Communication Area
Program Review Report
Department of Humanities
College of Arts and Sciences

B.A. Communication
B.S. Applied Speech Communication
A.A. Applied Speech Communication
Communication Minor
Speech Communication (Teaching) Minor

2007

Program Review Panel

Elizabeth Wilson, Chair and Program Coordinator
Sandra Alspach, Communication
Lon Green, Communication
Paul Kammerdiner, FLITE Archives & Special Collections
Connie Morcom, TV & Digital Media Production
Donna Smith, Communication
Grant Snider, Department Head, Humanities

CONTENTS

SECTION 4: FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS

SECTION 6: APPENDICES

SECTION 1: PROGRAM OVERVIEW

OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM

As noted in its mission statement, Ferris State University aims to be a 'national leader in providing opportunities for innovative teaching and learning in career-oriented, technological, and professional education." The communication area contributes to the achievement of this objective by providing the knowledge and skills students need to be effective communicators both in the workplace and in their communities. This is undertaken in two ways: through basic competency courses included in the general education curriculum and more comprehensive programs of study. Hence, instruction must adapt to different levels of expertise and interest in the discipline, thereby requiring faculty to use a variety of methods and approaches.

Communication faculty service the entire student body through general education courses that assist students in building basic competencies in communication. Historically, communication faculty have taught interpersonal communication (COMM 105), public speaking (COMM 121), small group decision making (COMM 221) and argumentation and debate (COMM 251). In 2002, two other courses were added to this group: foundations of interpersonal communication (COMM 200) and public presentation practices (COMM 201). Both are more rigorous than their 100 level counterparts in terms of course content and competency expectations.

The communication courses students took for general education spawned their interest in the area. As a result, a minor in speech communication was approved in 1987. While there have been system-wide impediments to tracking the number of persons completing the minor, there is evidence that 181 students have completed a speech communication minor.

In 1999, a teaching minor was developed specifically for those students seeking certification in speech communication. To date, forty-eight persons have been graduated with this credential.

Over time, degree programs were added to the menu of student options. In 1997, the Board of Trustees approved an Associate of Arts as well as a Bachelor of Science Degree in Applied Speech Communication. According to information obtained from Alumni Relations, thirty students have completed the A.A; seventy-seven students have completed the B.S.

While the B.S. degree appealed to a number of students, interest was expressed in a program of study that was more reflective of a liberal arts tradition which maintained a communication focus. This led to the Bachelor of Arts Degree which was approved in 2002. Thus far, fourteen students have been graduated with this degree.

Communication graduates are pursuing a variety of career paths. They include law, the ministry, retail sales, public relations such as fund raising and events planning, hotel management, etc. In addition, some have undertaken graduate study on a full or part time basis. *(See Appendix B)*

A. PROGRAM GOALS

A.1. Current learning outcomes for graduates of each program

The communication area has established the following outcomes for its graduates. While all graduates are expected to display the competencies included in the Associate's degree, those undertaking the B.S. and B.A. degrees need to master additional competencies which are noted below.

At the Associate level, the student will

1. demonstrate understanding of the human communication process; including message construction, dissemination, and interpretation
2. demonstrate understanding of how messages construct personal identity
3. demonstrate the ability to interact appropriately and effectively with another person, both verbally and nonverbally (interpersonal)
4. demonstrate the ability to construct appropriately and deliver effectively a public speech
5. demonstrate the ability to participate appropriately and effectively in performing a group problem solving activity
6. demonstrate understanding of how communication theories inform research and build knowledge in the field

At the Bachelor of Science level, the student will demonstrate the outcomes of the Associate level and

1. demonstrate understanding of how research is conducted in communication
2. demonstrate understanding of and ability to participate appropriately and effectively in organizational settings
3. demonstrate understanding of and ability to participate appropriately and effectively with people from different cultural backgrounds
4. demonstrate understanding of legal and ethical principles governing appropriate and effective communication

At the Bachelor of Arts level, the student will demonstrate the outcomes of the Associate level and

1. demonstrate understanding of how research is conducted in communication
2. demonstrate understanding of how various disciplines contribute to a broader appreciation of human communication processes and activities

A.2. Manner in which the goals were established

The goals were established by the faculty through a series of meetings held throughout the 2002-2003 academic year under the direction of the program coordinator. While the original program proposals included student goals, they were reworked so that they were specified in greater detail.

A.3. How the goals prepare students for careers and meeting employer needs

The communication program prepares students for a variety of careers which is critical given the changing nature of the job market. It is estimated that most people will make several career changes throughout their lifetime.

The communication program focuses on knowledge and skills that can be utilized in any work situation and, therefore, continues to be relevant to the needs and demands of any profession. This is due to the fact that the information obtained through communication studies is not limited to a particular field such as bridge construction but rather the process of bridge building. For instance, oral communication skills are vital when attempting to explain environmental impacts to a zoning commission, when soliciting community support, when attempting to obtain funds from investors, etc. Similarly, if you're going to build a bridge, it's vital to know about creating a team, dealing with conflict effectively, developing and maintaining leadership, group morale, etc.

A.4. Changes in goals since the last program review

In the last program review, the communication area was asked to articulate its mission in contrast to stating its goals. The two are not exactly the same thing.

Keeping that point in mind, it is noted that in the 2002 program review, the communication area stated its mission was "to prepare students to contribute in the workplace and in their communities with enhanced skills and knowledge in effective and appropriate interpersonal, small group and presentational communication." While the faculty does not take issue with this statement, the goals of the program have been honed and refined so that they more clearly articulate the outcomes faculty want students to achieve. By doing this, the goals have become more tangible thereby facilitating their measurement.

A.5. Relationship of the program goals to the University's mission, and the departmental, college, and divisional strategic plans

The communication program clearly advances the university's mission and is consistent with the aims of the departmental, college, and divisional strategic plans. This is readily seen when the program is examined in relation to President Eisler's three pillars since they are embodied in any strategic plan.   These three pillars: to create a learning-centered institution; to become an engaged campus; and to work together, will be discussed in greater detail.

The goals of the communication program focus on the knowledge and skills that students are going to need in order to be successful in their personal and professional lives. In that sense, the program is learner-centered. This learner-centered approach is also seen in the delivery of this information. Faculty make every effort to offer students opportunities to discuss ideas and information in class, to practice different communication techniques and methods, and to present material in a way that is relevant to students given their interests and experience.

The program fosters engagement in a number of ways. For example, students participate in debates about issues of public concern in the classroom, campus-wide forums and national competitive events. In addition, community outreach is encouraged through public presentations at local high schools, food drives for the needy, internships at various nonprofit organizations, etc.

The program works with others on campus in a variety of ways. Courses, in addition to those taught as general education, have been developed in response to requests from other disciplines on campus. Furthermore, efforts have been undertaken to work with the College of Allied Health in developing a health communication program. Most recently, the area cooperated with the College of Business to create the Integrated Marketing Techniques Minor.

B. PROGRAM VISIBILITY AND DISTINCTIVENESS

B.1. Distinctive features of the program

The fact that students may choose to pursue either a B.S. or B.A. degree distinguishes Ferris's communication program from others. Each meets different needs and interests. Students who seek a more structured academic experience in terms of course selection and focus have an option available to them. Similarly, the B.A. course of study allows students to integrate other disciplines into their program and to select more of their communication classes based on their individual interests, thereby providing greater flexibility and overall control of program content.

Even so, both degrees provide students with a broad grounding in the communication field so that they are prepared to meet the expectations of employers seeking a "communication" person. In today's world, knowledge of communication can mean different things to different people. It seems prudent, then, that a graduate has a range of information and tools at his/her disposal that will enable him/her to succeed. This broad-based approach differs from many other programs in the state. For example, at Western Michigan University, a student must choose one of seven possible majors to earn a B.A. in communication. If s/he chooses communication studies, no oral communication courses are included in the program; whereas, if s/he decides to major in interpersonal communication, public speaking is required.

Because the bachelor's degree is the most advanced one offered by the area, an emphasis is placed on undergraduate education. Faculty's time and attention is devoted to these students as seen in the number of opportunities students are given to utilize and develop their communication skills outside the classroom, e.g., the Ferris Communication Association, Lambda Pi Eta, and Pi Kappa Delta.

Historically, the speech and debate teams have achieved national recognition on the competitive circuits. That reputation continues as changes occur within the area, e.g., moving to a parliamentary form of debate, as seen in the awards and recognition received. For example, in 2006, the Ferris State Parliamentary Debate team placed second in the National Comprehensive Tournament.

B.2. The program's ability to attract quality students

In spring 2007 the communication area was informed that 34 persons had been admitted to the program for the fall term. The program coordinator sent a welcome letter to the new admits and encouraged them to contact her if they had any questions.

This was followed by a phone call undertaken by the program's graduating seniors. Two attempts were made to contact these persons, and 18 persons in all were reached. Using a protocol established by the program coordinator, the interviewers asked a series of questions which included whether they planned to attend Ferris and why or why not.

Only 2 persons had decided to attend Ferris; 2 others were undecided. The rest had made their choices: 6 were attending Michigan State University; 2 were going to Western Michigan University: 1 had chosen Central Michigan University; another Grand Valley; and 1 was attending Eastern. Only 1 person was going to go to community college and 2 others selected a private school.

When these persons were asked what factors were considered when making their choices, two reasons were given. One was economic concerns. For example, one student explained s/he could live at home and go to school X. The other overriding factor affecting decisions was the institutional image. This was reflected in one student's response when asked why s/he had chosen to attend Michigan State: "Why? Because it's Michigan State!"

In no instance did a respondent mention a decision being based upon programmatic preferences. Choices were not based on comparing one program to another and evaluating whether one better prepared him/her for his/her career.

The communication area was surprised by the results of this survey. Before getting these data, faculty were unaware that Michigan State was our primary competition, i.e., one-third of these respondents were attending this school. While it is flattering to be a contender against Michigan State, there doesn't seem to be a way in which the area can respond and in time prevail since it is the institutional image that seems to be the drawing card for these persons. Similarly, the area is in no position to combat the economic

concerns voiced by respondents. The communication area only has $4,000 per year for scholarships, and this money is given to currently enrolled students.

B. 3. Institutions that are main competitors for prospective students

Based on the information previously discussed, it appears as though Michigan State and to a lesser degree Western Michigan are the primary competitors for prospective students.

B.3.a. Comparisons of the programs

While it has already been noted that choices do not seem to be based on programmatic issues, there are differences between the three schools that merit examination. In general, The B.A. at Michigan State is similar to the one offered at Ferris with some interesting exceptions. For instance, Michigan does not require any public speaking classes but does require course work in mass communication, an area of study the communication program has not offered in the past but is developing with the addition of a new tenure-track faculty member this fall. It also offers a specialization in communication technologies which appears to be an interdisciplinary program. This is an area that faculty at Ferris would like to pursue through the hire of a tenure-track person.

At Western, there is not just one program of study that leads to the B.A. degree in communication but rather several different programs that lead to a B.A. Hence, the majors are more specialized, e.g., one in communication studies, another in interpersonal communication, a third in organizational communication, etc. In all, there are 7 different majors within the school of communication. Similar to Michigan State, media studies as well as telecommunication are included in the curriculum; however, each is designated as a specific major within the school. Interestingly enough, courses in public speaking are not required for all majors. For instance, persons majoring in communication studies do not have to take public speaking; whereas, those in interpersonal communication do.

B.3.b. Conclusions drawn from the comparisons

Overall, the communication program at Ferris is broader based when compared to these two institutions. There are certain foundation courses all students must take and they include public speaking, interpersonal communication and small group communication. Both Michigan State and Western Michigan have had the vision to include mass media and communication technologies/telecommunication studies in their programs. The faculty at Ferris is aware of these shortcomings in their program and has taken the initiative to rectify them although success is dependent upon administrative support to fund a tenure-track position in communication technologies.

C. PROGRAM RELEVANCE

C.1. Labor market demand analysis

As already noted, communication is not a vocational major that trains a student for one particular field.   Instead, communication studies prepares one for many occupations including business, education, government, health care, law, mass media, the ministry, and public relations.

In addition, a communication major provides an excellent set of skills for students whose career goals require a graduate-level education. In the case of the legal profession, for example, the *Occupational Outlook Handbook* makes it clear that "prospective lawyers should develop proficiency in writing and speaking, reading, researching, analyzing, and thinking logically-skills needed to succeed both in law school and in the profession."[1] It can be readily seen that the development of many of these skills forms the main learning outcomes for the communication program.

It is also significant to note that, in general, communication skills rank as the most-desired quality employers seek in college graduate candidates according to *Job Outlook 2007*, a report published by NACE (National Association of Colleges and Employers). Interpersonal skills and teamwork skills rose to the top of the list of desired qualities, two proficiencies which are core to the communication program. The report goes on to state that "ironically, communication skills not only top employers' list of most-desired skills, but also their list of the skills most lacking in new college graduates." [2]

As for specific occupational possibilities for a Communication degree holder, the 2006-2007 Edition of the *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (OOH) details that many of the possible career paths for communication majors enjoy healthy prospects for the coming decade. The OOH reports, for example, that employment opportunities will be quite good for those seeking to enter the advertising, marketing, and public relations sectors.[3]

Another area of projected growth is in health communication. Edgar and Hyde report that "evidence suggests that there is a greater demand for individuals to fill jobs that have primary responsibilities in health communication,"[4] citing the clear need "to expand the pool of health communication professionals" as stated in *Healthy People 2010*.[5] The

---

[1] Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Lawyers," in *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2006-07 ed., http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos053.htm (accessed May 5, 2007).
[2] National Association of Colleges and Employers, *Job Outlook 2007*, http://www.centenary.edu/attachments/services/career/mola_menu/nacejoboutlook07student.pdf (accessed May 14, 2007).
[3] Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2006-07 ed., http://www.bls.gov/oco/home.htm (accessed May 5, 2007).
[4] Timothy Edgar and James N. Hyde, "An Alumni-Based Evaluation of Graduate Training in Health Communication: Results of a Survey on Careers, Salaries, Competencies, and Emerging Trends," *Journal of Health Communication* 10 (2005): p. 5.
[5] U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Healthy People 2010*, (Washington DC: GPO, 2000), p. 11-17.

communication program at Ferris has begun to meet this particular trend, offering a COMM 390, entitled Health Communication, in spring 2007.

Overall, the learning outcomes of the communication program correspond nicely with the demands of the current technology-driven economy. A graduate of the communication program will have the option of pursuing a number of career paths as well as graduate school.

C.2. How the program responds to emerging issues in the discipline, changes in the labor force, changes in employer needs, changes in students needs, and other forces of change

Perhaps no other discipline has been so significantly affected by change as the field of communication. The technological revolution has been a communication one. The impact which the mass media and the home computer have had upon Americans' daily lives can hardly be underestimated. The same can be said for the business sector, e.g., on-line conferencing, e-mail, etc. As a result, the ways in which technology has affected communication both in the personal and professional spheres must be included in any program of instruction if students are to be prepared for the world in which they are living.

The communication area recognizes this fact and has hired a tenure line faculty member specializing in mass communication. The area has also requested a position in communication technologies which has been put on hold by the administration. Both of these sub-fields need to be taught by persons who are schooled in these topics due their complexity and the breadth of research which has been done.

Even so, many faculty members are attempting to be responsive to the changes which are occurring as a result of these new technologies. For example, an interpersonal communication course may include a unit on chat rooms or on-line dating in an effort to compare communication style, examine deceptive techniques, etc. Similarly, in the small groups' class students may be expected to conduct a group activity on-line in an effort to build skills, better understand the limits which inhere in the process given the technology, etc.

While these activities help to prepare students for situations they may encounter in their personal and professional lives, it should be emphasized that the study of communication focuses on processes and behaviors that lead to effective/ineffective communication. Much of that information is not time-bound except to the degree that the culture at-large evolves which, in turn, has consequences for societal norms and expectations.

C.3.Why students become communication majors.

Most of our students do not come to Ferris to study communication. Only one-third of those who responded to the alumni survey came to Ferris to major in communication. Often, students decided to major in communication because they took a course they liked

and did relatively well in it. Sometimes, students turn to communication because they do not like the field they are in or are not performing effectively in their program. Still others report they chose communication due to the diversity in career opportunities and the appeal that a communication background has to employers. *(See Appendix B)*

Within the last couple of years, a number of students in dental hygiene have decided to also pursue a communication degree. Since many cannot enroll in dental hygiene courses as soon as they would like, they are trying to benefit from the delay by using that time to complete a communication degree.

C.3.a) Student expectations and satisfaction

Since a detailed discussion of alumni and current students' views of the program, faculty and facilities is provided in Section 2, only a few general comments will be made here. In particular, the reader is referred to sub-sections A., the Alumni Survey; C., the Graduating Student Survey; and D., the Student Survey for specific information.

Overall, both graduates and current students expressed satisfaction with the communication program. The majority of alumni and students said they would definitely major in communication if they were to do it all over again. Similarly, the majority responding to each survey said they would absolutely recommend the program to others. Even so, concerns were expressed about the content of the program. Several persons felt the program needed to provide more direction in terms of a career focus. Some said that could be accomplished through the courses offered including electives. Others suggested better advising was needed.

Advising does seem to be an issue for both current and former students although it is not clear if respondents are referring to the need for assistance with course selection and scheduling or the need for career guidance. Unfortunately, the surveys were not designed to obtain this information since it was not realized that this subject was a concern.

Despite this criticism, students and alumni showed very positive regard for the faculty. They felt the faculty was extremely knowledgeable about the discipline and really made every effort to help students when they were having difficulty with a class. Comments at the end of the surveys noted how much they enjoyed their classes and appreciated the faculty.

The most negative remarks made by students and alumni pertained to the physical facilities. Specifically, students find the classrooms in Johnson Hall to be unsatisfactory and complained about the lack of temperature control as well as the clanking noises which drown out what is being said.

C.3.b) Method of measuring student sentiment

These views were obtained through surveys given to alumni and current students. Institutional Research and Testing assisted in the preparation of these instruments and analyzed the data. Additional insights were gleaned from students enrolled in the senior seminar, COMM 499.

D. PROGRAM VALUE

D.1.The benefit of the program, facilities, and personnel to the university

The communication area is involved in a number of activities that are beneficial to the university. As previously noted, a number of campus-wide speaking contests and public debates have been held by the area which, in turn, fosters engagement. The faculty has performed a valuable outreach function through its High School Student Leadership Institute which, in turn, exposes students to the university. (*See Appendix A*)

In conjunction with these activities, the communication faculty has also been actively engaged in the university. On the departmental level, faculty are members of and even chair curriculum and tenure committees, outcomes assessment committees, search committees, professional development committees, etc. They also serve on a number of college and university-wide committees including the Academic Senate, general education committees, Presidential committees and task forces, etc. In many instances, they have been chairs or officers of these groups. Along with this work, faculty members typically act as director of ceremonies for various university programs such as the honors convocation as well as adjutants for graduations. *(See Appendix A)*

The faculty is also active in the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning and has offered several learning communities on critical thinking as well as participating in others such as Web CT. In addition to this, faculty members have been active in the Critical Thinking Institute as well as Jim Crow Museum facilitators. *(See Appendix A)*

D.2.The benefit of the program, facilities, and personnel to the students enrolled in the program

Faculty members also serve as advisors to a number of student organizations that provide students with opportunities to develop and hone their leadership skills. For example, the president of Bulldog Radio, which is a student RSO, was responsible for the development of programming on Charter Cable, Channel 21. Others such as the Ferris Communication Association offer students the chance to network. Members, for instance, may attend state and national job fairs and conventions which can lead to internships as well as full-time positions. The internship program which is required for the B.S. degree has provided students with valuable experiences. For example, one student was able to produce his own television program at a local station.

The faculty has also aided students in developing papers that were presented at regional and national conferences. Others have been encouraged to enter national forensics and debate competitions resulting in recognition and awards. For some, this has resulted in membership in Pi Kappa Delta which is a national honorary. Those students involved in Lambda Pi Eta are also recognized for their academic achievements.

D. 3. Faculty assessment of program value to employers

The faculty feels that the communication program provides the knowledge and skills students need in order to be successful in a variety of fields. This is based upon the career interests expressed by students as well as alumni reports of current positions. Graduates report working as a counselor, human relations specialist, community development director, retail sales representative, customer service representative, emergency communications operator, small business owner, etc.

The faculty also believes a further testament of the program's value is seen in the number of students who opt to add a communication minor to their field of study because it enhances their marketability in today's workplace. Over and over again, employers cite communication knowledge and skills as being critical to performing effectively on the job.

D. 4. Program benefit to entities external to the University

Faculty members are actively involved in the field's professional associations. Their participation takes many forms. They serve as paper reviewers, offer short courses, and hold key leadership positions within regional and national organizations. *(See Appendix A for a detailed list.)*

Along with this, faculty members have provided book reviews for various publishers and even prepared an instructor's resource manual for one text. They provide input on accreditation teams and advisory boards as well as directing statewide competitions in forensics. *(See Appendix A for a detailed list.)*

D. 5. Services for extra-university general public groups that faculty, staff or students have provided

Faculty members have been asked to speak to various community organizations and colleges on topics pertaining to their area of expertise. In addition to these presentations, the faculty has served as judges at local speech competitions and provided consultancy services to area businesses. *(See Appendix A for detailed list.)*

Students also have been involved in such outreach activities. During the fall of 2005 and 2006, honors students presented speeches about issues of national concern to area high schools.

Such efforts, whether they be undertaken by faculty or students, raise awareness and provide information that can aid in decision-making. In addition, they can foster discussion and consequent participation in matters affecting the community as well as the nation as a whole.

Several faculty members have been involved in dispute resolution and have worked with area courts as well as the Dispute Resolution Center in Grand Rapids. Obviously, their service has saved the courts money. More importantly, though, research has found solutions reached in this manner seem to be more satisfying to the parties involved which increase the odds that agreements will be honored. *(See Appendix A for detailed list.)*

SECTION 2: PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

In the analysis which follows, percentages will be based on the total number of respondents in contrast to the number who actually answered a specific question. This will result in lower percentages when compared to those based on actual responses. This approach is being taken because there are instances when "don't know" responses and missing values should be considered when interpreting the data. The "valid percentage" can be accessed by referring to the frequency tables in the appendices.

A. **ALUMNI SURVEY**

The alumni survey was developed in consultation with Institutional Research and Testing. The survey along with a cover letter and a self-addressed, stamped envelope was mailed to 115 graduates. This number included those persons who had completed the A.A. degree. Responses were coded by Department of Humanities' support staff and then sent to Institutional Research and Testing for analysis. Eighteen alums (16%) returned the survey. The group included graduates from 1999 through 2007. *(See Appendix B)*

A.1. Employment profile

Of those that responded, six (33.3%) were able to find a full-time position in communication within a year of graduation. Two others (11.1%) obtained part-time employment in the field during that time span. Eight (44.4%) stated they were not successful during the first year and two persons (11.1%) did not respond to the question.

Graduates working in the communication field received a starting salary that ranged from $14,999 or less (one person) to $40,000 or more dollars (two persons) per year. The most frequently mentioned salary range was $20,000 - $24,999 (three persons). However, seven individuals (38.9%) did not reply to this question.

At present, eleven (61.1%) are working one job, full-time; two (11.1%) hold one or more jobs, part-time; another (5.6%) is working two part-time jobs that total over forty hours per week; and one (5.6%) is attending graduate school and working. In addition, one (5.6%) reported owning his/her own lawn care company. Two (11.1%) did not answer the question.

Respondents are employed by a variety of organizations. They include nonprofits like the American Cancer Society, banks such as the Chemical Bank, health providers and hospitals such as the Port Huron Hospital, retail stores such as Verizon wireless, and the public service sector that includes school districts and municipal police departments.

Given this range in regard to employers, it is not surprising that graduates are working in a number of fields. In fact, only two persons (11.1%) seem to be performing the same kind of work, that being an academic counselor. Others hold such positions as

community development director, human resources specialist, manufacturer's representative, sales manager, emergency communications operator, etc. Nine (50%) have held their positions less than two years as compared to two persons (11.1%) who stated they have had their job for five years or more.

Current salaries indicate that income varies dramatically among graduates. Four (22.3%) state they make under $20,000 a year; three (16.7%) say they earn between $20,000 and $24,999; and five (27.8%) report their salary falls within the $30,000-to-$39,999 range. One person (5.6%) stated s/he makes between $45,000 –to-$49,999; three others (16.7%) noted they make $50,000 or more per year. Two persons (11.1%) chose not to provide any information about their salaries.

Despite the economic conditions in Michigan, most respondents have chosen to stay in the state. To be more specific, thirteen (72%) are living in Michigan. Others report residing in Wisconsin, Texas, Arizona, New York and Guatemala.

A.2. Alumni's perception of the program

Graduates were asked three questions about the communication program. The first asked respondents if they agreed that the program provided a sound foundation in the discipline. Five somewhat (27.8%) and thirteen strongly (72.2%) agreed that it did. The next question asked graduates if they felt the program had prepared them for future graduate work. Four somewhat (22.2%) and eleven strongly (61.1%) agreed that it did. However, one person somewhat disagreed with this view, and two others remained neutral. The third question asked graduates to assess whether the program had prepared them to be successful in today's marketplace. Two somewhat (11.1%) and fourteen strongly (77.8%) agreed that it had. In marked contrast to this, two persons strongly disagreed that it had.

Alumni provided a number of comments about the program. One person felt the program should provide a clearer direction for pursuing employment after graduation. This point was reiterated by another who said the program was so general it was hard to translate the knowledge and skills into a career path. Yet, another stated the program had prepared them to "excel" in the marketplace; whereas, someone else stated s/he felt the program had been "very beneficial" in his/her career. Despite these different views, almost everyone noted that they enjoyed the program and found it a very positive experience.

A.3. Alumni's perception of the faculty

Alumni were also asked to provide feedback about the faculty. One of the questions they were asked is whether or not they felt the faculty is knowledgeable about the field. Their response was overwhelmingly positive as eighteen strongly (100%) agreed that the faculty was. Responses were not as strong when replying to another statement about instructional practices. To specify, five somewhat (27.8%) and twelve strongly (66.7%) agreed that the faculty provided instruction that was interesting and meaningful. One person remained neutral on this subject.

In addition to this line of inquiry, alumni were also asked to appraise the degree of assistance faculty provided to students. Two somewhat (11.1%) and sixteen strongly (88.9%) agreed that the faculty was available to help students when problems were encountered. However, the appraisal is not quite as strong when looking at academic advising. To illustrate, three somewhat (16.7%) and thirteen strongly (72.2%) agreed that the faculty provided adequate academic advising. One person somewhat disagreed with this statement and one other was neutral.

Comments about the faculty were extremely positive. For instance, one person remarked that faculty did "an amazing job." Another stated the staff was "wonderful." Still, a third person felt the faculty was "passionate" and "excited" about their classes. These remarks are someone tempered by another's comment who noted the need for better academic advising and a student friendly attitude on the part of faculty. Another individual observed some faculty members put more effort into advising than others do.

A.4. Program satisfaction

In order to evaluate program satisfaction, alumni were asked if they would still major or complete an A.A. in communication if they were to do it all over again. Four somewhat (22.2%) and eleven strongly (61.1%) agreed that they would. In contrast, two persons somewhat disagreed and one person said s/he didn't know. Graduates were also asked if they would recommend the program to others. Five somewhat (27.8%) and twelve strongly (66.7%) agreed that they would. One person strongly disagreed.

These views were supported by student comments. One person disclosed that the program was the "best thing" s/he did for him/her self and his/her career. S/he added s/he "would recommend the program to anyone." A similar sentiment was expressed by another who said s/he tells every student to major in communication and that s/he is "glad" s/he chose this major.

B. INTERNSHIP SUPERVISORS' SURVEY

An employer survey was not conducted for two reasons. Students graduating with a degree in communication pursue a variety of careers so that any one employer would only have one or perhaps two of our majors in his/her organization. It, therefore, becomes difficult for them to provide feedback which doesn't appear to be a performance appraisal, thus making them vulnerable to charges concerning a violation of confidentiality. Secondly, the area has not been able to obtain much information about these employers despite efforts to do so. Graduates either failed to answer questions pertaining to their employer, e.g., name and address, or provided scanty information on the subject. In addition, the number of alumni responding to our requests was small compared to the number of persons graduated, thereby weakening any confidence in responses based on such limited data.

In light of these factors, the area decided to survey internship supervisors instead. The instrument was designed in consultation with Institutional Research and Testing. It was set up as an Internet-hosted survey and distributed via an e-mail link to the 46 persons who had supervised communication interns over the years. However, there was a glitch in the link that was never corrected: the link could not be opened off campus by clicking on it. While a number of people tried to solve this problem, no one was successful. This most likely affected the number of responses received especially since the survey was sent more than once as a result of being told that the glitch was corrected. As of the end of May, the reason for this difficulty was still a puzzle. In all, seventeen persons did respond to the survey. *(See Appendix C)*

B. 1. Supervisors perceptions of the intern's knowledge and skills

Supervisors were asked to respond to several statements which pertained to the intern's communication effectiveness. Their assessments were very positive. For example, three somewhat (17.6%) and fourteen strongly (82.4%) agreed that the intern demonstrated effective interpersonal skills when interacting with the public. Similarly, six persons somewhat (35.3%) and eleven others strongly (64.7%) agreed that the intern communicated effectively with other staff persons. These results were duplicated in responses to the statement that the intern worked effectively in groups, i.e., six somewhat (35.3%) and eleven strongly (64.7%) agreed the intern worked effectively in groups. Supervisors' views were almost identical to these when asked if the intern demonstrated effective presentational skills. Specifically, six somewhat (35.3%) and ten strongly (58.8%) agreed that the intern was an effective presenter; the remaining individual said s/he didn't know.

Supervisors were asked to assess other facets of their intern's work performance. Leadership behavior was one. Eight somewhat (47.1%) and seven strongly (41.2%) agreed that the intern used appropriate leadership behaviors. One person somewhat disagreed with this view and another remained neutral on this subject. