acting for the Camera
MPRD (TC) 370 Advanced Audio and Video Production
MPRD (TC) 470 Advanced Narrative Video Short
TC 590 Television Performance
TC 590 Documentary Film Making
TC 599 Producing a Television Program – The Legends of Television
TC 599 Producing a Television Program for TV 26
TC 599 Developing and Writing for Episodic Television
TC 599 Digital Short Production
TC 599 Writing a Narrative Screenplay
COM 599 Mythic Structure of Narrative Film

International Program
Visiting Faculty, Florence, Italy – fall, 2012

**Academic Advisor to 80 Telecommunication and Media Production Majors**

**Professional Production Experience**

**Post-Keyes-Gardner Advertising, Chicago: Producer**

Produced national and regional commercials for major advertising accounts. Responsible for budgets, overseeing all aspects of preproduction and production working with film studios and agency creative teams and clients. Responsible for all post production work and delivering finished answer print for airing. Worked with 35mm Film and video tape

**Coast Productions, LA: Producer**

Produced national and regional commercials for award winning director cinematographer Joe Pytka. Oversaw all aspects of preproduction and production. Supervised and scheduled casting, crews, locations, stage production and equipment rental. Responsible for all production activity including delivery of equipment, crew time sheets, production reports and booking talent with SAG and AFTRA. Screened, compiled and edited director's sample reels. Worked with 35mm film

**Carlyle Casting, LA: Casting Director**

Major casting director for New York and LA directors for commercials and equity theatre. Coordinated and approved actors for casting sessions; directed and taped actors in casting sessions; organized, coordinated and scheduled call back sessions with directors, ad agency and talent agents. Worked with SAG Signatory agents, SAG and AFTRA for booking talent.

**Professional Acting Experience**

Guest starred in many popular television series, films, and shorts and appeared in over two hundred national and regional television commercials.

**Research and Presentations**

*Active Guidance: A Study of the Degree to Which Parents Will Engage in Activities in Order to Enhance Their Involvement in Their Children’s TV Viewing.* California State University, Stanislaus Journal of Research, Fall 2003.


Researched and Published *Telecommunications Major Deep Learning Assessment Report*

For the Communication Division, Pepperdine University

Broadcast Education Association (BEA) panel speaker: Understanding the College Radio Audience: Strategies
for Finding the Right Music Mix (SMA). April 16, 2004

Panel speaker: Westlake Information Technology Academy Luncheon for Young Women
Developed, recorded and launched pod cast lectures which are down loaded
by students on a web site for MPRD 470 and currently featured on Pepperdine’s iTunes U site
Wrote and published on line course books for MPRD 370 and MPRD 470
AAUW/Brighter Horizons Conference Presenter
Topic: Digital Media and Platform Delivery: Your future

**Director of Broadcasting**

Duties include overseeing student television and radio production. Supervise Broadcast Facility Manager and Station Engineer while approving budget expenditures, and equipment purchase and maintenance.

**Faculty Advisor**

Pepperdine Student Broadcasting, TV 32
KWVS-LPFM radio station
Pepperdine Video Festival (Creator and facilitator for nine years)
Pepperdine Film Society
Pepperdine Improv Troupe (PIT) 2011

**Academic Committees**

Telecommunications Scholarship Committee
Faculty Development Committee
Academic Integrity Committee
Communication Graduate Committee

**Broadcast Educators Association**

Student Media Advisor Committee
Conference Presenter
Faculty Research Paper evaluator and judge
Student Documentary Judge
Student Production Judge

**Campus Community Service**

KWVS-LPFM Radio Service Projects:

- 12 hour remote to raise hats for Hats Off For Cancer
- Partnered with Sigma Chi Fraternity to raise funds for Run Walk for Hope

Co-Produced Cinemagic Global Media Classroom for high school students from Ireland, LA inner city schools, and Westlake High School

**Community Service**

Westlake Information Technology Academy Mentor
Westlake Information Technology Job Shadow Program
Westlake Information Technology Senior Project Mentor
Career Day Round Table Participant, Newbury Park High School
Ventura County Regional Occupational Program: Video Production Advisory Committee

**Teaching Awards**

Howard A. White Award for Teaching Excellence, Pepperdine University, 2004
Communication Division Outstanding Teaching Excellence Award – Spring 2005
Who's Who Among America's Teachers
Curriculum Vitae

Elizabeth R. Smith, M.A.

1230 Wellesley Ave. Apt. 203 • Los Angeles, CA 90025

Office: (310) 266-8928 • Cell: (310) 266-8928

Email: Elizabeth.smith@pepperdine.edu

Professional Profile

• Accomplished journalism career that has demonstrated consistent success as a professional in the field. Outstanding track record in news, breaking news, local news, and feature reporting.

• Seasoned journalist whose experience includes print, web and broadcast; writing, editing and producing

• Extensive background in journalism/communication higher education

• Extensive experience advising students in award-winning journalism co-curricular programs

Education

• M.A., Intercultural Communication, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, 2003

DISSERTATION: The Dependency of African Americans on Daily Newspapers and the Role of Perceived Bias and the Use of Alternative Media

• B.A., Journalism, Harding University, Searcy, AR, 2000

Academic Honors & Awards

• Emmy Award, Writer, Unplanned Breaking News Event, The Death of Michael Jackson, KTLA, Los Angeles, 2009

• Recipient, Graduate Assistantship Award, Pepperdine University, 2002-2003

• Outstanding Adjunct Professor, Pepperdine University, Spring 2004

• New England Associated Press, Feature Design, 3rd Place, 2001

• Graduated Magna Cum Laude, Harding University, 1996-2000

• Outstanding Journalism Graduate, Harding University, 2000
• Alpha Chi Honors Society, Member, 1997-2000
• Honors College Member, Harding University, 1996-2000

**Academic/Teaching Experience**

**Visiting Professor/ Dir. of Student Journalism,** Pepperdine University, 2008 to present
• Faculty adviser for all student journalism publications, which includes more than 110 students; teach a variety of journalism and communication courses; serve as academic adviser

**Visiting Professor/Faculty Family,** Pepperdine International Campus, Florence, Italy, Summer 2010
• Taught intercultural communication course; led weekly convocation lessons; recruited and interviewed students

**Adjunct Instructor,** Pepperdine University, 2004-2008
• Taught trends in the journalism industry; taught writing, editing and reporting skills

**Asst. Director of Student Journalism,** Pepperdine University, 2004-2008
• Assisted with advising all student publications; managed operational and scholarship budget

**Courses Taught**

• JOUR 345, News Reporting and Editing
• JOUR 325, Publication Design
• JOUR 463, Feature and Magazine Writing
• JOUR 469, Critical and Editorial Writing
• JOUR 561, Journalism and Culture
• COM 180, Public Speaking
• COM 205, Story telling in the Media
• COM 400, Communication Ethics
• COM 512, Intercultural Communication
• COM 513, Intercultural Communication: Case Studies

**Publications & Presentations**
• Panelist, *Facebook in the Newsroom*, Associated Collegiate Press (Fall 2011)


• Featured Lecturer, Arkansas College Media Association (Spring 2005)


**Professional Experience**

• **Free-lance Writer, Editor, Producer**, Los Angeles, CA, 2004- present

• **Producer**, KTLA, Los Angeles, CA, 2009 to 2011

• **Writer**, KTLA, Los Angeles, CA, 2005 to 2011

• **Web Producer**, KTLA, Los Angeles, CA, 2005 to 2010

• **Copy Editor, Newport Daily News**, Newport, RI, 2000 to 2002

**Professional Development**

**Conferences**

• **Fall National College Media Convention** (annual) 2003 to 2011

• **Spring National College Media Convention** (annual) 2004

• **Intercultural Communication Association**, 2003

**Professional Affiliations**

• **CCMA** (California College Media Association)
• CMA (College Media Advisers)
• ACP (Associated Collegiate Press)
• SPJ (Society of Professional Journalists)
• AEJMC (Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication)

Community Service

• Nursery Coordinator, Culver Palms Church of Christ, Los Angeles, 2008 to present
• Seventh-grade Sunday School Teacher, Culver Palms, Los Angeles, Spring 2009
• Community Service Coordinator, Culver Palms, Los Angeles, 2005 to 2008
• Newspaper Adviser, Camp David Gonzales, Malibu, CA, Spring 2006
Christopher C. Stivers

28869 Michelle Drive
Agoura Hills, California  91301
(818) 889-4900
chris.stivers@pepperdine.edu

Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation title:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Models for Design Development of Higher Education Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Wide Web Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.B.A.</td>
<td>Pepperdine University, Malibu CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Pepperdine University, Malibu CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majors:

Music History and Literature
Music Theory and Composition
Music Education
Positions Held / Key Accomplishments

All positions held at Pepperdine University

**Visiting Assistant Professor of Communication and Faculty Advisor to the Student Communications Bureau**

Beginning Fall 2011

**Web Administrator, Seaver College and Instructor of Digital Media**

2006-2011


Contributing author (minor) for *Grunion Greeters in California: Beach Spawning Fish, Coastal Stewardship, Beach Management and Ecotourism,* a paper presented at the 5th International Coastal and Marine Tourism Congress, Auckland 2007, and published in the Proceedings volume. (Karen Martin, principle author and presenter)

**Director, Technology Intern Program and Instructor of Digital Media**

2001-2006

While in this position directed projects managed and executed by student interns. Some examples include:

- Development of online reservations system for Seaver Writing Center
- Development of faculty workshops in Powerpoint, Frontpage, and Photoshop
- Development of SGA online voting system
- Development of Seaver Faculty Association online voting system
- Development of web templates for various faculty
• Development of photo gallery database for SURB program
• Development of prototype online course evaluation system
• Development of ancient coins database for the Institute for the Study of Archaeology and Religion
• Development of online application form and online recommendation system for International Programs
• Development of original websites for several academic entities (e.g. Center for Faith and Learning, Conference On Christianity and Literature, Islamic Asia)
• Graphic design support for 2006 Expressionists magazine

Contributing author (minor) for Internet Technology for Rapid Data Acquisition Over Large Distances: Grunion Greeters Along California’s Coast, a paper presented at the Southern California Academy of Sciences annual meeting, May 2006. (Karen Martin, principle author and presenter)

Developed website to support education and activities for Grunion Greeters, spring 2005. (www.grunion.org) Continue to be webmaster through the present.

Co-presented Using technology in the communication curriculum assessment process, a short course at the fall 2005 National Communication Association annual meeting in Boston. (Steven S. Lemley, Virginia Rosenkrans, David N. Lowry, co-presenters)

Co-presented Is Your Web Site on Target? Aiming for Policies and Structures that Work, a poster session at the March 2004 Western Regional Educause conference in Sacramento. (John F. McManus, co-presenter)

Developed and co-lead a technology workshop for Seaver education students about to begin their student teaching. Skills learned are directly applicable to the classroom and development of an electronic portfolio. Spring 2004 through spring 2010. (Stella Erbes, co-developer/presenter)

Presented Technology Intern Program Creates Effective Student/Faculty Partnerships, a poster session at the November 2003 annual Educause conference in Anaheim.

Created and presented a Multimedia Narrative Workshop for Carolyn Vos Strache’s fall 2003 first-year seminar course (Sport and Society). Topics included: elements of Powerpoint; page layout and construction; storyboarding; selecting images and music; how to cite sources; digital photography, scanning, and digital enhancement; integrating multimedia.

Developed a semi-automated system for managing first-year seminar requests from new students
during New Student Orientation (NSO) registration in summer 2003. This system was expanded in spring 2004 to include an online NSO registration form and pre-load students into their first semester classes.

Created the basic organizational structure for the academic division websites that was carried into our current Seaver website during the spring 2003 Web Unification Project. Also contributed to this project by migrating content from the old department/divisional websites into the new and authoring program scripts to create web accessible course catalog and course schedule data.

Presented Technology Intern Program: Student/Faculty Partnerships, at the 2002 Educause annual meeting in Atlanta. Two TIP student interns, Nathanael Highfield and Gabriela Moreno, provided testimony during the presentation.

Created and administered online surveys twice annually summer 2002 through spring 2007 in support of research funded by the Lily Foundation. These were multi-part custom surveys producing data formatted for SPSS.

Co-developed an online version of the course Introduction to Human Anatomy and Physiology (SPME 106) in spring 2002 with Laurie Nelson using Blackboard. This was a research project to compare an online learning class with a regular lecture class in terms of several outcomes such as grades in the class, satisfaction with the class, and overall learning objectives.

Created and taught first-year seminar, Communication Arts for the Digital Age. This seminar has been taught each fall 2001-2010. Brief description: The ability to communicate clearly is a mark of an educated person. It increases credibility, promotes goodwill, and fosters deeper, more genuine relationships in addition to increasing opportunities in career, public, and private arenas. The willingness to communicate clearly reflects the spirit of a servant leader—one who values truth, respects others, and a desire to promote goodness. Students will explore many facets of communication through group activities, discussion, role play, presentations, and the development of multimedia projects using digital media tools. Although various technologies will be used in the course the emphasis will be on their application in promoting good communication. Topics include audience-centered communication, graphic design, website development, ethical and moral aspects of technology-assisted communication, and effective project management. In addition, the class will address personal study habits and decision-making skills relevant to the college setting.

Director of Support Services 1993-2000

While in this position responsibilities included oversight of the following:
Consultation and liaison between customer base and IT
Acquisition, installation and computer products
Computer-related troubleshooting and repair
Compatibility testing and standards development
Technology-related policy and standards development
Userid and data access control administration
Computer-related project management
Development of user documentation in various forms
Training on host computer and PC applications, end-user programming, and project design
Special training on management issues and new technologies
Special assistance to faculty for academic projects
Photoreprographic services through copy centers and self-service copiers
Telephone and in-person computer HelpDesk

Co-presented Partnership: A model for student/faculty collaboration on the web at the 1999 Syllabus annual conference. (Craig Bowman, co-presenter)

Created "planITpepperdine" the first university website dedicated to providing online technology support and information for faculty and staff. Open in spring 1999 it also was a support tool for the university's Year 2000 conversion.

Developed curriculum for and taught Computer Skills in Communication (COM 208) in spring 1999.

Co-created first-year seminar, Creative Web Design, with Craig Bowman. This seminar was taught each fall 1997-2000. Brief description: Through this experience students will advance their computer skills with hands-on, practical applications, develop abilities to listen and produce through design analysis what they have heard from the client, work cooperatively in groups through responsible interaction, satisfy Pepperdine University's commitment to service learning by directly benefiting various departments and divisions, and establish research skills essential for academic excellence.

Built the arachnid webservo, which has been providing web and FTP services for university departments, faculty, and for individual courses continuously 1997-present.

Retasked the Word Processing Center—essentially a typing pool—to Academic Project Design, whose new mission was to provide specialized full spectrum technology-based support to faculty for their academic projects. (1996)

Designed and co-presented *Beyond the Berlin Wall: System Management in the 90s* at the 1994 SISU annual meeting. This was a multimedia presentation incorporating Powerpoint, video, and role playing to demonstrate collaboration between IT personnel and customers in solving business problems. (Keith Jones, co-presenter) "SISU" was the international user group for our administrative system.

Participated in a UNESCO-sponsored project in St. Petersburg, Russia, assisting in the installation and implementation of a computerized maintenance tracking system for the Hermitage museum. The implementation team consisted of four specialists from US and Canadian museums and me. (fall 1994)

**Director of the Information Center 1989-1992**

Presented and participated on a "Networking the Campus" panel at the annual SIS Users Conference (1992) addressing standards, management, and support of the campus network infrastructure.

Co-presenter of "Using SIS Data For Prospecting at Pepperdine University" at the annual SIS Users Conference (1992) describing how information from prospective students is collected, managed, and utilized for communication and better admission decisions.

Developed pre-Windows (i.e. DOS) PC Menu system to streamline initiation of command-line applications and functions.

Coordinated acquisition and implementation first university-wide email system (SysM) and created the training program for faculty and staff.

Presented "Security" at the annual SIS Users Conference (1989) addressing policy and procedural concerns of Student Information System security administration and decisions regarding institution-wide information access.
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Manager, Management Information Systems (I.T.) 1988

Chaired SIS Management Group, a university-wide assembly of managers responsible for ongoing management of the student admission, records, financial aid, and bursar systems. (1986-1989)

Developed ad hoc reports and provided staff training on administrative systems.

Dean of Student Records 1984-1987

Project team co-leader (1984-1985) for implementation of university's new administrative system (SIS): determined system defaults, built data tables, oversaw data conversion, coordinated testing, created and coordinated video-based and workshop training for 150+ staff and faculty.

Acting University Registrar 1983

Re-envisioned registration process from one in which students had to visit individual division and administrative offices for each step of the process to one where all divisions and departments and their computer terminals were all together. (Sounds simpler than it actually was – lots of politics)

Director of Admission Records 1979-1982

Worked with SCT (computer services) personnel to streamline admission process workflow and develop first "online" screens for use by office staff.

Coordinated consolidation of the separate university school admission offices under a centralized admission dean.

Admission Office, various entry-level positions 1977-1978

Coordinated acquisition and implementation of the university's first departmental computer system, an IBM System 6, used for contact management of prospective students.

Served as liaison between Admission and SCT, the onsite service bureau that handled all university administrative computing needs.
Other Interests

Musical Director, Songfest 1974, 1976-present
More than just an annual musical variety show, Songfest provides a unique opportunity for student leadership, personal growth, and development of life-long friendships.

Contributed new songs based on the Psalms.

Composer/Musical Director, Twelfth Night spring 2006
Composed musical score and musical directed the performances.

Musical Director, Man of La Mancha fall 2002
Musical directed and conducted the Pepperdine orchestra for performances.

Composer, Millennial Dawn fall 2000
This piece for full orchestra was commissioned and performed for the inauguration of Pepperdine’s seventh president, Andrew K. Benton.

Pepperdine Associates Dinner spring 1991
Co-wrote and musical directed an autobiographical tribute to George Pepperdine for the 1991 annual Associates Dinner.

Church Teen Development
Including and encouraging youth leadership through involvement in worship, fundraisers, and accompanying them on mission trips (e.g. San Felipe and Puebla, Mexico).

Worship Planning/Leading
I believe we should bring our best to the assembly of Christians when we worship, involving not only the use of our gifts but also hearts and minds ready to receive the Word of God and leading of His Spirit. Those who plan and lead parts of
the corporate worship have the added responsibility and privilege of providing a setting and structure that promotes everyone's ability to bring their best.

**Arranging Music for A Cappella Worship**

I have arranged scores of SATB worship songs for use in worship at the Conejo Valley Church of Christ and other congregations.
Education

M.A.  Mass Communication – Journalism. Murray State University in Murray, Kentucky

B.A.  French and Journalism. Harding University in Searcy, Arkansas.

