

# **Communication Program Review**

# Program Review Guidebook for Academic Departments 2016-2017

## INTRODUCTION

Reviews begin with an introduction that provides a context for the review. In contrast to the rest of the self-study report, this portion is primarily descriptive and should include:

### 1. INTERNAL CONTEXT

This begins with an overview of the program describing (as appropriate).

- a. where the program is situated (school/division),
- b. degrees granted, concentrations available, programs offered
- c. where is the program located (campus location)
- d. Provide a brief history of the program
- e. Describe the changes made to the program since the last review.

The Communication Studies (aka "Human Communication") program is situated in the Communication Division of Seaver College. Students in the communication major choose one of the four following degree emphases: intercultural communication, interpersonal communication, organizational communication, or rhetoric and leadership. The program also offers minors in intercultural studies, rhetoric and leadership, and speech communication; and contributes courses to interdisciplinary majors in international studies; minors in ethnic studies, sustainability, women's studies; and the undergraduate certificate program in conflict management through the School of Law's Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution. The program is located in the Center for Communication and Business on Pepperdine's Malibu campus. A detailed history of the program is attached.

At the time of the last review, the four degree emphases were operating as four separate majors with very little overlap in curriculum and faculty. The previous review identified this as a weakness given the size of the university and department. Since then, the interpersonal sequence, under Dr. Bert Ballard's leadership, has undergone a curriculum revision which both enhanced the interpersonal-specific courses, and allowed for overlap with courses in the other sequences. Additionally, the four emphases have moved from functioning and assessing as four separate programs to unifying under the name Communication Studies and writing a collective assessment report. We have re-evaluated the core (COM 200, 300, 301, 400) and a proposal has been approved by the division to restructure those courses for the benefit of all of our majors. However, the core revision is on hold pending a conversation about anticipated changes to the Communication Studies program. All faculty in this area have been actively engaged in the discussion of how to revise the curriculum and bring more unity to the various parts of the program. In spring 2017, we drafted and agreed upon a newly adapted set of Communication Studies program learning outcomes and are now in the process of evaluating curricular changes to support those outcomes. We anticipate that this report will offer evidence to further guide that revision.

## **2. THE EXTERNAL CONTEXT**

**This should explain how the program responds to the needs of the area in which it serves: this can include the community, region, field, or discipline.**

Communication Studies is a broad discipline with a plethora of ways to connect outside of our classrooms. The report will offer more detail on these efforts. By way of overview, it is important to note that our program is designed to help students connect the theory, methods, and content they are learning in the classroom to their current and future professional and service goals so that they can lead a life of purpose. We foster external connections through experiential learning, internships, service projects, co-curricular activities, and more. We are constantly tweaking our approach to teaching and learning in ways that respond to the information and relationships we gain through academic conference, professional organizations, churches, non-profit organizations, and other relationships we have.

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

History\_of\_the\_Communication\_Division.docx

## OUTCOMES

### INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES

| Identifier            | Description  |
|-----------------------|--|
| CA-PEP-ILO-16.L-1-KS  | Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.  |
| CA-PEP-ILO-16.L-2-FH  | Demonstrate value centered leadership.   |
| CA-PEP-ILO-16.L-3-CGU | Demonstrate global awareness.  |
| CA-PEP-ILO-16.P-1-KS  | Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery. |
| CA-PEP-ILO-16.P-2-FH  | Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.   |
| CA-PEP-ILO-16.P-3-CGU | Understand and value diversity.  |
| CA-PEP-ILO-16.S-1-KS  | Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.  |
| CA-PEP-ILO-16.S-2-FH  | Incorporate faith into service to others.  |
| CA-PEP-ILO-16.S-3-CGU | Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.  |

## MISSION

### 3. MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES

A key component in providing the context for the review is a description of the program's mission, purpose, goals, and outcomes.

- a. **Mission** - This should be a general explanation of why the program exists, what it hopes to achieve in the future, and the program's essential nature, its values, and its work.
- b. **Goals** are general statements of what the program wants to achieve.
- c. **Outcomes** are the specific results that should be observed if the goals are being met.

The program's purpose, goals, and outcomes should relate to and align with the mission and goals of the college and of the University.

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.

#### Communication Core (CC) PLOs

*A student who completes the Communication Core should be able to:*

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| <b>PLO #1</b> | Describe the essential nature of communication as a field of study and recognize its significance in interpreting human behavior.               |
| <b>PLO #2</b> | Acquire foundational skills in academic and professional research, writing, analysis, and presentation necessary to excel in the major courses. |
| <b>PLO #3</b> | Demonstrate the ability, through practice and performance, to clearly and effectively express messages through multiple mediums.                |
| <b>PLO #4</b> | Demonstrate knowledge of various ethical theories and how to apply ethical thinking to an array of ethical dilemmas.                            |

#### Intercultural Communication (IC) PLOs

*A student who graduates with a major in Intercultural Communication should be able to:*

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| <b>PLO #1</b> | 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. |
| <b>PLO #2</b> | Comprehend the interrelationship of culture, language, and thought, and the various dimensions of cultural similarities and dissimilarities (e.g., individualism vs. collectivism, etc.).                 |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| <b>PLO #3</b> | Analyze complex interactions between people of different cultures and design plans that facilitate the constructive transfer of meaning, thus helping diffuse conflict and misunderstanding. |
| <b>PLO #4</b> | Construct ethical messages that are appropriate for targeted audiences.  |

### Interpersonal Communication (IP) PLOs

*A student who graduates with a major in Interpersonal Communication should be able to:*

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| <b>PLO #1</b> | Identify and explain important interpersonal communication theories and research as they relate to various interpersonal settings.               |
| <b>PLO #2</b> | Explain the importance of interpersonal relationships in influencing people's beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors.                         |
| <b>PLO #3</b> | Use interpersonal communication theories and skills to enhance interpersonal communication competence in self and others.                        |
| <b>PLO #4</b> | Appraise and evaluate varied interpersonal communication interactions in order to create ethical, culturally competent, communication exchanges. |

### Organizational Communication (OC) PLOs

*A student who graduates with a major in Organizational Communication should be able to:*

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| <b>PLO #1</b> | Connect liberal arts learning and critical thinking with frames of organizational and communication theory and research.   |
| <b>PLO #2</b> | Explain and value the importance of civility in the workplace, meaningful work, and work-life balance.   |
| <b>PLO #3</b> | Use analytic and applied skills to solve problems, make decisions, and strategize about communication in organizations using case studies, creative portfolios, internships, and service learning. |
| <b>PLO #4</b> | Engage communities and organizations with an ethical sensibility that involves dialogue, complex thinking, and spiritual discernment.  |

**Rhetoric & Leadership (RL) PLOs**

***A student who graduates with a major in Rhetoric & Leadership should be able to:***

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b><i>PLO #1</i></b> | Demonstrate knowledge of the central role that rhetoric and communication play at all levels of social and cultural life.                                      |
| <b><i>PLO #2</i></b> | Identify and explain the major periods, figures, developments, and conceptions of persuasion within the history of Western rhetorical theory.                  |
| <b><i>PLO #3</i></b> | Apply rhetorical theory and criticism to analyze persuasive public messages and develop ethical and effective persuasive presentations for diverse situations. |
| <b><i>PLO #4</i></b> | Identify and explain characteristics and examples of ethical and effective rhetorical leadership.  |

**Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

## CURRICULUM MAP

I - Introduced  
D - Developed  
M - Mastered

### Evidence

*Please attach evidence.*

**Introduce** the PLO (**I**), **Develop** skills related to the PLO (**D**), or demonstrate **Mastery** of the PLO (**M**).

| Course Number | Course Title                                | PLO#1                | PLO#2                | PLO#3                                | PLO#4                |
|---------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| COM 200       | Communication Theory                        | CC-I<br>IP-I<br>OC-I | CC-I<br>IP-I<br>RL-I |                                      | CC-I<br>IP-I         |
| COM 220       | Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication | IC-I<br>IP-I<br>OC-I | IC-I<br>IP-I<br>OC-I | IC-I<br>IP-I/D                       | IC-D<br>IP-D         |
| COM 300       | Intro to Com Research                       | CC-D<br>IP-D<br>OC-D | CC-D<br>IP-D<br>OC-I | CC-I<br>IC-I<br>IP-D<br>RL-I<br>OC-I | CC-I<br>IC-D<br>IP-D |
| COM 301       | Rhetoric & Social Influence                 | CC-D                 | CC-M<br>OC-I<br>RL-D | CC-D<br>IC-D<br>RL-D                 | CC-D<br>IC-D<br>IP-D |
| COM 380       | Business & Professional Communication       |                      |                      | RL-D                                 | RL-D                 |

|                |  |              |                      |                      |                                |
|----------------|--|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
|                |  |              |                      | OC-I                 |                                |
| <b>COM 385</b> | <b>Argumentation &amp; Advocacy</b>                      | OC-D         |                      | RL-D<br>OC-I         | RL-D                           |
| <b>COM 400</b> | <b>Communication Ethics</b>                              | CC-D         | CC-M<br>IP-D<br>OC-I | CC-M<br>IP-D         | CC-M<br>IP-D/M<br>OC-D<br>RL-D |
| <b>COM 418</b> | <b>Communication in Organizations</b>                    | IP-I<br>OC-D | IP-D<br>OC-D         | IP-D<br>OC-D         | IP-D<br>OC-D                   |
| <b>COM 450</b> | <b>Communication &amp; Leadership</b>                    | IP-D<br>OC-D | IP-D<br>OC-D         | IP-D<br>OC-D<br>RL-D | IP-D<br>OC-D<br>RL-M           |
| <b>COM 483</b> | <b>Small Group Communication</b>                         | IP-D<br>OC-D | IC-D<br>IP-D<br>OC-D | IC-D<br>IP-D<br>OC-D | IC-D<br>IP-D                   |
| <b>COM 506</b> | <b>Media Worldwide</b>                                   | IC-I/D       | IC-D                 | IC-D                 | IC-D                           |
| <b>COM 507</b> | <b>Public Opinion, Propaganda, &amp; Attitude Change</b> |              | RL-D<br>OC-D         |                      | RL-D                           |
| <b>COM 512</b> | <b>Media Impact &amp; U.S. Minorities</b>                | IC-I/D       | IC-D                 | IC-D                 | IC-D                           |
| <b>COM 513</b> | <b>Intercultural Communication</b>                       | IC-D<br>IP-D | IC-I<br>IP-D         | IC-I/D<br>IP-D       | IC-D<br>IP-D                   |
| <b>COM 514</b> | <b>International Com &amp; Negotiation</b>               | IC-D         | IC-D                 | IC-D                 | IC-D                           |
| <b>COM 515</b> | <b>Intercultural Case Studies</b>                        | IC-M         | IC-M                 | IC-M                 | IC-M                           |

|                |  |                        |                      |                      |                              |
|----------------|--|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>COM 518</b> | <b>Advanced Organizational Communication</b> | OC-D                   | OC-D                 | OC-D                 | OC-M                         |
| <b>COM 519</b> | <b>Communication &amp; Conflict</b>          | IP-D<br>OC-D           | IC-D<br>IP-D<br>OC-D | IP-D<br>OC-D         | IC-D<br>IP-D<br>OC-D<br>RL-M |
| <b>COM 521</b> | <b>Organizational Communication Analysis</b> | OC-M                   | OC-M                 | OC-M                 | OC-D                         |
| <b>COM 530</b> | <b>Interpersonal Com Theory</b>              | IP-M                   | IP-M<br>OC-D         | IP-M                 | IP-M                         |
| <b>COM 581</b> | <b>Contemporary Voices of Leadership</b>     | RL-D<br>OC-D           |                      | RL-D                 | RL-D<br>OC-D                 |
| <b>COM 587</b> | <b>Rhetorical Theory</b>                     | RL-D                   | RL-M                 | RL-D                 | RL-M                         |
| <b>COM 588</b> | <b>Principles of Rhetorical Criticism</b>    | RL-M                   |                      | RL-M                 | RL-M                         |
| <b>COM 590</b> | <b>Seminar in Communication</b>              | IP-I/D<br>OC-D<br>RL-M | IP-D<br>OC-D         | IP-D<br>RL-M         | IP-D                         |
| <b>COM 595</b> | <b>Communication Internship</b>              | IP-D                   | IC-M<br>IP-D<br>OC-D | IC-D<br>IP-D<br>OC-D | IC-M<br>IP-D                 |

## **ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Meaning**

### **Analysis of Direct Student Learning: Meaning Quality and Integrity**

The university is required to define and ensure a distinctive and coherent educational experience for each of its degree programs. The findings from the program assessment and analysis process should explain how effectively courses, curricula, the co-curriculum, and other experiences are structured, sequenced, and delivered so that students achieve

**learning outcomes at the expected levels of performance in core competencies in their majors or fields of specialization, in general education, and in areas distinctive to the institution. It means ensuring alignment among all these elements, and maintaining an assessment infrastructure that enables the institution to diagnose problems and make improvements when needed. Direct student learning, an examination of how well students are meeting the program learning outcomes, should come from the past four years of annual assessments.**

**(2013 WSCUC Accreditation Handbook.)**

**Meaning of the Degree: Describe how the program ensures a holistic experience by answering the following questions about the coherence and alignment within the program:**

**4. What are the learning outcomes and how does the degree support the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes? How does the degree embody the distinct values, basic commitment, and traditions of the institution?**

Learning outcomes are provided in the mission section of the report.

Our curriculum is designed to help students become experts in one or more areas of communication. We do this by providing opportunities for research, writing, speaking, and reflection. Our students regularly present their research at conferences such as the Southern California Conference for Undergraduate Research, the Communication Ethics Conference, Western States Communication Conference, and the National Communication Association Conference (ILO #1 &7).

Our ethics course (COM 400) and assignments in each of the major's areas encourage students to consider how their faith intersects with their culture and experiences to inform their understanding of ethics. The core course introduces students to multiple ethical theories and invites them to bring both personal experience and disciplinary knowledge together in articulating their own method for making ethical choices (ILO #2, 7, & 8).

When teaching communication we call attention, particularly within the intercultural communication curriculum, to the diverse experiences people have that inform their interactions with one another and students in all majors learn the importance of taking diversity of identities and experiences into account when communicating interpersonally, within organizations, and with larger audiences (ILO #3).

Communication majors have multiple opportunities to put their classroom learning to work to serve others and address real-world challenges. Every communication major is required to complete at least one internship experience. While some students choose to work in corporate offices, others work for charitable organizations such as Stand Up to Cancer, or religious organizations such as Young Life. They also have the opportunity to apply their skills through community-engaged research and service learning in upper division major courses. Some of our faculty—Dorothy Andreas, Bert Ballard, Sarah Ballard, Juanie Walker, and Denise Ferguson—have sought to enhance our community engagement and service learning by acquiring a grant to form the group Engaged Partnerships in Communication (EPiC) to create a stronger infrastructure for these practices in the division and further integrate them into the curriculum (ILO #4, 5, & 6).

All of our majors emphasize the importance of communication in leadership and highlight the way that communication can be a tool for seeking justice. As a result, many of our majors choose internships and jobs that promote justice locally and globally (ILO #9).

**5. Is there a coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities? Does the degree offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular major or program? Please explain.**

The communication majors all share four core courses—Communication Theory (COM 200), Communication Research Methods (COM 300), Rhetoric and Social Influence (COM 301), and Ethics (COM 400)—as well as a required internship (COM 595). Students are encouraged to take COM 200 in their first year in order to gain a broad introduction to the theoretical basis of the discipline. They tend to take COM 300 and 301 the following year, which develops their understanding of the different research methods (quantitative, qualitative, and interpretive) used by each major area. In their third and fourth years, students emphasize Intercultural (IC), Interpersonal (IP), Organizational (OC), or Rhetoric and Leadership (RL), taking the prescribed courses for their chosen major to help them refine disciplinary knowledge, gain stronger research skills, and consider how their major equips them to serve others. After completing 75 units, students choose an internship that applies what they have learned in their major. In their final year of coursework, students take the ethics course and a capstone course in their major. Each capstone course is adapted to fit the needs of the individual major. While all capstones require research, some are more focused on writing a discipline-specific research paper while others are more focused on applying research to serve the community.

**6. How current is the program curriculum? How has the curriculum changed (if at all) over the last five years including the reasons for the change (e.g., the result of a learning outcome assessment) and evidence used as a basis for change?**

The curriculum has remained relatively stable over the past five years, with the exception of the interpersonal communication sequence. Adaptations have been made to specific courses based on the need to update and respond to assessment.

Interpersonal curriculum changes: In Fall 2015, with implementation in Fall 2017, the interpersonal communication major made 3 course changes to its curriculum. This was in response, primarily, to past assessments that indicated a need for more distinctive interpersonal classes and a broadening of electives. There were three course changes: adding COM 430: Family Communication as a required course; transitioning COM 530: Interpersonal Communication Theory to COM 438: Advanced Interpersonal Communication as a true capstone and removing it from the graduate electives given the shift in the graduate program toward a strategic communication program; and adding COM 422: Organizational Training and Development as an elective.

Organizational curriculum changes: Since the last assessment, COM 518 has served as the capstone course for the sequence because COM 521 was not offered. COM 518 was enhanced to add an applied project for the development of analytical field research skills, and included applied topics of corporate social responsibility and social enterprise.

Proposed COM Core Changes:

The biggest change, in response to previous years' assessment data, has been the proposal to revise the communication core structure. Assessment of majors and of the written communication core competency showed the following:

- COM Core courses are increasingly taught by visiting and new tenure track faculty.

- Students are lacking a broad sense of the discipline and how it fits together.
- COM 200 and 300 are being asked to do too much - they are currently trying to teach all theories and research methods in the broader discipline.
- Students are not writing well prior to capstone courses - assessment of lower division courses demonstrates students are behind in their writing competency. However, assessment of the capstones demonstrates that they are meeting or exceeding expectations in this area by senior year. It appears that faculty in the introductory courses are working so hard to introduce the theories and methods, they cannot devote enough time to the writing aspect. Faculty in the capstone are then forced to devote too much time to improving writing skills. We need to strike the appropriate balance at all levels.
- Major areas want more opportunities to teach specific skills - some majors need a stronger foundation in certain research methods, while others need a broad sense of multiple methods. The current core aims to introduce everything, but leaves the method that a student emphasizes in their research project up to the professor teaching research methods and their particular strengths. While we need to allow professors to teach their expertise, students also need to be matched appropriately with that expertise based on the needs of their major.

To address these concerns, a proposal was approved by the division to revise the core curriculum in the following ways:

- Refocus COM 200 to:
  - overview the discipline and the significance of its various parts,
  - provide foundational knowledge of metatheory and demonstrate broad applicability of a limited set of theories
  - teach basic research skills—how to locate, read, and understand research in the discipline and condense it into a literature review
- Refocus COM 300 to:
  - overview (briefly) multiple research methods
  - teach advanced research skills by emphasizing one major methodology (quantitative, qualitative, rhetorical, or critical/cultural)
  - improve attention to writing and presentation skills
- Return 3 units (formerly COM 205/301 requirement) to the majors.
- Retain COM 400, but agree on some basic elements across sections (this change is already in progress and does not require SAC approval)

Although the entire division agreed on these changes in spring 2016, the proposal will not go to the Seaver Academic Council until fall 2017 at the earliest because it needs to be implemented in a manner that accounts for changes of the majors it supports. Many of those changes will be the result of this program review and ongoing discussions.

**7. Please present a curriculum comparison with at least three peer institutions and with national disciplinary or professional standards if available.**

 The picture can't be displayed.

\*Note: Majors in film, PR, etc. that would compare to other areas of the Communication Division outside of the Communication Studies area are not reflected here.

The National Communication Association does not issue curriculum guidelines/standards.

**Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

## PEDAGOGY

**8. Please present measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching or implementing, scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty, survey measures, participation rates, and student satisfaction surveys).**

**Course Evaluations:** Each regular class ends with a course/instructor evaluation handled by the Seaver Dean's Office. Instructors receive statistical summaries of the evaluations and anonymous comments of students after grades are submitted. Divisional deans also receive results of the evaluations and often discuss them with faculty.

**Peer Evaluations:** When faculty apply for tenure or promotion, five colleagues write peer reviews of their teaching, scholarship, and service. Reviews of teaching evaluate a statement about teaching, class visits, and teaching materials such as syllabi, tests, rubrics, and assignments. These reviews are confidential, reviewed only by deans and the rank, tenure, and promotion committee.

### **Scholarship on issues of teaching and learning:**

Ballard, R. L. (2017). Communication ethics. In M. Allen, *The Sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (pp. 195-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ballard, R. L., Vélez Ortiz, M., Bell McManus, L. M. (October 2016). Communication ethics: A vital resource in an ever-changing world (bibliographic essay). *Choice: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries*, 54(2), 1-9. *Invited submission.*

Choi, C.W., Honeycutt, J., & Bodie, G.D. (2015). Effects of Imagined Interactions and Rehearsal on Speaking Performance, *Communication Education*, 64, 25-44.

Stone Watt, S. (2012). Authentic assessment in debate: An argument for using ballots to foster talent-development and promote authentic learning. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*, 33, pp. 75-104.

Stone Watt, S. (2013). Representing women in the workplace. In M. J. Murphy & E.N. Ribarsky (Eds.), *Activities for Teaching Gender and Sexuality in the Classroom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Stone Watt, S. (2017). Debaters as Citizens: Rethinking Debate Frameworks to Address the Policy/Performance Divide. In J. Michael Hogan, Jessica A. Kurr, Michael J. Bergmaier, and Jeremy D. Johnson (Eds.) *Speech and Debate as Civic Education*. University Park: Penn State University Press.

Walker, J. N. & Andreas, D. (April 2013). Shifting Mental Models: Mapping, Engaged Reflection, and Transformative Practice, *Office of Institutional Research Brief: Student Learning*, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.

### **Presentations and trainings:**

Amaro, L. M. (2017). Participant, 7th Annual Seaver College Service Learning/Community Engaged Research Workshop. Malibu, CA.

Leavitt, M. A., Ballard, R. L., Swenson Lepper, T. R., Jovanovic, S., Bell McManus, L. M., Charron, L. J. N., Tompkins, P. S., Holba, A. M., & Vélez Ortiz, M. (2016). Presenter, "Heeding the call: Promoting civic engagement with communication ethics activities and resources for any class!" National Communication Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Choi, C. W. (2015). Presenter, "Conversations in courage: Embracing opportunities for difficult conversations in the classroom and in the community." International and Intercultural Communication Division at the National Association Conference held in Las Vegas, NV.

Satchel, R. & Stone Watt, S. (2016) Co-Leaders, Faculty Summit on Inclusive Pedagogy, Seaver Dean's Office, Pepperdine University.

Stone Watt, S. (2014) Presenter, "Report on the Findings of the CEDA Research Assessment Working Group." National Communication Association, Washington DC.

Stone Watt, S. (2014) Presenter, Short Course: "A Beginner's Guide to OERs." National Communication Association, Washington DC.

Stone Watt, S. (2012) Presenter, "Debate as High Impact Practice: Cultivating Assessment Norms in our COMMunity." National Communication Association, Orlando, FL.

Stone Watt, S. (2012) Presenter, "Assessing the Co-Curricular," Western Association of Schools & Colleges, Academic Resources Conference, Costa Mesa, CA.

Walker, J.N. (2016) Presenter, "The Place Where Your Deep Gladness and the World's Deep Need Meet: Exploring and Engaging the Meaning of Calling at Christian Colleges and Universities," Religious Communication Interest Group, National Communication Association Conference, Philadelphia, PA.

Walker, J. N., Zavala Perez, M., & Tefertiller, S. (February 2016). "Transformational Learning Through International Community Engagement." *Institute for the Liberal Arts Conference Proceedings Annual Conversation (Social Entrepreneurship)*, Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA.

**Formative discussions:** After the last program review, the faculty engaged in discussions regarding a major program revision. In 2013 the group found itself at an impasse and tabled the conversation. In 2016, Drs. Ballard and Stone Watt reintroduced the conversation and visiting, tenure-track, and tenured faculty have met consistently for the past year to discuss our approach to the current curriculum and any potential changes needed. We have agreed upon a revised mission statement and PLOs and, after compiling this report, we will turn our attention to restructuring the curriculum.

#### **Student Exit Survey Summary:**

A student exit survey of senior communication studies major was conducted as indirect assessment. Eighteen seniors completed the survey with half (9) of them interpersonal communication majors. Please refer to the attached Excel spreadsheet for full results. Overall, the results were positive:

- 95.94% indicated that communication courses fairly or very well prepared them for a variety of communication skills (#5)
- 94.4% thought Pepperdine was doing reasonably or extremely well in accomplishing its mission as a Christian university (#10) and 88.8% would probably or definitely choose Pepperdine again (#11)
- 94.4% agreed or strongly agreed that the program prepared them for post-graduate life (#20). Notably, 27.8% were planning to attend graduate school.

- 91.67% agreed or strongly agreed with a variety of characterizations about the communication studies program's interest, spiritual engagement, and applicability outside the classroom (#12)
- 88.89% agreed or strongly agreed that there is a strong sense of community and the service-learning/community engagement group projects have an impact outside of the classroom (#19)
- 82.9% were satisfied or very satisfied with courses (#3)
- 74.35% indicated that professors offered a range of support, encouragement, faith, respect, and other supportive/mentoring type activities (#4). Indeed, in an open-ended question, professors and faculty were overwhelmingly mentioned as a strength of the program.

Regarding courses (#16), Com 519: Communication and Conflict was marked as the most useful (55.5%). COM 200: Communication Theory, COM 595: Internship, COM 450: Communication and Leadership, and COM 590: Seminar were also named as most useful (50%), notably the Perspectives on Identity class and social media class. Rhetoric courses, like COM 301: Rhetoric and Social Influence, Gender and Communication, and Environmental Communication/Sustainability were also mentioned. COM 400: Communication Ethics and COM 220: Interpersonal Communication were notable as well.

Regarding assignments (#18), not surprisingly, students want less group papers (50% less of this) and would like to see more skill building assignments (72.2%) and career building assignments (61.1%). But overall, students thought assignments were about right (63.41%).

In terms of internship (#6), 83.33% indicated the experience was helpful or fantastic, but only 16.7% were offered jobs (#7) even though 47.1% indicated that they were contacted about job possibilities (#8).

Most were not involved in co-curriculars sponsored by the Communication Division (82.67% - #9), which bears some further reflection. Of those involved, though, 10.89% indicated they were fantastic experiences.

In terms of areas to improve, students indicated they would like to see more discussion of diversity and inclusion, more skill-based learning, and more evaluation and analyses of organizations in the classroom (#13). They also suggest that the curriculum needs to be updated and streamlined, feeling that some classes were repetitive or even useless (COM 483: Small Group Communication). This mirrors direct evidence found in this assessment.

In sum, students are overwhelmingly pleased with their curricular experience in communication studies, including courses, the supportiveness of professors (especially going beyond the classroom), internship, and overall Pepperdine experience. Yet, they do suggest that the curriculum could use more updating and streamlining.

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

2017\_Student\_Exit\_Survey\_excel\_one\_worksheet.xls

## ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Quality

**Quality of the Degree:** In meaning of the degree student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the quality of the program.

**9. Describe the high impact practices which enrich the learning experiences (How are they integrated in the curriculum? Are they assessed?)**

- a. Service learning
- b. Research opportunities
- c. Internships
- d. Other high-impact practices

### **Service-Learning:**

**The following provides a snapshot of service-learning activities across 6 classes during Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 in the Communication Division. Overall, it reveals consistent and quality community engagement and service-learning by faculty and students in the Communication Division.**

#### **GSCO 199: Freshman Seminar, Juanie Walker, Instructor (Fall 2016)**

The GSCO 199: Freshman Seminar on Social Entrepreneurship and Organizational Communication raised more than \$1,000 in one week with their own entrepreneurial ventures on campus to fund the cost of their Step Forward Day service project that took place at the Christian-based social enterprise, With Love L.A. Market and Café. This involved hanging lights and shades for an outdoor patio and garden at the organization. They also pruned and watered the garden and area trees, swept and picked up trash in the neighborhood in Southwest L.A. In addition, the class partnered with John Peterson's SAAJ class to work with affiliate and neighbor, World Impact intercity missionary group, to help a family move from one residential area to another. The class also had the opportunity to tour and learn about this six-month old social enterprise and planned to continue supporting the organization and learning about it as a living case study for the class.

#### **COM 422: Training and Development, Juanie Walker, Instructor**

COM 422: Training and Development engaged in the creation of a six-module training nutrition curriculum for teens in South West Los Angeles to be offered by With Love Los Angeles Christian Social Enterprise after collaborating with nutrition students in Loan Kim's (Natural Sciences Division) Public Health Nutrition course. COM 422 students assessed training needs, developed a proposal, and created and presented curriculum consisting of two modules on nutritional cooking, two modules on practical cooking skills, and two modules on developing abilities in cooking with peers and for families.

In addition, a smaller team developed training modules for Seaver College Student-Led Ministry leaders, which they presented to on-campus program administrators. These assignments provided students the opportunity to use knowledge from the course, develop and practice skills, and serve not-for-profit organization clients. Students were assessed individually in class by the professor for their knowledge and skills, then they were assessed as a team by the professor and clients.

### **COM 438: Advanced Interpersonal Communication, Bert Ballard, Instructor**

Bert Ballard's interpersonal communication capstone class hosted "Adulting 101: From Taxes to Tinder in a Time of Uncertainty" in spring 2017 at the Ventura County Community Foundation in Camarillo in partnership with the Ventura Center for Dispute Settlement. The event featured speakers on topics such as budgeting, job searching, and student loans, and was attended by Pepperdine students.

Pepperdine seniors, who were given a final class assignment to "create" an event that would educate other emerging adults, planned the all-day seminar for community members, especially college students and recent graduates. This type of service learning course aims to challenge students to use all of their knowledge and skills to create an event, while working in teams. The learning experience also reinforces for students what they have learned, as they work together to apply their learning to specific opportunities that educate others. For this particular group of students, it was the first time for the event, so they created a template for future classes to follow and learned about the importance of community networking and event planning.

### **COM 515: Intercultural Communication: Case Studies, Charles Choi, Instructor**

Charles Choi's intercultural communication capstone class (COM 515) participated in a service-learning project for foster families in Ventura county. All foster parents are required to attend several hours of training per year to keep their status as parents updated. Partnering with Arrow Child & Family Ministries (a non-profit child service agency), the intercultural communication majors created a communication workshop for foster parents. Student presentations reflected research in the areas of attachment theory, trauma and loss, and identity formation (family and ethnic).

Service-learning in higher education is intended to increase civic responsibility and enhance learning. By the end of their undergraduate curriculum in intercultural communication, students possess strong foundations in research, theoretical application, and oral presentation. In the capstone course, the service learning project gives students the opportunity to explore the intersection of theory and application by directly providing a benefit to foster parents in Ventura County. Both students and participants felt the experience was positive academically and in terms of community gain.

### **COM 519: Communication and Conflict , Sarah Ballard Instructor**

Each semester, junior and senior students in COM 519, a course in communication and conflict, directly engage with the Pepperdine University and surrounding Malibu communities to identify a conflict and then design and implement an intervention based on concepts learned in class. As an example, this past spring 2017, students in Sarah Ballard's Communication and Conflict class recently held a two-part educational event for Seaver students. An "Open Dialogue" event attracted 55 students who heard a panel of five students who openly and honestly spoke about their experiences at Pepperdine regarding community and what they called "invitation vs. intimacy." Students defined this as the tendency of their peers to accumulate many surface-level relationships but not a concentrated depth of committed and intentional relationships. Sarah's students said they received positive feedback from the attendees including comments on how this discussion has been long-needed, how it feels comforting to know that other people are in the same boat (regarding their feeling a lack of community), and how they gained some interesting new insight on how to move forward and be more intentional.

A week later the same students hosted 20 of their peers at a "Community & Coffee" event in Alumni Park. This event, in which students provided coffee, blankets, and music, aimed to create a space for people to spend quality time with a person or people they have been meaning to

connect with. Students planning the event posted questions (one lighter-hearted question, one deeper question) on the coffee cups given to participants. Relationship IQ provided the questions. Student planners Caroline Rubach, Sarah Gow and Joel Foster received funding from the Communication Division's budget for support of service learning assignments.

**Internships:** All Communication Studies majors are required to take at least 1 unit of internship, COM 595, before graduating. Students can find their internship on their own, or with the help of division internship coordinator, Professor Debbie Wideroe, or through the Career Center. To count toward the major requirement, the internship must be approved by the student's major advisor who works with them to set learning objectives consistent with their program's learning outcomes. At the end of the internship experience, a daily work journal and reflection paper addressing the stated learning outcomes is submitted to the professor supervising the internship and is evaluated for credit during the semester and a grade in summer--summer grading is a result of students signing up for a general studies internship in the summer because the university offers a scholarship for that experience. This creates some inconsistency in grading which we will address in the QIP. The division has recently begun collecting past student reflection papers. However, since it has not been a division-wide practice in the past, availability of artifacts for assessment is inconsistent for most majors and missing altogether for others. So, in this report, we are relying on the division-wide data collected by Debbie Wideroe in her most recent cohort, which is attached. The Career Center also collects data in the form of demographics and student and supervisor questionnaires at the culmination of each internship. This data could be incredibly useful. However, it often is not provided to professors until after the grading window has closed, if at all. A list of the data for every student has been provided to the division, but due to the identifying information for each student in the file, it is not appropriate to attach here. Additionally, there is so much raw data, we have not yet found someone with the time to process it all.

**10. Co-Curricular : How intentional are the co-curricular experiences which are provided and how are they integrated into the curricular plan?**

- a. Academic and career advising programs and resources**
- b. Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and teaching assistants**
- c. Orientation and transition programs**
- d. Financial support for obtaining scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc.**
- e. Support for engagement in the campus community**
- f. Support for emotional and psychological variables of success**
- g. Spiritual development programs and opportunities**
- h. Multicultural opportunities which support diversity**
- i. Plays, musicals, art exhibits, and lectures**
- j. the Sophomore Experience**
- k. Study Abroad**

**Debate Team:** The primary co-curricular experience associated with this major is the debate team. Over the past three years, the team has transitioned from research-intensive form of policy debate unique to the United States to a format called British Parliamentary Debate, which requires a broader set of information literacy skills and an ability to interact with people and debate about issues pertaining to the countries all over the world. In addition to their domestic travel schedule, the team competed in international competitions, including the Pan American tournament and the Trinity College (Dublin) Intersvarsity competition. Students studying abroad in London in 2016-2017 and taking COM 180: Public Speaking and/or COM 385: Argumentation & Advocacy, also had the opportunity to attend the Trinity Intersvarsity and the Imperial College (London) Intersvarsity competition. In addition to competitions, the debate program has an

increasing presence on campus. Over the past three years, the team has partnered with iDebate Rwanda to bring the "Voices of a Post Genocide Generation Tour" to Pepperdine. The tour brings high school and college-aged students from Rwanda to campus to conduct a campus-wide event as well as attend certain classes such as COM 313: Intercultural Communication and SAAJ 122: Social Justice Colloquium to discuss and demonstrate the role of academic debate in perspective taking and working through conflict. The tour has been very successful, and in 2016, the tour's organizer joined the Pepperdine debate coaching staff as he moved to Pepperdine from Kigali to work on his Master's Degree in Social Entrepreneurship at Pepperdine's Graduate School of Education and Psychology. Additionally, in the past year, the debate team launched an on-campus debate series titled "Let's Argue," designed to demonstrate and facilitate productive argumentation on contentious issues. The first two topics were immigration and feminism. These events were successful and will continue in future years. The "Let's Argue" series also provided the model for a workshop that Director of Forensics, Abi Smith, conducted at a local school where she taught argumentation principles to fifth graders. The event was such a success that the team has been asked to continue to serve in this area.

**Academic and Career Advising:** Each student is assigned an academic advisor from the University (OneStop) who can help with general advising and GE requirements questions. They are also assigned a major advisor in our area who helps with class planning, internships, and career planning. They also have access to Professor Debbie Wideroe, the division's internship coordinator, although her expertise tends to be more heavily slanted toward the mediated fields. Students also make use of the Pepperdine Career Center and Career Coaching program.

**Financial Support:** Some scholarships are available through the division, but they tend to go to student workers and/or those with high need or special circumstances. Students can also earn the faculty/staff scholarships awarded by a Seaver committee. Most often, students earn additional financial support by collaborating with faculty through the following programs: the faculty mentorship program, the Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative (AYURI), Summer Undergraduate Research Program (SURP), or the Cross Disciplinary-Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Research program (CDUIR). These are the awards from the past five years (faculty members listed first):

**AYURI:**

Fall 2012 - Theresa De Los Santos & Bud Davis

Fall 2013 - Ryan Board & Andrew Robertson

Spring 2014 - Christina Littlefield & Savannah Janssen & Patrick Rear

Fall 2014 - Bert Ballard & Hannah Novak

Fall 2015 - Juanie Walker & Rachel Hews

Spring 2016 - Theresa De Los Santos & Kelsey Foreman; Roslyn Satchel & Chelsea Harris; Juanie Walker & Shannon Tefertiller

Fall 2016 - Lauren Amaro & Bianca Dorin; Theresa De Los Santos & Brooke Zielinski

Spring 2017 - Juanie Walker & Heet Ghodasara

**SURP:**

Summer 2013 - Kimberly Stoltzfus & Amanda LeCave

Summer 2014 - Dorothy Andreas & Sarah Bender; Bert Ballard & Hannah Novak

Summer 2015 - Lauren Amaro & Carly Hanna & Jess Jiang

Summer 2017 - Elizabeth Smith & Mason Folse

**CDIUR:**

Summer 2012 - Sarah Stone Watt & Lauren Riddle

Summer 2016 - Lauren Amaro & Bianca Dorin; Theresa De Los Santos & Esther Kang; Nataria Joseph & Brooke Zielinski

Summer 2017 - Lauren Amaro & Annelise Green; Bert Ballard & Jessica Jiang; Theresa De Los Santos & Emma Johnson; Nataria Joseph & Daisy Jauregui

Faculty-Student Mentorship Program:

Fall 2014:

|                   |   |                      |
|-------------------|---|----------------------|
| Denise Ferguson   | Assist with professional responsibilities | Jacqueline Cisneros  |
| Roslyn M. Satchel | Research Assistant                        | Shelby Jones Jolivet |
| John G. Watson    | Research Assistant                        | Matthew West         |

Spring 2015:

|                             |                                |                      |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Christina Littlefield (Eng) | Teaching Assistant/Web Support | Jonathan Chun        |
| Michael Murrie              | Media Production Assistant     | Eryn Ramsey          |
| Roslyn M. Satchel           | Research Assistant             | Shelby Jones Jolivet |

Fall 2015:

|                       |                               |                    |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Hoyoung (Anthony) Ahn | Research                      | Sarah Hwang        |
| Denise Ferguson       | Research                      | Corinne Lederhouse |
| John G. Watson        | Research & Teaching Assistant | James Gehrels      |

Spring 2016:

Bert Ballard | Catherine Dapello  
 John G. Watson | James Gehrels  
 Christina Littlefield (Eng) | Madison Harwell  
 Hoyoung (Anthony) Ahn | Sarah Hwang  
 Denise Ferguson | Corinne Lederhouse  
 John G. Watson | James Gehrels

Fall 2016:

Denise Ferguson | Cecilia Arteaga  
 Hoyoung (Anthony) Ahn | Kristen Rodriguez  
 Salas Susan | Valerie Varghese

Spring 2017:

|                   |                   |               |            |            |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|------------|------------|
| Theresa           | de los Santos     | Communication | Josie      | Lionetti   |
| Bert              | Ballard           | Communication | Meghan     | Doyle      |
| Christina         | Littlefield (Eng) | Communication | Jennevieve | Fong       |
| Hoyoung (Anthony) | Ahn               | Communication | Kristen    | Rodriguez  |
| Susan             | Salas             | Communication | Mason      | Folse      |
| John G.           | Watson            | Communication | Blake      | Blacklidge |

**Spiritual Development:** Faculty in the Communication Studies major are actively involved in students' spiritual development, often informally, but also frequently through formal programs associated with convocation. These include individual spiritual mentorship, club (small group) convocations, and speaking at larger convocation events. The following are some examples from recent years. Additional examples can be found in faculty CVs.

- Satchel, R. (2016, Nov. 2) "Invitation to Remove Barriers," Convocation, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.
- Ballard, B. L., & Ballard, S. J. (2016, September 13). "Negotiating interracial friendships, relationships, and dating." Pepperdine University, Boone Center for the Family, Special Convocation Presentation.
- Stone Watt, S. (2016, April 5) "Table Talk: Feminism," Convocation, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.
- Satchel, R. (2016, Jan. 19) "Table Talk: Cultural Competency." Convocation, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.
- Ballard, R. L., & Ballard, S. J. (2015, Oct. 5) "Behind the Smiles: Loneliness and Building Community." Presented for Relationship IQ, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.

**Multicultural opportunities which support diversity:** The Communication Studies curriculum and co-curriculum provide multiple opportunities in this area. First, our area houses a broad-based course in intercultural communication that addresses the "World Civilizations" general education requirement. Second, our faculty are dedicated to infusing multicultural learning throughout the curriculum. Sometimes this comes through intentional integration of a diversity of voices and topics in a traditional course, such as Rhetorical Criticism or Communication and Conflict. Other times, it comes through courses expressly designed to address diversity, such as COM 512: Intercultural Media Literacy, COM 513: Advanced Intercultural Communication, and COM 514: International Communication and Negotiation. In recent years, Communication Studies faculty have also been active in earning grants for the development of additional courses related to diversity, including Dr. Satchel's First Year Seminar, Dr. Ballard's COM 590: Perspective on Identity, and Dr. Amaro's COM 590 concerning health communication. Dr. Ballard has also been awarded a grant from the Glazer Institute to incorporate content from Jewish texts, thinkers, and perspectives into a section of COM 400: Communication Ethics. Notably, Dr. Ballard served as an inaugural "SEED" facilitator for Seaver faculty. In summer 2016, Dr. Ballard was trained by SEED (Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity) and helped lead faculty through a series of seminars and workshops on pedagogy and issues related to race, gender, sexual orientation, social class, and more. Dr. Watson, Dr. Littlefield, and Prof. Daum were participants in SEED; five more communication faculty will be attending in future years.

In terms of service in this area, Dr. Ballard is serving on a task force assessing the feasibility of a GE on diversity for Seaver College. Dr. Ballard and Sarah Ballard have annually presented a convo presentation on interracial relationships. Dr. Satchel has been very active as an advisor and consultant with the Black Student Association, and in 2017 she was awarded Excellence in Diversity, a student-nominated, administration-selected award for a faculty member who has made significant contributions to Pepperdine's campus in the area of diversity. Dr. Satchel also gave a well-attended "Table Talk" on cultural competence in 2016 to students and was a Convocation presenter in 2016 to students. This is not to mention the countless hours Drs. Ballard, Satchel, Stone Watt, Amaro, along with Visiting Professors Sarah Ballard and Sharita Wilson spend mentoring students of color and female students on issues of diversity, identity, gender, spirituality, and so forth.

**Sophomore Experience** Communication Studies faculty have been active in contributing to the Sophomore Experience. In recent years multiple tenure-track and visiting faculty in our area have attended and taught at the Sophomore trip to Catalina in the fall. Drs. Ballard, Satchel, and Stone

Watt have also contributed their expertise to leading movement tours about the Women's Movement and the Asian American Immigration Movement for the Sophomore Experience trip to San Francisco each spring.

**Study Abroad:** Drs. Ballard, Jones, Selby, and Stone Watt have taught abroad in the past five years with International Programs. Professor Daum leads an IP program in East Africa every summer, and the faculty mentor instructors from other divisions and from IP campuses when appropriate to allow for their teaching of COM 180: Public Speaking and COM 313: Intercultural Communication in international programs.

**11. Please describe evidence of students' research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments.**

Pepperdine Journal of Communication Research:

**The *Pepperdine Journal of Communication Research* is a student-led research publication of the Communication Division that seeks to pursue truth and academic excellence in the field of communication by recognizing outstanding student scholarship that explores interpersonal, organizational, rhetoric and leadership, and intercultural communication. Through rigorous peer-review, the *Journal* strives to contribute to ongoing discussions in communication studies by publishing student papers that investigate a variety of contemporary topics and issues. The *Journal* is published annually, both in print and through Digital Commons.**

The *Journal* is in its fifth year, and for the past two years, the *Journal* has set records in terms of submissions and impact. Notably,

- **Vol. 4, 2015-16:** Led by Cate Dapello, Editor-in-Chief, and senior interpersonal major, the *Journal* took a major leap forward by developing its first ever theme of “Creating Connections” and had a record (at the time) number of submissions at 23, accepting 7 (30% acceptance rate). The call for submissions broadened the kinds of submissions and included 5 research articles, 1 media campaign, and 1 reflection entry. The journal was 80 pages in length, and there were 13 student editors (i.e., peer reviewers).
- **Vol. 5, 2016-17:** Led by Meghan Doyle, Editor-in-Chief, and junior intercultural major, the *Journal* used the theme of “Voices of Diversity” and had a (current) record 41 submissions, with 12 being published (29% acceptance rate). Articles examining diversity in race, sexual orientation, gender, politics, religion, and geography were featured in the 78 page volume. The 10 student editors selected a range of articles for this volume, ranging from research to *Graphic* articles to blog posts to sculptures, and featured a color cover. In addition, this was the first year for an online exclusive that featured another 7 articles. Meghan, one of the student editors, and one of the published authors all presented on the *Journal* at the Student Research Symposium on March 24, 2017, also a first for the *Journal*.

This is a student-led, student run publication. Although Bert Ballard advises and helps to organize and guide, the Editor-in-Chief recruits other editors, solicits submissions, promotes the *Journal*, and ultimately collects the reviews and makes the final decisions about what submissions are included and which ones are not. Further, the Editor-in-Chief designs and produces the layout.

**Beyond the outstanding opportunity for students, the *Journal* is hosted on the Pepperdine Digital Commons site at <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/pjcr/> I encourage you to visit the website (also professionally laid out by the Editor-in-Chief) as the *Journal* has received 334 downloads in the past week, almost 10,000 in the past year, and nearly 25,000 downloads since its inception! Even more impressive is that these downloads are not just from the United States, but also from around the world including Europe, the Middle East, Asia, India, Australia, South America, Korea, and Africa!**

Student Conference Presentations:

Hews, R. (Fall 2015). *The Kibo Group as a Transformational Development Organization Adapting Cultural-Political Dimensions*. Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University, Seaver College. Funded by Pepperdine University Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative Program and presented at the Pepperdine Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Achievement Symposium, April 2016. Dr. Juanie Walker - faculty mentor.

Novak, H. (2014-2015). *An exploratory study on the influence of relational dialectics on communication in Christian-based marriages*. Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University, Seaver College. Funded by Pepperdine University Summer Undergraduate Research Program Undergraduate Research Program and presented at the Pepperdine Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Achievement Symposium, April 3, 2015. Dr. Bert Ballard - faculty mentor.

Tefertiller, S. (Spring 2016). *Transformational Learning in East Africa, Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative*. Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University, Seaver College. Funded by Pepperdine University Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative Program and presented at the Pepperdine Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Achievement Symposium, April 2016. Dr. Juanie Walker - faculty mentor.

Waters, K. (2013). *Acknowledging the adrift: Homelessness and the life-giving gift of acknowledgment* [documentary film]. Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University, Seaver College. Film presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Washington, DC, November 21-24, 2013. Dr. Bert Ballard - faculty mentor.

Student involved Research Publications:

Amaro, L. M., Jiang, J., & Hanna, C. (under review). A never ending battle: Emotional frames, conflict, and resolution among mothers of children with eczema. Under review at *Qualitative Health Research*.

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

Internship\_Survey\_Results\_\_Graphs.pdf

Internship\_Data\_Ken\_Waters\_2.pdf

## STUDENT SUCCESS, ALUMNI, AND ASSESSMENT DATA

### Student success data

**12. What is the profile of students in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the purpose and goals of the program?**

**Please explain your student success data (enrollment and retention data). Evidence should include student retention and graduation rate trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories such as race, gender, first-generation students, etc.).**

**OIE provides this data annually and houses the reports on the OIE website and LiveText site.**

### Student Success Data

*Attached is the student success data for your program.*

Enrollment\_Data\_Intercultural\_Communication\_Fall2011\_15.xlsx

Enrollment\_Data\_Interpersonal\_Communication\_Fall2011\_15.xlsx

Enrollment\_Data\_Organizational\_Communication\_Fall2011\_15.xlsx

Enrollment\_Data\_Speech\_Communication\_Fall2011\_15.xlsx

Enrollment\_Data\_Rhetoric\_Leadership\_Fall2011\_15.xlsx

### Student and Alumni Data

**13. Please present your student and alumni survey data examining student attitudes, satisfaction levels and dispositions. OIE will provide the data in tables and graphs in their Educational Effectiveness Report. Programs are responsible for explaining the survey results. Survey data includes: UCLA/CIRP satisfaction survey data, alumni data.**

### Student and alumni survey data

*Attached is the student and alumni survey data for your program.*

Data\_Report\_\_\_COM\_Alumni\_\_2016\_\_FINAL\_08\_22\_16.pdf

For indirect evidence in consideration of alumni satisfaction and success, we offer the following video "Advice from Pepperdine Communication Division Alumni" (<https://youtu.be/5QyX7kN4224>). The video was produced in summer 2017 by a graduating Rhetoric and Leadership major as part of her capstone project in which she was tasked with interviewing COM alumni on advice for graduating seniors. They reflect not only on advice, but also what they liked about the COM program, how it prepared them, and thoughts on what could have been improved.

### Assessment Data

**14. Other relevant data. e.g. General education data, special reports.**

### Assessment Data

*Attached is the assessment data for your program.*

COM\_180\_LiveText\_Report\_\_\_Speech\_and\_Rhetoric.pdf

A sample of speeches from Com 180 - Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis (N = 220) was collected, and the assessment evaluated students in the categories of organization, language, delivery, use of supporting materials, and central message. Overall, students performed better in the categories pertaining to content (i.e, organization, supporting material and central message). More than 40% of the sample received either capstone or milestone 3 evaluations. The evaluations related to language and delivery were weaker, and larger percentages were seen at milestone 2 for these categories. A majority of students are demonstrating milestone 3 level work overall.

## ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Integrity

**In meaning of the degree (section four) student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the rigor of the program.**

**15. Are the graduates achieving the student learning outcomes at the expected level? How was the threshold determined? How do you know your expectations are appropriate? Do you use comparisons based on national standards or benchmarking? How have your assessment findings supported this? Is there assurance that students consistently meet the standards of performance that the major has established? What happens to students that don't meet the standards?**

See attached Full 5 year review direct evidence - 200, 300, IPC, IC, RL, OC word document that details direct evidence collected this year.

**16. Please present an integrated analysis of the data collected from the assessment of direct learning and indirect learning ( survey data, focus group, alumni data, and authentic evidence). Please report on the findings from the last comprehensive program review. In summary please explain how the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the students' educational experience.**

Integrating direct assessment evidence from two core classes and four capstone classes provides a broad assessment of the communication studies program at Pepperdine. Conclusions, or "Closing the Loop," that are presented here are organized into two broad categories, those relating to assessment and those relating to the future of the program. Note the following abbreviations:

- IC = Intercultural Communication concentration
- IPC = Interpersonal Communication concentration
- OC = Organizational Communication concentration
- RL = Rhetoric & Leadership concentration

#### “Closing the Loop” on Assessment:

While significant strides have been made since the 2012 five-year program review regarding consistency across classes and concentrations, efficiency, integration and collaboration, and process, more can be done. Specifically:

- For the core, consistent assignments across COM 200 and COM 300 (as well as COM 301: Rhetoric and Social Influence and COM 400: Communication Ethics – not assessed this time) would make assessment more seamless and enhance consistency across sections.
- For IC, an assignment, exam question, or reflection specifically for assessment of intercultural majors is needed to improve veracity of data.
- For OC, an assignment that offers more clarity in presenting data would help and would also reduce analysis time and investment.
- For OC, more faculty ought to be involved in assessment to ensure reliability of the data and to separate conflicts of interest.
- For all concentrations, students should be involved more directly in direct evidence assessment and review. Although this has been done in the past with success (see 2016 COM 450 Oral Competency), it was not done for this, or the previous five-year program review. Although some concentrations did use reflection papers (IC, IPC), more is needed to enhance assessment results and conclusions. Indirect evidence through student satisfaction surveys is also valuable (see #7 – Pedagogy), but serves as a supplementary and confirmatory role rather than as direct evidence of learning outcomes.
- For both core and concentrations, consistent rubrics need to be developed. Rubrics ranged from 3-point to 5-point Likert scales and were generally consistent with the AAC rubrics. However, while the different rubrics were justified due to PLO diversity and nuance, it makes comparison across courses, sections, and concentrations uneven and inconsistent. However, all rubrics were excellent in terms of capturing the PLOs (although IPC’s did not explicitly state its PLO in its rubric, focusing instead on the quality of evidence presented by students).
- Relatedly, in the concentrations, more integration, collaboration, and consistency from an assessment standpoint is recommended. Again, there is evidence that significant strides have been made since the previous five-year review, notably in clarity of curriculum coordinator roles, however, more collaboration would enhance results and ease the process. Additionally, shared course design may facilitate the integration of assessment as a course design issue and not a “back-end” issue. This could better couple PLO focus with course design.

#### “Closing the Loop” on Curriculum:

While clarity of curriculum coordinator roles and the solidification of the curriculums in the 4 areas has been advanced based on the 2012 five-year review, the challenge of functioning as a “4-in-one” program remains. The broadest recommendation based on direct evidence from this current five-year review is for the Communication Studies faculty to review its curriculum and move forward with a more integrated curriculum.

- The IC concentration has the greatest need for a curriculum review given inconsistent leadership (a retired coordinator and a new coordinator in a relatively short amount of time) with a need for more explicit scaffolding across its PLO’s. A comprehensive review and restructuring of its PLO’s/vision are warranted.
- The OC concentration should assess the content in its capstone course (as recommended) as well as conduct a review of its scaffolding of content across the curriculum.

- The IPC concentration is successful with a relatively solid curriculum (although it has many options that can be confusing for students), but a consideration of its rigor is suggested over the next five-year period.
- The RL concentration provides a solid curriculum with strong rigor, but lack of consistency in faculty has caused this concentration to decrease in numbers and overall effectiveness.
- The inconsistency of findings across the concentrations points to an inefficient management of the major that has created unnecessary “silo-ing” for faculty. This is a structural deficiency, not a programmatic or personnel one. The inconsistency has led to some major programs being viewed as “more” or “less” rigorous by students as well as creating an environment whereby faculty are dis-incentivized to work across concentration areas. As such, resources are not shared as much as they could within a program that, by most points, is largely successful.
- Many of these inconsistencies and inefficiencies are due to a high turnover in faculty, both in terms of leaving the institution as well as absence through routine university opportunities such as sabbatical, visiting leaves, medical leaves, and international programs service.
  - IC has had 1 retirement, 1 new curriculum coordinator hired in the last 2 years, and 1 new tenure-track faculty join the concentration in the last year (2 total tenure-track faculty).
  - IPC has had 1 tenure-track faculty member serve as a visiting international program faculty and 1 new tenure-track hire in the past 3 years (2 total tenure-track faculty).
  - OC has had 1 tenure-track faculty leave (1 total tenured faculty now).
  - RL has had 2 tenured faculty leave (1 visiting leave for another institution, another medical/personal leave), 1 tenured faculty member serve as a visiting international program faculty, and 1 tenured faculty member recently accede to divisional dean. In the past 3 years, none of the 3 RL faculty members have been together for a full year and there is only 1 going into the next academic year, but she is serving as divisional dean. (1 tenured faculty member total)
  - All of this is coupled with only 3 who are tenured with 3 on tenure-track and many courses in both the core and upper division taught by visiting professors (in addition to visiting professors also involved in assessment). And while the visiting professors are performing admirably, they lack the political and institutional capital to provide curricula consistency and leadership, and for some, lack the content and research expertise to lead the program.
- Curriculum-wise, for both the core and the concentrations, streamlining and more strategically integrating the core and concentrations is warranted, not just for content, but also for creating a structure that will enable faculty and instructors to collaborate and teach in their expertise areas. Streamlining may reduce inefficiencies and inconsistencies, while maximizing flexibility for students and faculty. Simply put, a curriculum that provides a core (similar to what exists) with less “silo’d” concentrations may lead to more collaboration, reduce territoriality, and encourage integration between classes for assessment and through course content. It will also enable faculty to focus their teaching on their expertise areas (and cover less remedial content) and encourage assessment as a course design issue – a “front end” conversation rather than a “back end” one. If faculty feel less defensive about their curriculum and take more ownership of their courses without feeling threatened, turnover could be reduced.
  - Complementarily, a streamlined curriculum with less “silos” will mirror other peer institutions as well as the general trend in communication studies across the United States. Other communication programs have recognized the need to integrate the breadth of the communication discipline into a common set of core courses, maximize flexibility in upper division courses which enables faculty to focus on their expertise areas, enhance choice and creativity for students in course selection, and

create a more secure structure for faculty. Pepperdine Communication Division should follow this trend.

- A comprehensive PLO review and visioning process should be undertaken (and indeed one has already begun) as well as a re-alignment of curriculum; a re-alignment and re-design that considers the strengths of the current faculty while building on its past successes.

**Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

Human\_Communication\_Annual\_Report\_2016.docx

Human\_COM\_Assessment\_Report\_2015.docx

Human\_COM\_Assessment\_Report\_2014.docx

Rhetoric\_and\_Leadership\_Assessment\_Report\_2013.docx

Intercultural\_Assessment\_Report\_2013.docx

Interpersonal\_Assessment\_Report\_2013.docx

Organizational\_Communication\_Assessment\_Report\_2012.docx

Rhetoric\_and\_Leadership\_Assessment\_Report\_2012.docx

Interpersonal\_Communication\_Assessment\_Report\_2012.docx

Intercultural\_Communication\_Assessment\_Report\_2012.docx

Full\_5\_year\_review\_direct\_evidence\_\_200\_300\_IPC\_IC\_RL\_Org\_June\_2017.docx

## WASC 5 CORE COMPETENCIES

**17. How does the program ensure that graduates meet the WASC FIVE CORE COMPETENCIES? Present your findings of measurements you have done of the core competencies.**

Core Competency Assessment Summary:

The following chart details when the Five Core Competencies were assessed for the Communication Studies major (Intercultural, Interpersonal, Organizational, and Rhetoric and Leadership) over the past 5 years. The five WASC core competencies are Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, Oral Communication, Written Communication, and Quantitative Skills. At times these competencies were directly assessed while others are indirectly assessed through PLOs. Reviewers should consult the report for that year.

Here is a summary based on year:

- **2011-12 – Five Year Review** – Core competency assessment was not requested
- **2012-13 – Individual program reports** submitted rather than a combined report. Core competencies were indirectly assessed through PLO's as follows:
  - Communication Core – not assessed
  - Intercultural Communication – PLO #3 with Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Written Communication indirectly assessed.
  - Interpersonal Communication – PLO #3 with Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Written Communication indirectly assessed.
  - Organizational Communication – PLO #2 with Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Quantitative Skills indirectly assessed.
  - Rhetoric and Leadership – PLO #3 with Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Written Communication indirectly assessed. (Note that Quantitative Skills are not a competency developed in the RL program).
- **2013-14 – Combined Report** but different PLO's assessed depending on program:
  - Communication Core – PLO #4 with Critical Thinking indirectly assessed.
  - Intercultural Communication – PLO #4 with Oral Communication and Written Communication indirectly assessed.
  - Interpersonal Communication – PLO #4 with Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Written Communication indirectly assessed.
  - Organizational Communication – PLO #3 with Critical Thinking and Oral Communication indirectly assessed.
  - Rhetoric and Leadership – PLO #4 which does not map with Core Competencies.
- **2014-15 – Combined Report** – all programs assessed both Critical Thinking and Written Communication directly
  - Communication Core – PLO #3 with Oral Communication and Written Communication indirectly assessed.

- Intercultural Communication – PLO #3 with Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Written Communication indirectly assessed.
- Interpersonal Communication – PLO #3 with Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Written Communication indirectly assessed.
- Organizational Communication – PLO #2 with Critical Thinking indirectly assessed. (Note: Between 2013-14 and 2014-15, OC adjusted their PLOs so Core Competency alignments also changed.)
- Rhetoric and Leadership – PLO #3 with Critical Thinking and Written Communication indirectly assessed.
- **2015-16 – Combined Report** – all programs assessed Oral Communication directly
  - Communication Core – not assessed
  - Intercultural Communication – PLO #2 with Information Literacy indirectly assessed.
  - Interpersonal Communication – PLO #2 with Oral Communication, Written Communication, and Quantitative Skills indirectly assessed.
  - Organizational Communication – PLO #2 with Critical Thinking indirectly assessed. (Note: Between 2013-14 and 2014-15, OC adjusted their PLOs so Core Competency alignments also changed.)
  - Rhetoric and Leadership – PLO #1 with Information Literacy indirectly assessed.

The following chart represents when Core Competencies were assessed either directly or indirectly:

The picture can't be displayed.

Recommendation: Communication Studies needs to better align assessment schedule and PLOs in order to reduce redundancy of core competencies (i.e., less Critical Thinking for OC) while ensuring all Core Competencies are assessed (i.e., Information Literacy for most programs). Also, communication core should be assessed more consistently going forward.

## SUSTAINABILITY: RESOURCES

**18. With the rapid changes in the higher education environment, the University needs to demonstrate how financial viability and planning of their long-term stability are ensured.**

**In order to demonstrate this each program should address**

- a. questions about the level of student demand for the program and**
- b. the degree to which resources are allocated appropriately so they are sufficient to maintain program quality.**
- c. What is happening within the profession, local community, or society that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future? (If appropriate include market research.)**

**Existing Demand:** See enrollment data trends across majors in section 9-12.

**Resources:** The Communication Studies major shares its operating budget with all majors under the Communication Division. The Divisional Dean manages the budget to allow for important resources needed for each program's success. Resources are allocated to key areas, including but not limited to: faculty conference travel, female faculty research/writing retreat, student workers, graduate assistants (this program is ending in 2018), assessment, books and other supplies for curriculum development, etc. The debate co-curricular activity has its own operating budget. All programs are well supported and have access to the resources they require to thrive.

**Future Demand:** The National Communication Association recently released a brief (attached) demonstrating increased demand for the Communication major nationally. Additionally, employers consistently cite the skills we emphasize as the most essential skills for succeeding in the working world. These skills include, but are not limited to: teamwork, ability to solve complex problems, and ability to communicate effectively in oral and written formats (see for example: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/susanadams/2014/11/12/the-10-skills-employers-most-want-in-2015-graduates/#4834be525116>). The NCA data concerning increased demand for our major, and the NACE data on what employers are looking for in graduates both point to a strong future for our program.

## 19. FACILITIES

**Please describe the adequacy of**

- a. Classroom space**
- b. Laboratories**
- c. Office space**
- d. Programming venues**
- e. Student study spaces**

The Communication Studies major has access to approximately ten classroom spaces in the Center for Communication and Business. Classes are scheduled in rooms according to their needs. For example, a class with more than 20 students needing to move desks for group work may use a larger classroom with individual desks, while a class with less than 10 students focused on discussion may use a large conference room. Most classes meet on the second floor of the CCB across the hall from professors' offices. All tenure-track faculty have their own office. Full time contingent faculty have 1-3 people per office depending on space and their student advising responsibilities. Adjunct faculty share one office, which is rarely in use by more than two people at a time. Majors have access to all programming venues on campus if they reserve them

ahead of time. Students study in the CCB's cafe area where there are tables for group work and computers for individual use. They also have access to Payson Library (newly remodeled and opening in Fall 2017) where they have access to a librarian who specializes in helping Communication students access appropriate research in their field. Our librarian, Melinda Raine, also regularly compiles finding aids and conducts sessions in the library for specific classes at the request of the instructor.

## **FACULTY AND STAFF**

**20. What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty/staff in the program in relation to the program purpose and goals? How do faculty/staff members' backgrounds, expertise, research, and other professional work contribute to the quality of the program?**

**Evidence in this category should include (this could be collected through faculty CVs) :**

- a. Proportion of faculty with terminal degrees**
- b. List of faculty/staff specialties within discipline (and how those specialties align with the program curriculum)**
- c. Record of scholarship for each faculty member, professional presentations for staff members**
- d. Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment**
- e. External funding awarded to faculty/staff**

All six tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Communication Studies program hold terminal degrees.

Three visiting faculty regularly teach in the Communication studies major. All hold Master's degrees.

### **Faculty specialties as aligned with the Communication Studies curriculum:**

#### *Interpersonal Communication*

- Robert Ballard, Ph.D.
- Lauren Amaro, Ph.D.
- Sarah Ballard, M.A.
- Greg Daum, M.S., M.Div.

#### *Intercultural Communication*

- Charles Choi, Ph.D.
- Roslyn Satchel, Ph.D., JD

#### *Organizational Communication*

- Juanie Walker, Ph.D.

#### *Rhetoric & Leadership*

- Sarah Stone Watt, Ph.D.
- Abi Smith, M.A.
- Gary Selby, Ph.D. (Left Pepperdine in 2016)
- John Jones, Ph.D. (On leave 2015-16. Left Pepperdine in 2017)

## 21. FACULTY/STAFF

**Are there sufficient numbers of faculty/staff to maintain program quality? Do program faculty/staff have the support they need to do their work?**

- a. Distribution of faculty across ranks (or staff years at institution)
- b. Diversity of faculty/staff
- c. Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty)
- d. Student-faculty ratio
- e. Faculty workload
- f. Faculty review and evaluation processes
- g. Mentoring processes
- h. Professional development opportunities and resources (including travel and research funds)
- i. Sufficient time for research, program development

Distribution of faculty across ranks:

Two tenured faculty members at the rank of Professor in Communication Studies left the university in spring of 2017. Currently, the program has:

- 4 Associate Professors (3 with tenure, one without)
- 2 Tenure-track Assistant Professors
- 3 Visiting faculty members, all of whom have been teaching in the program for five years or more

Diversity of faculty:

Religion:

- 4 Christian (non-denominational)
- 3 Church of Christ
- 1 African Methodist Episcopal
- 1 Christian (Presbyterian)

Racial Background:

- 5 White/Caucasian/European American
- 2 Asian-American
- 1 African American
- 1 Biracial Japanese/Caucasian

Gender:

- 6 Female
- 3 Male

Citizenship:

- 9 United States

While there are many part-time faculty members who teach general education and other courses in the Communication Division, all Communication Studies major courses are taught by full time faculty.

Unless they have a course release for research or a co-curricular, all tenured faculty teach a 3-3 course load, tenure-track faculty teach 2-3, and visiting faculty teach 4-4. Tenured and tenure-track (after their first year) faculty serve as major advisors for students. The division average for number of majors is 35. Visiting faculty engage in informal advising relationships with students who seek their expertise, but they are not assigned to anyone as a major advisor. Communication Studies faculty are also active in the graduate program as teachers, advisors, and committee members. All tenured and tenure-track faculty also serve on division, college, and university committees.

Annual reviews of faculty have been sporadic over the past five years. Visiting faculty have not had reviews. Tenure-track faculty are eligible for step increases every two years. Tenure track faculty are reviewed through the Seaver College rank, tenure, and promotion process at pretenure, tenure, Associate and Professor ranks, and every five years thereafter. The new Divisional Dean has recently instituted an annual review process and all full-time faculty can expect to be reviewed annually from this point forward.

There is currently no formal mentoring process for visiting faculty. Tenure track faculty are assigned a mentor from another division in their first year. Three faculty members have participated in the Women's Mentorship Program provided by the Seaver College Committee on Women Faculty. Two faculty members have participated in the Provost's Leadership Group for people interested in administrative roles.

The division and the university provide many professional development opportunities to faculty. The division provides conference funding for 1-2 conferences per year, with additional travel and/or research funding on a case-by-case basis depending on available resources at the time of the request. Some faculty have earned additional conference and research funding through university programs including fellowships, research grants, student research collaboration, and more. Professional development in teaching is provided through the Dean's office funding for attendance at the Teaching Professor Conference, which many of the faculty have attended. Recently, many faculty have also taken part in, or are signed up to take part in, SEED, a professional development opportunity that builds cultural competence.

While faculty class schedules (2-3 tenure-track and 3-3 tenured) appear to give appropriate time for research activities, many Communication Studies faculty are heavily involved in service opportunities that tend to take up time intended for research activities. In the past year, all Communication Studies faculty have made time for regular meetings concerning program development--a practice we aim to continue.

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

RBallard\_CV\_July\_2017.doc

Abigail\_Smith\_CV.docx

Ballard\_S\_CV\_July\_2017.doc

Greg\_s\_CV.doc

Stone\_Watt\_Vitae\_2016\_\_1\_.doc

## FINANCIAL RESOURCES

### 22. Financial Resources:

Please describe your operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a 3-5 year period.

Awaiting data.

### Evidence

*Please attach evidence.*

## EXTERNAL REVIEW

### External Review Report

In summary please explain how, through the findings in the annual assessments, the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the educational experience that is supported through benchmarking. (Has the program been reviewed by external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, or compared with other similar institutions, or national standards?)

#### I. GUIDELINES FOR ORGANIZING THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

The external review typically occurs after a program or department completes its self-study report, but the selection and invitation of external reviewers can occur during the self-study process to ensure the availability of the best reviewers. However, programs with concurrent accreditation (e.g., AACSB, APA, ABA) can use the visiting team for that discipline-specific accreditation as the external review. The report from the site visitors should be included in the final report. For an illustration of potential areas for the reviewers to consider, see Attachment below.

#### II. CHOOSING REVIEWERS

The size and composition of the review team can vary, depending on the size of the program under review. Usually, the team involves one or two people. At the time a department or program is notified that it will be conducting a program review, appropriate individuals should submit a list of names of possible reviewers. These reviewers should be external to the school/University. External reviewers should be distinguished scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field and be familiar with campuses that are similar to Pepperdine University and the program undergoing review. It is also helpful for external reviewers to have had experience with program administration and with program assessment. At least one of the reviewers should be experienced with student learning outcomes assessment in order to review and analyze the program's assessment processes and results. The Dean of each School will have the final approval of the external reviewer.

#### III. MATERIALS FOR THE EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM

At least 30 days prior to the scheduled department visit, the information from the program self-study and appropriate additional materials are sent to each member of the external review team. An identical information package should be provided to appropriate members of the administrators overseeing the program. The reviewers should compile a

report that includes observations, strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations based on evidence. The attached External Review Report expectations outlines the guidelines for the external reviewers' site visit and report. Reviewers and Divisional Deans should also sign a consultant agreement. External Reviewers should also be given a schedule for their visit and a confirmation letter, and programs will submit a budget proposal for the site visit to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

#### **IV. CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION**

- Curriculum
- Faculty
- Resources
- Viability

#### **V. EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM VISIT AND REPORT**

The review team visit typically lasts for two days, during which time the review committee members meet with department faculty, academic advisors, students, and select administrators. The review team typically takes part in an exit interview just prior to concluding its departmental visit.

The team is expected to submit its written evaluation to the campus program review committee no later than 4 weeks after the visit. The written evaluation should include a review of strengths and challenges, resource allocation, and program viability as well as suggestions for policy and resources. Upon submission of the report, off-campus reviewers receive a previously agreed upon stipend and travel expense reimbursement (to be determined by the department under review).

As soon as the program receives the report from the external review team, it is distributed to the appropriate individuals. The department is typically asked to review the report (within a brief time period) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. To maximize the effectiveness of program review, the findings and resulting decisions should be shared with all of the stakeholder groups. Such sharing of findings generates buy-in to the program's and/or institution's goals. To facilitate and track the implementation of improvement plans, each year the relevant faculty members should review the progress of programs reviewed in previous years. If the department/program was not successful in implementing all aspects of the plan, they may follow up with their appropriate administrative unit regarding resource allocation or other barriers involved in preventing successful implementation.

#### **External Reviewer Report Expectations**

Please find the link below for the "External Review Summary Sheet".  
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Z835R7F>

#### **External Reviewer Report Expectations**

*Please attach the completed form.*

External\_Reviewer\_Report.docx

## FORMS

### QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

#### QIP

For the Quality Improvement Plan, the program should extract from the "preliminary quality improvement goals and action plan" of the self-study (section A.III) as well as from both the external and internal review recommendations.

The following prompts may be helpful in considering your QIP:

1. Are the curriculum, practices, processes, and resources properly aligned with the goals of the program?
2. Are department/program outcomes aligned with the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs)?
3. Is the level of program quality aligned with the school/University's acceptable level of program quality?
4. Is the level of program quality aligned with the constituents' acceptable level of quality?
5. Are program goals being achieved?
6. Are student learning outcomes being achieved at the established standard of achievement? What are you using for comparison/benchmarking?
7. How have the results of program review been used to inform decision-making and improve instruction and student learning outcomes?
8. What was identified in the process of examining the institution's program review process that may require deeper reflection, changes, and/or restructuring? What will be done as a result? What resources will be required?
9. What have the reviewers learned as they carried out assessments of student learning? How have assessment protocols, faculty development, choices of instruments, or other aspects of assessment changed as a result?

Many of the changes that occur following program review are related to curricular adjustments that are, in essence, resource neutral. Program faculty or staff should make note of the ways that they used data to make decisions. Changes that are outside the control of the program or need additional support should be noted and reviewed by the dean in the final section, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

#### QIP Form

Please find the link below for the "QIP Form".

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6ufJTOgPx32M3JiNTM3bV9KNVk/view?usp=sharing>

**Please attach the QIP form**

*Please attach the completed form.*

COM\_QIP.docx

For items 1-6 and 9, please see Question 10-16 on "Closing the Loop," which addresses issues of curriculum, alignment, quality, outcomes, achievement, assessment, and assessment process. For #7 and #8, see attached QIP form.