Teaching Experience

• Adjunct professor of public relations, journalism and speech communication 1982–present

Professional Experience


• Copy editor of the Journal of Nutrition, a peer-reviewed scientific periodical, as a half-time research faculty position, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 1978–1981

• Journalism graduate assistant supervising five other graduate assistants’ copy editing of the Murray (Kentucky) State News

• City editor of the Searcy Daily Citizen, the daily newspaper in Searcy, Arkansas 1973–1976

Professional Recognition

• Outstanding Service Award from the Associated Press, Little Rock bureau, for daily reporting from the six-week capital murder trial of Dr. Porter Rodgers – AP stories carried across the United States and in the London Times. 1975

Affiliations/Memberships
• Society of Professional Journalists 1974–2000
• National Communication Association 2001, 2009
EDUCATIONAL SUMMARY:

University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida (1981) Ph.D. in Communication Studies; recognized as one of the 12 Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistants in the university; elected to Phi Kappa Phi.

Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky (1977) M.S. in Speech Communication; awarded a graduate teaching assistantship.

Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas (1974) B.A. in Speech; minor in Political Science

EXPERIENCE

July 1998 – present: Served as NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative

July 1997 – present: Professor of Broadcasting.

July 1996 – July 1997: Interim Dean of the Faculty for Seaver College. Responsible for the academic aspects of Seaver College.

April - July 1994: Acting Dean of Administration for Seaver College. Responsible for coordinating administrative operations within the Dean's office including functions of the Academic
Advising Center, the Cultural Enrichment Center, Educational Technology office, and the Admission and Financial Aid offices.

August 1993 – July 1996: Chairperson of the Communication Division and Professor of Broadcasting.

August 1988 - July 1993: Chairperson of the Communication Division and Associate Professor of Broadcasting. Responsible for the direction of a division with over 600 majors and 30 full-time faculty members. Teach two courses per year.

September 1987 - April 1988: Visiting Professor in Pepperdine University's Year-in-Europe program in London. Taught basic public speaking, small group communication, ethics and values in the mass media and introduction to mass communication. Traveled throughout Britain, Germany, Austria and Italy.

September 1985 – August 1988: Associate Professor of Broadcasting and Manager of Information Programming on Pepperdine University's cable television channels 3 and 6, Malibu, California. Duties include teaching broadcast news, programming and issues courses and supervising the university's cable TV stations.

September 1981 - August 1985: Assistant Professor of Broadcasting and Coordinator of Radio at Pepperdine University, Malibu, California. Duties included teaching beginning and upper division broadcasting courses and supervising the university's cable FM radio station.

May 1981 - June 1981: Instructor, Lake City Florida Community College. Duties included planning and teaching a college credit, prison, extension course in basic communication.

March 1979 - August 1981: Graduate teaching assistant, University of Florida. Duties included teaching sections of public speaking and introductory communication courses. I also served as co-director of the mass lecture section of the basic course.

June 1979 - August 1979: Student assistant in the Editorial Department of the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences at the University of Florida. Duties included producing and duplicating agriculturally-related radio programs, audio production for slide presentations and operation of portable, color, video cameras and electronic video-tape editing equipment.

August 1977 - January 1979: Associate minister and educational director, University Avenue Church of Christ, Gainesville, Florida. Duties of the position included organization and implementation of an educational program, weekly hospital visitation and supervision of a college-aged program. Duties also included teaching a number of classes of students from high school age through adults.

June 1976 - August 1977: Graduate teaching assistant, Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky. My teaching duties included two sections of the basic public speaking course per semester. I had complete responsibility for class material and grades awarded.

October 1976 - May 1977: News announcer for WMSU-TV, Murray, Kentucky. This job required writing and on-air presentation of news and sports for an evening news program.

May 1974 - June 1976: News director for KWCK and KSER radio stations in Searcy, Arkansas. In this position I was responsible for expanding news coverage into six rural counties. We began complete election coverage for the area during the 1974 campaign. I supervised the expansion of the news department from one half-time person to two full-time and three part-time staff members.

April 1973 - April 1974: Station manager for KHCA campus radio station in Searcy, Arkansas. This was a scholarship position in which I worked directly under the faculty advisor. During this time I helped design new studio facilities and recommend equipment purchases. My responsibilities also included staff recruitment and general oversight of station operation.


PRESENTATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

Coordinator/Organizer of the 16th Annual (Southern California) Communication Ethics Conference, Pepperdine University, April 2003.

Respondent to Kimberly Bell's, "Relational Dimensions of Communication between Physicians and Families during End-of-Life Care," presentation at the Seaver College Graduate Student Research Colloquium, November 6, 2001.

Coordinator/Organizer of the 14th Annual (Southern California) Communication Ethics Conference, Pepperdine University, April 2001.
Reviewer of graduate student papers for the 10th Conference on Communication Ethics, Azusa Pacific University, April 1997. Also served on the advisory board for the conference.


Reviewer and critic of graduate student papers at the 7th Conference on Communication Ethics, Azusa Pacific University, March 25, 1994.

Program Chair for "In Hostile Terrain: The Religious Community's Communication with the Broader Culture," presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention in Miami Beach, November 20, 1993.


Reviewer and critic of graduate student papers at the 6th Conference on Communication Ethics, Azusa Pacific University, March 25, 1993.


Reviewer and critic of graduate student papers at the 5th Conference on Communication Ethics, Azusa Pacific University, March 25, 1992.

Reviewer and critic of graduate student papers at the 4th Conference on Communication Ethics, Azusa Pacific University, March 13, 1991.

Panel member, Sears Asian Fellows program, Bonaventure Hotel, Los Angeles, October 13, 1990

Fellow in the Sears Asian Fellows Program for the better understanding of Asian culture, Pepperdine University, 1990-91.


"The Populism of Jimmy Carter Examined," paper presented at the Kentucky Association of
Communication Arts convention in Louisville, Kentucky, September 1977. (co-authored)


Current Research, Artistic, Professional, and Course Development

a. Since teaching the Communication Ethics course, I have begun studying the possible effects of such a course on student lives. I have data from students on the first day of class and comparable data from students on the last day of class to compare.

b. Since teaching a 1st Year Seminar on the development of the television family, I have become interested in a study of the values presented in “family” television programs from the 1950s to the present.

c. I have started a study of primetime television programming comparing critically accepted shows with those high in audience ratings. I plan to also look at content of critically acclaimed programs and highly rated programs.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FARA conference in San Diego, November 2011
NCAA Rules Conference in Tucson, AZ, May 2011
FARA conference in Baltimore, November 2010
Conducted Advising Workshop, Communication Division, August 2007
National Academic Advising Association conference on athletic advising in Colorado Springs, May 2007
NCAA Rules Conference in Denver, May 2007
National Communication Association convention in San Antonio, November 2006; completed workshop on Teaching the College Ethics course.
National Communication Association convention in Boston, November 2005
Faculty Athletics Representative Association (FARA)conference in San Diego, November 2005
NCAA Rules Conference in San Francisco, May 2005
National Communication Association convention in Chicago, November 2004
Helped conduct Program Review workshop, Communication Division, August 2004
Using Blackboard (workshop), Seaver College, June 2004
National Assessment Conference, Honolulu, March 2004
AEJMC national convention, Kansas City, August 2003
Conducted Academic Advising workshop, Seaver College, June 2003
Junior Writing Portfolio workshop, Seaver College, May 2003
Making Time for Good Teaching (workshop), Seaver College, May 2003
Conducted Academic Advising workshop, Seaver College, February 2003
National Communication Association convention, New Orleans, November 2002
Teaching with Rubrics (workshop), Seaver College, July 2002
7th National Communication Ethics Conference, Kalamazoo, MI, May 2002
Faith, Learning and Vocation (workshop), Seaver College, May 2002
National Communication Association convention in Atlanta, November 2001
Technology Workshop, Seaver College, June 2001
Conducting Classroom Observations (workshop), Seaver College, July 2001
Shared Inquiry faculty workshop, Seaver College, June 2001
Organized workshops on Advising and Using Frontpage, Communication Division, May 2001
National Communication Association convention in Seattle, November 2000; completed a shortcourse on Violence in the Media
AEJMC national convention in Phoenix, August 2000; participated in a workshop on Teaching Media Ethics
National Communication Association convention in Chicago, November 1999
AAHE Conference on the Scholarship of Teaching, Washington, DC, March 1999
National Communication Association convention in Chicago, November 1997
Seaver Teaching Scholars Workshop, June 1997
Service Learning Faculty Seminar, Seaver College, May 1997
AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards in San Diego, January 1997
Speech Communication Association convention in San Diego, November 1996
American Council of Academic Deans (Western Region) in Santa Clara, October 1996
Speech Communication Association convention in San Antonio, November 1995
AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards in Boston in June 1995.
AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards in New Orleans in January 1994.
Speech Communication Association convention in Miami Beach, November 1993.
AEJMC convention in Kansas City in August 1993.
Council of Independent Colleges' workshop on Collaborative Learning, Newport Beach, April 1993.
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication convention in Boston, August 1991.
Sears Asian Fellows Program, Seaver College, 1990-91.
Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication winter meeting and conference on assessment, New Orleans, November 1990.

Professional Memberships

Alpha Chi National Honor Society (sponsor) (honorary membership) 2006 to present
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (1979 to 2008)
National Communication Association (formerly Speech Communication Association (1976 to present)
Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society (1981 to present)
American Association for Higher Education (1994-99)
Sigma Delta Chi, Society of Professional Journalists (1977-84)
Southern Speech Communication Association (1979-83)
Florida Speech Communication Association (1979-82)
International Communication Association (1982-86)
Alpha Epsilon Rho Broadcasting Society (1983-90)
Western Speech Communication Association (1985-97)
Association for Communication Administration (1988-97)
Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication (1988-97)
American Council of Academic Deans (1996-97)

**DIVISION, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

**Current:**
- University Tenure Committee (2011-12)
- West Coast Conference FAR Advisory Committee (2009 to present) (Chair 2010 to present)
- Seaver College Rank, Tenure and Promotion committee (2009 to present) (chair 2011-12)
- Seaver College Admission/Financial Assistance Exceptions committee (2005 to present)
- West Coast Conference Executive Council (2005 to present)
- Alpha Chi National Honor Society sponsor (2002 to present)
- NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative (1998 to present)
- Seaver College faculty athletic committee (Chair 2001-2002) (1998 to present)
- Seaver College admissions/scholarship exception committee (2003 to present)
- Communication Division Curriculum committee (chair) (1994-present)
- Divisional Graduate committee (1984-1996, 2004 to present)

**Service Completed:**
- University NCAA Athletic Department Accreditation Steering committee (2006-2008)
- Divisional Faculty Search committees (a member of each search committee from 1988-1997, 2006-2011)
- Payson Library Electronic Resources Council (2005-2007)
- Seaver College Academic Council (1988-2006, 2007-09)
- University Faculty Council (elected) (2002 to 2005)
- President of Seaver Faculty Association (2003-04)
- University Academic Council (2002-04)
COURSES TAUGHT

Current:

COM 400 Communication Ethics (2000-present)
COM 590 Seminar in Communication (1998 to present)
GSCO 199 Freshman Seminar (1992, 1996 to present)
MPRD 550 Entertainment Industry Strategies (2011 to present)

Past Courses:
COM 210        Introduction to Radio, Television, Film (1981-86)
COM 220        Audio Production and Announcing (1981-83)
COM 250        Radio Production (1982)
COM 350        Advanced Radio Production and Programming (1982-84)
COM 604/640    Seminar in Ethics, Values and Legal Foundations (1989-2011)
MSCO 200       Introduction to Mass Communication (1986-89)
SPE 180        Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis (1987, London)
SPE 483        Discussion, Conference and Small Groups (1988, London)
TC 262        Television Production: Sports Announcing (2002 to present)
TC 550        Programming and Policy (2001-2011)
TC 590        Senior Seminar in Telecommunication (1987, 1998-99)

Other Academic Responsibilities:

a. I have between 100 and 150 students assigned to me as advisees. These students include majors in Advertising, Integrated Marketing Communication, Organizational Communication, Public Relations, and Telecommunications. I try to advise as many of our Communication transfer students as possible. In addition to these assigned advisees, I regularly advise other students with special academic problems. As a past division chair many students come to me seeking answers to specialized questions.

b. I usually advise 2-3 graduate students per year. I serve on 3 to 4 thesis committees a year, while I try not to chair more than one thesis per year. In addition, I serve on 5 to 6 comprehensive exam (both oral and written) committees each year.

c. I coordinate our Sports Broadcasting sequence in the Communication Division. This involves teaching a weekly class on sports announcing (Fall, Spring), coordinating announcing crews to cablecast all home men’s and women’s basketball and volleyball games/matches.

d. I supervise internships for students in Advertising, Communication, Integrated Marketing Communication, Public Relations and Telecommunications. Interns work with me Fall, Spring and Summer. In a typical year, I will work with approximately 50-60 interns.
COMMUNITY SERVICE

Ministry coordinator at the Malibu Church of Christ (1984-2004).
Malibu High School assistant softball coach (Spring 2000)
Malibu High School Athletic Booster Club Board of Directors (1998 to 2001)

Coach and manager of a Little League softball team (1992 to 1997). I have coached youth t-ball, basketball and soccer in various age groups since 1985.
Curriculum Vitae

Elizabeth R. Smith, M.A.

1230 Wellesley Ave. Apt. 203 • Los Angeles, CA 90025

Office: (310) 266-8928 • Cell: (310) 266-8928

Email: Elizabeth.smith@pepperdine.edu

Professional Profile

• Accomplished journalism career that has demonstrated consistent success as a professional in the field. Outstanding track record in news, breaking news, local news, and feature reporting.

• Seasoned journalist whose experience includes print, web and broadcast; writing, editing and producing

• Extensive background in journalism/communication higher education

• Extensive experience advising students in award-winning journalism co-curricular programs

Education

• M.A., Intercultural Communication, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, 2003

DISSERTATION: The Dependency of African Americans on Daily Newspapers and the Role of Perceived Bias and the Use of Alternative Media

• B.A., Journalism, Harding University, Searcy, AR, 2000

Academic Honors & Awards

• Emmy Award, Writer, Unplanned Breaking News Event, The Death of Michael Jackson, KTLA, Los Angeles, 2009

• Recipient, Graduate Assistantship Award, Pepperdine University, 2002-2003

• Outstanding Adjunct Professor, Pepperdine University, Spring 2004

• New England Associated Press, Feature Design, 3rd Place, 2001

• Graduated Magna Cum Laude, Harding University, 1996-2000

• Outstanding Journalism Graduate, Harding University, 2000

• Alpha Chi Honors Society, Member, 1997-2000

• Honors College Member, Harding University, 1996-2000
Academic/Teaching Experience

Visiting Professor/Dir. of Student Journalism, Pepperdine University, 2008 to present

- Faculty adviser for all student journalism publications, which includes more than 110 students; teach a variety of journalism and communication courses; serve as academic adviser

Visiting Professor/Faculty Family, Pepperdine International Campus, Florence, Italy, Summer 2010

- Taught intercultural communication course; led weekly convocation lessons; recruited and interviewed students

Adjunct Instructor, Pepperdine University, 2004-2008

- Taught trends in the journalism industry; taught writing, editing and reporting skills

Asst. Director of Student Journalism, Pepperdine University, 2004-2008

- Assisted with advising all student publications; managed operational and scholarship budget

Courses Taught

- JOUR 345, News Reporting and Editing
- JOUR 325, Publication Design
- JOUR 463, Feature and Magazine Writing
- JOUR 469, Critical and Editorial Writing
- JOUR 561, Journalism and Culture
- COM 180, Public Speaking
- COM 205, Story telling in the Media
- COM 400, Communication Ethics
- COM 512, Intercultural Communication
- COM 513, Intercultural Communication: Case Studies

Publications & Presentations

- Panelist, Facebook in the Newsroom, Associated Collegiate Press (Fall 2011)
• Featured Lecturer, Arkansas College Media Association (Spring 2005)


**Professional Experience**

- **Free-lance Writer, Editor, Producer**, Los Angeles, CA, 2004- present

- **Producer, KTLA**, Los Angeles, CA, 2009 to 2011

- **Writer, KTLA**, Los Angeles, CA, 2005 to 2011

- **Web Producer, KTLA**, Los Angeles, CA, 2005 to 2010

- **Copy Editor, Newport Daily News**, Newport, RI, 2000 to 2002

**Professional Development**

**Conferences**

- **Fall National College Media Convention** (annual) 2003 to 2011

- **Spring National College Media Convention** (annual) 2004

- **Intercultural Communication Association**, 2003

**Professional Affiliations**

- **CCMA** (California College Media Association)

- **CMA** (College Media Advisers)

- **ACP** (Associated Collegiate Press)

- **SPJ** (Society of Professional Journalists)

- **AEJMC** (Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication)

**Community Service**

- **Nursery Coordinator, Culver Palms Church of Christ**, Los Angeles, 2008 to present

- **Seventh-grade Sunday School Teacher, Culver Palms**, Los Angeles, Spring 2009

- **Community Service Coordinator, Culver Palms**, Los Angeles, 2005 to 2008

- **Newspaper Adviser, Camp David Gonzales**, Malibu, CA, Spring 2006
Debra L. Widerøe

5470 East Napoleon Avenue  Oak Park, CA  91377

Mobile: (818) 620-3113

E-mail: dwideroe@sbcglobal.net

www.wideroegroup.com

www.neweye.com

http://seaver.pepperdine.edu/academics/faculty/member.htm?facid=debbie_wideroe

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY  Malibu, CA  1999-present

Visiting Professor and Advisor - Communication Division

Director, Internship Program - Communication Division

Director, Randall Internship Program – Communication Division

Presenter and Facilitator, Com Connection

Who’s Who Among America Teachers

Recipient, Community Service Award – 2008

Recipient, Academic Excellence Award-2010

Recipient, Academic Excellence Award-2009

Recipient, Academic Excellence Award-2008

Recipient, Academic Excellence Award-2006

Recipient, Academic Excellence Award-2004

Facilitator – Ethics Conference, 2000

Courses taught include: Advertising Fundamentals, Introduction to Advertising, Public Relations and Integrated Marketing Communications, Advertising Account Planning and Research, Advertising Media, Advertising Campaigns, Market Research, Consumer Behavior, Copywriting/Storyboarding, Broadcast Advertising, Public Relations, Special Event Planning, Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis,
Communication Ethics, Media Management, Survey of Broadcasting, Telecommunications Management and Writing for Screen and Television.

THE WIDEROE GROUP Los Angeles, CA concurrent

Principal

Expertise in marketing solutions within the entertainment industry. Specialization in branding, licensing and merchandising, retail programs, product development, promotional campaigns, celebrity outreach, production of TV, commercials, PSA’s. Coined techniques used by agencies worldwide to pinpoint consumers through “Product-Person Match” and "Exploding the Dot”.

Business Partner/Producer – New Eye Media; producing media that matters for PBS. New Eye is an award winning national, independent production company producing relevant, fresh and authentic programming, covering film and music celebrity, global initiatives, education and sustainability for broadcast and digital media related distribution.

Board of Directors- Westlake Nautical Foundation
Board of Advisors - SpectrumDNA
Board of Advisors - Malibu Wine Trail Tour
Board of Directors - Lokal Yokal

MULTI-MEDIA PROMOTIONS, INC. Westlake Village, CA 1983-2001

President and CEO

Founded and managed a full service creative marketing and advertising firm. Developed award-winning campaigns for clients worldwide. Spearheaded projects for key clients, licensees and the major entertainment studios; including Frontier Communications, Best Buddies, American Airlines, Hamilton Projects, MGM, Sony Signatures, Spelling Entertainment, Twentieth Century FOX and Warner Bros.

Marketing Role

• Developed and implemented overall marketing strategies, positioning, multi-media marketing, promotional opportunities and strategic sales tactics.
• Directed marketing efforts for a myriad of corporate clients; creating consumer products, business-to-business marketing, corporate identity packages, synergistic branding programs and sales training materials.
• Oversaw advertising and promotional venues, advertising placement and direct response programs.
• Directed in-house and outside creative teams on all marketing and creative efforts including writing and producing commercials, QVC spots, print ads, sell sheets, brochures, newsletters, posters, press kits, EPK, videos, Internet and direct response.

Creative Communications

• Developed and pitched programs, licensing proposals and negotiated agreements.
• Collaborated with clients and licensors to develop brands and translate product strengths into market appeal, sales and promotional opportunities.
• Maintained strategic relationships with clients and high profile non-profit organizations.
• Columnist - KidScreen Magazine
• Speaker - Authority on children’s television and marketing

Product Development

• Oversaw development of all consumer products, packaging, in-store POS materials, island displays, kiosks, signage and product guidelines, maintaining the integrity of the brand.

WARNER BROS. CONSUMER PRODUCTS Burbank, CA 1997-1999

Executive Director, Marketing

Responsible for development and direction of the multi-billion dollar global marketing efforts for the Looney Tunes, Baby Looney Tunes, Animaniacs, Pinky & The Brain and Tiny Toon Adventures in the U.S., Europe, Middle East, Asia and Africa.

Marketing Role

• Developed and managed implementation of worldwide marketing efforts, strategic marketing and public relations plans, sales materials, research objectives, new branding initiatives and product packaging.
• Directed the International offices to ensure brand continuity and global growth.
• Collaborated with all of the Warner Bros. divisions, i.e. Six Flags, Home Video, Theatrical, Publishing, WB Online and Studio Stores, to identify, create and direct synergistic brand opportunities and multi-media vehicles for building brand exposure.
• Spearheaded integrated programs with global licensees, Warner Bros. divisions and internal departments to facilitate product development, sales and marketing execution.
• Helped give birth to the Baby Looney Tunes brand: creating the very first animation, sound bytes and music.
• Represented Warner Bros. corporate with their master toy licensee; overseeing their major print ads and commercial productions. Helped develop their toy into the “Toy of the Year 1998”.
• Developed brand building marketing programs and promotions for the Big 6 retailers (Sears, J.C. Penney, Target, Walmart, Toys R Us, Kmart).

Product Development:
- Developed unique art programs and style guides for use by all licensees in all product categories.
- Worked with major licensees on product development.
- Directed outside advertising agencies on all creative elements.
- Approved all artwork and programs, ensuring brand continuity.

CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY


School of Business/Communication Division

Director, MBA Program/Assistant Professor

Managed graduate business school program, course and curriculum development, faculty selection and evaluation, marketing and public relations effort. Ongoing adjunct teaching for CLU until 2002.

- Served as department head in marketing and advertising area
- Directed the MBA Program, managing professors and staff at three educational centers.
- Led award winning General Motors Project: received national recognition for CLU, as well as first prize for creation of nationwide college campaign.
- Developed Advertising Campaigns and Broadcast Advertising courses. Taught a variety of marketing, advertising, public relations and special event courses throughout my tenure.

Board Advisor - Ad Club of Los Angeles

Board Advisor - Ad Club of Ventura County

KATV -TV

Little Rock, AR 1986-1988

Director of Public Relations and Corporate Communications

Spearheaded the launch of Group W’s most successful For Kids’ Sake (FKS) television campaign. Managed and developed programming, marketing, promotion, advertising, fund raising, sales and public relations efforts targeted to children and teens.

- Wrote and produced award-winning FKS television specials, promos, PSA’s and news segments.
- Received awards from the State, as well as national recognition for these pro-social efforts.

Vice President – National Broadcast Association for Community Affairs (NBACA)

Columnist – Sunshine Family Magazine

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO 1985-1986 Adjunct
Professor

- Created media workshops, seminars and led extension courses for LAUSD teachers.

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY Malibu, CA 1984-1985

Adjunct Professor, Communication Division

Education

HARVARD UNIVERSITY Cambridge, MA

Ed.M, Concentration in human development
Emphasis in children's television marketing
Phi Delta Kappa honors
Member, Harvard Media Club

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHridge Northridge, CA

B.A., Liberal Studies, emphasis in Communications
Summa Cum Laude

U.C.L.A. Los Angeles, CA

Studied Journalism and Communications

Associations

Active as both a member and leader in selected civic, professional and non-profit
Respected leader in using communications to contribute to organizational effectiveness. Experienced in global communications, mergers and acquisitions, change management, multivehicle campaigns, and leadership coaching. Skilled in building and implementing communication plans that deliver strategic messaging through electronic, print and interpersonal tactics. Seasoned manager, team leader, and facilitator.

OBJECTIVE

Contribute talents, skills and experience to the mission of a worthwhile institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPABILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee surveys/research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design/execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/classroom delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/editing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPERIENCE

**ADJUNCT PROFESSOR, PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY**  
**AUGUST 2009 TO PRESENT**

Instructor in Communications Division of Seaver College for upper-level courses in Public Relations.

**MINISTER, RICHARDSON EAST CHURCH OF CHRIST**  
**NOVEMBER 2005 TO PRESENT**

Served as minister of spiritual development for my church in Richardson, Tex. Responsibilities included designing and implementing strategies for adult spiritual formation, consulting with church leadership on strategic communications, coordinating adult classes and small-groups, and mentoring volunteer-led ministries.

**COMMUNICATIONS PROJECT MANAGER**  
**MAY 2003 TO OCTOBER 2005**

I am assigned through Aquent, an international communications contracting firm, to the Texas Instruments Communications Services group. I serve as a senior project manager for the HR Communications team, designing internal campaigns and managing a range of publications and promotional materials for TI's benefit programs.

**POSITIONS AT TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED (1982-2002)**
Director, Mergers & Acquisitions Communications April 2000 - March 2002

Led internal and external communications processes for mergers & acquisitions (M&A) from pre-announcement to final integration.

- Worked with business units to assess needs, build strategic communication plans, implement tactics, and evaluate effectiveness
- Led communication teams on five acquisitions, addressing branding issues, organization realignments, management changes, and benefits programs
- Integrated the efforts of communication functions into unified processes
- Reported to senior vice president for Communications & Investor Relations
- Member of company’s senior-level Communications Leadership Team.

Retired in April 2002.


While leading the internal communications group, assumed additional responsibility for the Communication department’s support of mergers and acquisitions.

- Designed and implemented new communications processes to help rapidly integrate key acquisitions
- Assembled virtual project teams from marketing communications, media relations, and internal communications
- Managed 19-member Worldwide Internal Communications team
- Fiscal responsibility approximately $1.6 million annually


As senior leader for TI’s internal communications efforts, ensured that communications to TI people contributed to successful business operations.

- Directed strategic planning and daily operations of TI’s global employee communications network
- Led staff of 11 in internal company communications, executive face-to-face communication events, employee surveys/research and Human Resources communications
- Guided a network of 12 site-level print publications, managed corporate Intranet sites, coordinated U.S.-wide communication campaigns
- Designed and implemented successful strategic-communication programs for:
  - corporate restructuring
  - company vision/mission
  - War for Talent initiative
  - HR programs/policies
  - first U.S.-wide universal drug testing by major corporation.
Employee Relations Representative, Semiconductor Group, Dallas  

Coordinated human resources support for a variety of high-technology manufacturing, engineering, and sales operations. Worked with managers, supervisors and employees on full range of HR issues, including complex benefit programs, resolution of employee grievances and workforce reductions.

Site Employee Communications & Employee Relations Representative, 
Consumer Products Division, Lubbock, Texas  
Oct. 1982 – May 1986

Responsible for employee communications and various aspects of employee relations for 2,000-person manufacturing site.

Site Newspaper Editor, TI Consumer Products Division, Lubbock  
March 1982 – Sept. 1982

Hired as part-time temporary employee to revive the site employee publication. Offered permanent position six months later.

LUBBOCK CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY (1980 – 1982)

Served as admissions counselor and director of student publications. Responsibilities included teaching introductory communications courses, supervising student staffs for campus publications, and implementing recruiting strategies.

EDUCATION

Master of Business Administration, Wayland Baptist University, Plainview, Texas, 1989

Bachelor of Science, business communication, Lubbock Christian University, Lubbock, Texas, 1980

ACTIVITIES OF NOTE


- Instructor, Managing Communications in Organizations & Projects, University of Texas at Dallas Project Management Certification program (2000-2003)

- Leader in local church (before joining staff), including teaching adult Bible classes and leading volunteer ministries.
Michael H. Murrie

Home:

- 6645 Gross Ave., West Hills (Los Angeles), CA 91307, 818-932-7954

Office:

- Communication Division, Pepperdine University, 24255 Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu, CA 90263  Michael.Murrie@Pepperdine.edu  Office: 310-506-7523. Fax: 301-506-4411

Education

- Ph.D., Southern Illinois University at Carbondale: Major, Journalism including mass media theory, research methods, instructional design, 1998.


Professional Experience
• Professor, Communication Division, Pepperdine University, since 1999.

• Director Student Journalism, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, 2004-2007.

• Acting Chair, Department of Radio-Television, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, Illinois, 1999.

• Director, Graduate Studies, Department of Radio-Television, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1996 - 1999.

• Associate Professor, Department of Radio-Television, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1992 - 1999.

• Acting Director, New Media Center, College of Mass Communication and Media Arts, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1996.

• Assistant Professor, Department of Radio-Television, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1988 - 1992.

• Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Journalism, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, 1986-1988.

• Producer, Assistant News Director/Assignment Editor, KSDK Television, St. Louis, Missouri, 1977-1986.

• News Producer, KOCO-TV, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1977.

• News Producer, Campaign and Election Producer, Weekend Anchor, Reporter, KOMU-TV, Columbia, Missouri, 1976.

• Television Coordinator, Westark Community College Vietnamese Education Program, Fort Chaffee, Fort Smith, Arkansas, 1975.


Teaching Experience

Teaching interests and courses taught:
• Television news production, reporting
• Video field production
• News writing for all media
• Media and society
• Introductory cross media skills course (Web, video, text)
• Online news writing and production
• Influences on media content; media bias
• Non-dramatic performance for radio and television

Teaching grants:
• Summer Student Undergraduate Research grants, Pepperdine University, 2010, 2002
• Cross Disciplinary/Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Research (CDIUR) grants, Pepperdine University, 2005, 2008
• Teaching Fellowship, SIUC, to develop digital video course for non-majors, 1998.
• Director/instructor, Voice of America, Hungarian TV News Workshops, SIUC, 1998-97.
• Teaching Fellowship, SIUC, to develop materials for new college core course, 1994.
• Teaching Fellow in Broadcast Journalism, The Poynter Institute for Media Studies, St. Petersburg, Florida, 1990.
• Teaching Workshop, Writing Across the Curriculum, Ohio Wesleyan University, 1986
Teaching awards:

- Outstanding Teacher, College of Mass Communication and Media Arts, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1995
- Outstanding Teacher, Department of Radio-Television, 1992

Other teaching experience:

- Advisor, Newswaves (student newscast), Pepperdine University, since 1999.
- Director of student journalism and primary advisor, Graphic (student newspaper), Pepperdine University, 2004-2007.
- Visiting Professor, Seaver College London International Program, 2007-2008.
- Undergraduate advising, Pepperdine University, since 1999.
- Advisor for multimedia minor and multimedia contract major students, since 2000.
- Chair, committee member, more than 30 masters theses and projects, Pepperdine and SIUC, since 1991; committee member for two doctoral dissertation committees, SIUC, 1998-99.
- Guest lecturer, Handong University, Pohong, South Korea, 2006.
- Curriculum Consultant, Department of Media Studies, University of Botswana, 2005.
- Director/instructor, Voice of America, Hungarian TV News Workshops, SIUC, 1997-98
- Instructor, video workshop, Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt, 1991, 1994
- Director/Instructor, Grass Roots Video Workshops, Department of Radio-Television and Division of Continuing Education, SIUC, 1992-93.
- Guest lecturer, television news technology, American University, Cairo, Egypt, 1991.
- Adjunct instructor, broadcast writing, Maryville College, St. Louis, Missouri, 1984.

University Service

Pepperdine University
• Seaver College Faculty Association, president 2011-12; executive committee, since 2010, 2002-2004, 2005-2006.
• University Faculty Council, since 2010.
• University Planning Committee, 2010-2011.
• Seaver College International Programs Council, 2008-11.
• Seaver General Education Assessment Committee, 2008-2009.
• Seaver Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force, since 2006.
• Seaver Student Discipline Committee, 2006-07, 2009-2010.
• Communication Division, Graduate Committee, since 2000.
• Communication Division, Comm Connection, conference planning committee, 2002-2006.
• Communication Division, Assessment and Program Review Committee, 2003.
• Communication Division, chair, search committee, 2002-2003; also served on search committees 2004-2007.
• Communication Division, rank, tenure, promotion guidelines committee, 2001

Southern Illinois University


SIUC College of Mass Communication and Media Arts:

• Chair, Graduate Curriculum Committee, 1997; member 1996-1998.
• Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, 1993-1995.
• Promotion and Tenure Committee, 1993-94.
• Phoenix Committee (developed original proposal for new college), 1992-93.
• Chair, Symposium Program Committee, Communications: Shaping a Global Society, 1993.

SIUC Department of Radio Television:

• Graduate Committee, 1993-1999.
• Vice-chair, Equipment/Facilities Committee, 1992-95.
• Chair, Service and Development Committee, 1989-1992.
Professional Service

Professional associations:

- Member, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Radio-Television Division, since 1987.
- Member, College Media Advisers, 2004-2007, since 2009.
- Member, Radio Television News Association of Southern California, since 2009.
- Member, Online News Association, since 2009.
- Member, Radio Television News Association of Southern California, since 2008.
- Member, National Communication Association, 2008-2010.
- Member, Interactive Multimedia Association, 1994-97.

Honors:

- Emmy for Best News Broadcast, St. Louis Chapter of National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, 1985.

Consultantships:

• Consultant for startup community information services, videotex news, online industry situation analysis, and public relations. VisionLink, Carbondale, Illinois, 1989.

Other academic and professional service:
• Associate coordinator, APTRA Academy at Pepperdine University, Associated Press Television Radio Association, annually since 2000.
• Judge, Mark Twain Awards, Associated Press Television and Radio Association, 2010-2012.
• Screener, Online Journalism Award for the Online News Association, 2009-2010.
• Reviewer, competitive papers, World Journalism Education Congress, 2007.
• Judge, Documentary Division, Broadcast Education Association, 1995.
• Judge, Milwaukee Press Club Awards, 1994.
• Discussant, Communication Technology and Policy Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, national convention, Atlanta, August, 1994.

Community Service
• Elder chair, Conejo Valley Church of Christ, Thousand Oaks, California, elder since 2005, member since 2000.
• Ambassador, OneLegacy, organ donation procurement agency in Southern California. Speak to meetings, classes and workshops of medical professionals and students about organ donation experience, since 2004.
• Volunteer, Valley Trauma Center, social service agency, Van Nuys, CA. Audio visual assistance and
other occasional volunteer activities, 2009-2011.

- Choir, St. Paul’s Onslow Square (Holy Trinity Brompton) Anglican Church, South Kensington, London, UK, 2007-08.
- Member, President's Council, Harding University, 2001-2007.
- Commissioner, Communication and Technology Commission, City of Calabasas, California, 2000-2003.
- Foster parent of one child, Ohio Child and Family Services, Columbus, Ohio, 1988.
- Board president, Butler Hill Church of Christ, St. Louis County, Missouri, 1982-1986.
- Secretary, Bernard School PTA, St. Louis County, Missouri, 1984-1986.
- Deacon, McKnight Road Church of Christ, Rock Hill, Missouri, 1981-1982.

**Scholarship**

**Research/creative activity interests and specialties:**

- Video production
- Presentation of news, especially video and local news, on the World Wide Web
- Viewer elaboration in cognitive processing of interactive video
- Applications of new communication technologies, especially those related to high definition television, digital television, interactive television, or broadband Internet
- Television news technologies including newsroom automation and Web news
- Influences on media content and news bias
- News and mental health; news and crime
- Use of software for content analysis and experiments (ATLAS, QDA Miner, Wordstat, MediaLab)

**Dissertation:** 782

**Monographs:**


**Chapters in Books:**


**Grants (principle initiator)**

• Initiated contact and worked with staff to acquire $100,000+ worth of studio sets and equipment from KCBS-KCAL-TV, 2007.
• $6500 in travel and other support from Radio Television News Directors Foundation to participate in Excellence in Broadcast Journalism Education Project including faculty internship in Web news at WGAL-TV, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 2001.
• $8000 in travel and other support from the Radio Television News Directors Foundation to visit Web news sites for monograph (invited), 2000-01.

**Grants (participant and unfunded applications)**

• Development of informational/instructional videos regarding HOPE Probation, Honolulu, Hawaii, with Prof. Angela Hawken, Pepperdine School of Public Policy. Department of Justice grant proposal accepted. Since 2011.
• Development of high definition video about Grunion with Prof. Karen Martin (P.I.) $37,000 funded by National Geographic Society and California Coastal Commission. Some video has appeared on National Geographic site and a few television programs (see productions below).
Completed video is presented at Cabrillo Aquarium in Los Angeles and accepted at four California film festivals. Efforts are underway to place at television outlets. Since 2009.

- Development of diabetes prevention telenovela with Prof. Susan Helm (P.I.) and others, $35,000 from Wood-Claeyssens Foundation, 2008. Next phase of cooking workshops, video and Web site is underway with new funding, $50,000 from McKesson sources, 2011.
- Worked with chair and engineer to acquire $125,000+ in video production equipment from John Bell, retiring producer and underwater photographer.

**Presentations of peer reviewed papers at academic conferences:**

International Communication and International Conflict, panel of the annual conference of the International Association for Mass Communication, Sao Paulo, Brazil, August, 1992.


**Invited presentations at academic and professional conferences:**

- Panelist, Cool Tools and Ones to Avoid, Broadcast Education Assn. Las Vegas, April, 2005.
- Panelist, From Carbondale to Cyberdale, Business Development Center, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1998.
- Speaker, Affordable Digital News Video, NBC Newschannel Digital Summit, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1997.
- Panelist, Keeping Up With Technology in TV News Production Courses, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, national convention, Kansas City, 1993.
- Panelist, Teaching Broadcast Journalism in the Year 2000 and Beyond, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, national convention, Boston, 1991.
Articles in Encyclopedias (CD ROM):


Articles in professional/trade publications:

- Murrie, Michael; Focus, RTNDA Communicator, monthly technology summaries, 2002-2004.
- Murrie, Michael; “New Technology Brings Live Coverage of the War in Iraq”, RTNDA Communicator, May, 2003, pp. 6, 8
- Murrie, Michael; “The World at Your Fingertips”; RTNDA Communicator, July/August, 2001
- Murrie, Michael; “RTNDA Gets Serious about the Web”; Television Broadcast, October, 2000, p. 22.
- Murrie, Michael; “DTV R&D Offers Hope to Clean Up Reception”; Television Broadcast, July, 2000, pp.9, 16.
- Murrie, Michael; Compression Dilemma: MPEG or DV?, Television Broadcast, June, 2000, p.72.
- Murrie, Michael; “LA AFTRA Seeks Adoption of Airborne Standards”, Television Broadcast, June,
2000, p.25.
- Murrie, Michael; “Meet the New Competition”, RTNDA Communicator, April, 2000, p.12.
- Murrie, Michael; "News is the News at NAB,” Television Broadcast, March, 1997, p. 70.
• Murrie, Michael; "Audiences Go Online," Television Broadcast, June, 1994, p. 28.
• Murrie, Michael; "KIRO's Third Avenue Productions Seeks Satellite Viewers," Television Broadcast, April, 1994, p. 5.
• Murrie, Michael; "RTNDA/SBE Digs Into the Information Age," Television Broadcast, October, 1993, pp. 1, 25.
• Murrie, Michael; "Westcountry Revolutionizes Xmission," Television Broadcast, October, 1993, p. 36.
• Murrie, Michael; "In Wire Wars, Newsrooms Win," Television Broadcast, October, 1993, p. 40.
• Murrie, Michael; "Pro-scan Cams: To Be or Not to Be?" Television Broadcast, August, 1993, p. 23.
• Murrie, Michael; "What Business Is Television?" Television Broadcast, June, 1993, p. 46.
• Murrie, Michael; "Servers, Editors and Backhaulers Dominate NAB," Television Broadcast, June, 1993, p. 20.
Murrie, Michael; "Telephones Discussed at RTNDA as the Possible Wave of Future TV Newscasts," *Television Broadcast*, November, 1992, p. 29.
Murrie, Michael; "Is DNG the Next Big Trend?" *Communicator*, June, 1992, pp. 11-13.
Murrie, Michael; "New Reasons to Caption Local Newscasts," *Television Broadcast*, August,
• Murrie, Michael; "Linking up with Fiber Optic ENG," Television Broadcast, October, 1990, pp. 30, 31.
• Murrie, Michael; "Sikes Predicts Broadband Delivery," Television Broadcast, September, 1990, p. 28.
• Murrie, Michael; "Computer Cub Reporter: Newsroom Computers, Online Databases are where newspapers are scooping TV," Television Broadcast, September, 1990, pp. 16, 19.
• Murrie, Michael; "Courts Send Mixed Signals on Cameras," Television Broadcast, August, 1990, pp. 16, 19.
• Murrie, Michael; "If We Could Talk to the Newscast: Interactive TV," Television Broadcast, July, 1990, pp. 22, 41.
• Murrie, Michael; "Small Format Forays: S-VHS, Hi8 Formats Get the Nod from First Field Acquisition Applications," Television Broadcast, March, 1989, pp. 20, 22.
• Murrie, Michael; "Newsroom Computer We'd Like to See," Television Broadcast, January, 1990, pp. 12, 16.
• Murrie, Michael; "Big Brother Wants Your Home Video," Television Broadcast, December, 1989, pp. 14, 16.
1989.

- Murrie, Michael; "Whose Video Is This Anyway?" Television Broadcast, September, 1989, pp. 14, 16.
- Murrie, Michael; "In Synch: From the Campus", RTNDA Communicator, August, 1989, pp. 41, 42.
- Murrie, Michael; "Station SNG Vans Pitch in to Beam '89 Baseball Season's First Pitches", Television Broadcast, April, 1989, p. 1.
- Murrie, Michael; "Spanish Cable News 24 Hours", Television Broadcast, August, 1988; p. 8.
- Murrie, Michael; "Electronic Databases in the Newsroom", Linkup, March/April, 1988; p.27.
Book, video and database reviews:

- Murrie, Michael; "Taming the Online Beast", Linkup, July/August, 1989, pp. 18-20.

Productions:

- Murrie, Michael, faculty advisor, NewsWaves, twice weekly student newscast, TV32 (Charter Cable / Verizon Fios Education Channels), Malibu, CA, since 1999.
- Murrie, Michael, producer, video, writer, HOPE Probation, informational video about effective corrections program in Honolulu, Hawaii (http://vimeo.com/27207235).
- Murrie, Michael, director of photography, Surf, Sand and Silversides: The California Grunion, educational video for aquariums, television and public screenings; screened at San Francisco Ocean Film Festival, Temecula Valley International Festival, SoCal Film Festival, Huntington Beach, Los Angeles City Cinema Festival, first place, short documentary; see Grants and Honors sections above, 2011.
- Murrie, Michael, producer, editor, faculty advisor, 45th State Assembly District Debate, Calabasas TV3, Calabasas, CA; Pepperdine University TV 26, Charter Cable, Malibu, CA; Adelphia Public Access, portions of Ventura and Los Angeles Counties, CA, 2002
- Murrie, Michael, moderator, Inside Television News, documentary/interview program, WSIU-TV, April, 1990.
- Murrie, Michael, producer, Eyewitness News, twice-daily newscast, KOCO-TV, Oklahoma City,

• Murrie, Michael, producer, *Missouri Decision ’76*, primary election campaign coverage and election night coverage, instant special on senate candidate fatal plane crash, KOMU-TV, Columbia, Missouri, August, 1976.


• Koupal, Pam; Murrie, Michael (co-producer) & Jacober, Ron; *Celebration*, sports special program, KSDK Television, St. Louis, Missouri, 1982.

• Neff, Chuck, producer, and Murrie, Michael (writer); *A Dream for the Future*, promotional video, Chuck Neff Communications, Creve Coeur, Missouri, 1986.


CURRENT – Producer/Director/Writer


“Offering” – Feature film thriller in preproduction with Media 8.

“Car Whisperer” – New automotive reality series on PBS. Partnered with team from “Dog Whisperer”.

“MyCar/Green Tech Automotive” – A music video-style sales film and corporate image film for GTA, a new American car company, which will produce “green” cars in Mississippi. Client is Terry McAuliffe, former head of DNC.

“SS United States: Made In America” – (working title) Sequel to Public TV national special on the plight of the SS United States. SS United States Conservancy.


Adjunct Professor: UCLA Extension and Pepperdine – Teaching undergrad and postgraduate classes including, “The Business of the Documentary”, “Producing Documentaries”, and a "Directing Workshop”.

FEATURE FILMS – Director

Shot on location in Atlanta.

“The Substitute 3” – HBO World Premiere Movie starring Treat Williams. Shot on location in Salt Lake City. For Artisan Entertainment.

“TNT” – HBO World Premiere Movie starring Eric Roberts, Olivier Gruner, Randy Travis. For Interlight Pictures.


“Best of the Best II” – Sequel to “Best of the Best”, starring Eric Roberts, Wayne Newton, Ralf Moeller, Meg Foster, Christopher Penn, and Phillip Rhee. Distributed by 20th Century Fox. Theatrical release on 1300 screens. Filmed on location in Las Vegas and Los Angeles. Shipped 275,000 video units worldwide.


TELEVISION – Director

“Lady In Waiting” – National PBS Special about the plight of America’s historic superliner, the SS United States – the fastest passenger ship in the world since 1952. Presenting station, WTTW (Chicago Public TV) Top rated on PBS

“V.I.P.” – Directed multiple episodes. One hour syndicated action series starring Pamela Anderson. For Columbia Tristar.

“Soldier of Fortune” – Directed four episodes of this one hour syndicated action series for Jerry Bruckheimer/Rysher Entertainment, including the pilot episode.

“Hercules” – Directed one hour syndicated series for Renaissance Pictures/Universal.

“18 Wheels of Justice” – Directed one hour syndicated action series starring Lucky Vanous. TNN Network/Stu Segall Productions.

“Air America” – Directed two-part Pilot episode for Franklin/Waterman Productions. Stu Segall Producer


“Mighty Morphin Power Rangers” – Directed over 30 episodes for Saban Entertainment/Fox Family Channel.


“I'll Do It Guy's Way” – Directed an HBO/Cinemax Comedy Experiment (30 min.) comedy film featuring Tim Stack, Jon Lovitz, and the Groundlings.


“LA Heat” – Directed this one hour syndicated action series episode for PM Entertainment.


MUSIC VIDEOS – Producer/Director/Writer

Jackson Browne “Tender Is The Night” (Elektra Records) featuring Daryl Hannah

Crosby, Stills & Nash “Southern Cross” (Atlantic Records)
Survivor “I Can’t Hold Back” (Epic Records)

Graham Nash “Innocent Eyes” (Atlantic Records) features John Ritter & Jenny Sullivan

Bill Medley (Righteous Brothers) “You’ve Lost That Lovin’ Feeling” and “I’m Gonna Be Strong” (MCA/Curb Records)

Stray Cats “Look At That Cadillac!” (EMI-America Records) (Editing only)

The Doors Filmed in Paris for The Doors Anthology DVD

“The Karate Kid” (Columbia Pictures) – “movie video” from the film “Karate Kid” featuring the music of Survivor ("Moment of Truth")

“War Games” (MGM/UA Pictures) – “movie video” from the film “War Games” featuring the music of Crosby, Stills & Nash ("War Games")

“Christine” (Columbia Pictures) – “movie video” from the film “Christine” featuring the music of George Thorogood ("Bad To The Bone")

“Bizet's Carmen” (Columbia Pictures) – the world’s first classical movie video featuring Placido Domingo and Julia Migenes

Mickey Gilley “Doo Wah Days” (Epic Records)

Stacy Lattisaw “Nail It To The Wall” (Motown Records)

INFORMATIONAL – PROMOS – COMMERCIALS - Director/Producer

“Ford Mustang 5.0 – Drifting Tejon Ranch in 3D” – Ford’s first 3D car commercial.
Premiered with Thor in 3D. Stars drift champion, Vaughn Gittin, Jr.

“Los Angeles Times Movie Theater Trailer Campaign” – Developed, wrote, produced and directed series of movie trailers entitled “Southern California – Where Anything Is Possible” for theatrical display in California. Series designed to update the Times’ image.

“Not Your Daughter’s Jeans” (Producer/Director) – Fashion infomercial for use in Nordstroms, Macy’s, Dillards, AOL, Yahoo online.

Car and Driver Video Magazine – Directed instructional videos about high speed driving techniques with Emerson Fittipaldi and Richard Petty.


Chrysler “Full Line Image” commercials – for BBDO, Detroit - Featuring complete model line. 1 (30 sec.) and 1 (60 sec.). Nation dealer spots/“Full Line” campaign.

Dodge Dakota Trucks “Dodge Boys” commercials – three (30 sec.) and 3 (15 sec.) national dealer ads for the Dakota truck campaign. Produced & directed by Radler Films for BBDO, Detroit.


Business Week – Developed, wrote, produced and directed a home video Careers series, featuring the Groundlings.

“A Special Place” - promotional film for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts featuring Governor Mike Dukakis, Leonard Nimoy, Arlo Guthrie.

Numero Uno Pizza Commercials – two (30 sec.) and 2 (10 sec.) comedy spots introducing Numero Uno’s new Pasta dishes.

“Building Baltimore’s Best” (City of Baltimore and Rapid Transit District)
Environmental impact report dealing with the impact of subway construction on the people of Baltimore.

“Marathon Man” (Polaroid Corporation) – motivational film for annual stockholder's meeting, featuring the Boston Marathon.


“Memory Tales” – (Clearpoint Research Corporation) – Corporate image/educational video presentation dealing with computer memory in high-reliability applications.

“Cardsettes” – a series of music video greeting cards (“Birthday”, Christmas” etc.) designed for the home video market – nationwide.

Unitarian Universalist PSA's – Four spots on First Amendment Freedoms, Overeating, Child Abuse, and Gun Control.

“Regenerate PSA/ Help Me” - Produced and mentored this “by youth/for youth” production. Winner, Georgia State Univ. Film Festival, Chicago Festival.

Kleen Kitty Plus – National kitty litter commercials for Cabot Agency, Boston

Produced when working at Equinox Films/New York (various positions)

“Metallic Tales” (Aluminum Association) - prototype comedy/industrial sales and image film. Numerous awards including Bronze Hugo.


Mobil Oil - series of "soft news spots" about the environmental impact of oil drilling on America's coastline.

“Motel” - short subject film (awarded First Prize at six Film Festivals, including Mannheim, Edinburgh, Oakland)

“Wolftrap Farm Park” – For the National Park Service.
EDUCATIONAL SUMMARY:


ACADEMIC SUMMARY:

Chair, Communication Division, June 2010-present.

Professor of Journalism, 2003-present.

Blanche E. Seaver Professor of Communication, 2006-2011.

Director, Student Journalism, 2007-2009.

Associate Professor, Pepperdine University, 1993-2002.

Visiting Faculty, Pepperdine University Lausanne program, 2009-2010; Pepperdine University London program, summer 2002 and academic year 1994-1995.
Assistant Professor, Pepperdine University, 1990-1993.

**COURSES TAUGHT AT PEPPERDINE:**

**Communication**
Communication Theory
Communication Ethics
Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis
Intercultural Communication
First-year Seminar (“Media Ethics” and “Understanding Christian Media” are most recent topics)

**Mass Communication**
Introduction to Mass Communication
Writing for the Mass Media
Philosophy and Effects of the Mass Media

**Public Relations**
Public Relations Techniques and Campaigns
Public Relations Management

**Journalism**
Introduction to Journalism
News Reporting
Public Affairs Reporting
Editorial and Critical Writing
Feature Writing
News Communication Technologies Seminar

**ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS:**


ACADEMIC PRESENTATIONS:

Education in Journalism and Mass Communication at their annual meeting, St. Louis, August 2011.


“The TARES Test as an Ethical Analysis Tool: Assessing the Ethicality of Direct Response Television Programs,” (Co-authored with graduate student Jamie Melton). Paper presented to the media ethics division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication at their annual meeting, San Francisco, August 2006.


(With Mike Jordan), "High School Newspapers in California: A Blueprint for Improvement,” presented to the Scholastic Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, annual meeting, Anaheim, CA, 1996.


“The Short Life of the National Courier: Christian Journalism’s Finest Hour?” presented to the History Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Montreal, Canada, 1992.

BOOK REVIEWS:


**WORKS IN PROGRESS:**


**PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS:**


**GRANTS AND PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES:**

* I regularly attend the annual meetings of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication and the National Communication Association.

*Attendee, Collegiate Press Association annual meeting, Kansas City, October 2008.


*University research grants, 1994 and 1996.


* Student, Teaching Communication Ethics pre-conference seminar before the annual meeting of the Association for Journalism and Mass Communication, Phoenix, 1999.


*Attendee, Teaching Scholars workshop, 1997.

*Attendee, Faculty Technology seminar, 1997.


**SERVICE TO THE COMMUNICATION DIVISION:**

*Chair, Communication Division, June 2010-present.

* When I’m teaching a first-year seminar, I also advise the 18 freshman.

* I oversee about a dozen student internships per year.

* I occasionally serve as chair of a thesis committee, or as a committee member, in our master's program in communication. To date, I have chaired or co-chaired four thesis committees, and served on seven others. I am currently on two thesis committees and will chair two MS exam committees this year.

* I have served as a committee member on several committees that revised Communication Division curriculum during the late 1990s. I am currently on the division's curriculum committee and an ad hoc committee e re-configuring the mass communication, journalism and telecommunications majors.

**SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY:**

*Member, Seaver Academic Council, June 2010-present.

*Member, University Academic Council, September 2011-present.
* Member, Seaver Assessment Leadership team, September 2010-present.

* Visiting Professor, Pepperdine University Lausanne program, 2009-2010.

* Chair, Communication Division faculty search committees (hired 3 faculty in 2010; currently conducting searches for two or three more).

* Author, Communication Division Five Year Assessment Review, 2011-2012. This includes writing substantial portions of two program assessment reviews, sections on co-curricular and internship activities the past five years, and writing the 20 to 30-page division summary and “closing the loop” sections.

* Member, Dean’s Research Council, 2003; 2006-present.

* Member, Seaver College Credits Committee, 2002-present.

* Member, Faculty-Staff Scholarship Committee, 2007-present.


* Member, Search Committee for Communication Division chair, 2003.

* Member, Communication Division Curriculum Committee, 1999-2005.

* President-elect, President and Past-President, Seaver College Faculty Association, 1997-1999.

* Member, University Faculty Committee, 1997-1999.

* Member, University Benefits Committee, 1998-1999.

* Member, Seaver College Dean’s Search Committee, 1998.

* Member, Seaver College Associate Dean’s Search Committee, 1997.

* Member, Communication Division Graduate Committee, 1995-1997.

* Secretary/Treasurer, Faculty Organization of Seaver College, 1994.

* Member of Reassigned Time Committee, Student Scholarship Committee, Faculty *Enrichment Committee, Convocation Committee, Student Life Committee and Student Scholarship Committee, 1990-1995.

* Chaired or co-chaired four theses for graduate students in Communication Division. *Served as faculty member for six other theses.

**SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY:**


Consulting Professor for the journalism program and student newspaper, Oaks Christian High

Judge for the annual magazine competition of the Associated Church Press, 2003-2009. I usually review 30-40 articles and/or complete publications.

Judge of annual competition for feature writing and specialized news writing for the Catholic Press Association's annual awards program, 2002.


Chair, Communication Committee of Calvary Community Church, Westlake Village, 1997-1999. Created fundraising and communication material for $18 million church construction project. Managed creative team of some 20 professionals.


**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE BEFORE PEPPERDINE:**


Communication Services Manager, World Vision International, 1979-1984. Duties included the teaching of communication skills to Third World communicators and coordinating the gathering of communication and fundraising information by the organizations 75 offices worldwide. Also traveled extensively in the Third World to document the suffering and needs of people facing poverty, natural disaster and civil wars.


Associate Public Relations Director, Pepperdine University, 1972-1975. Handled news media and coordinated publicity for Pepperdine’s Southern California campuses.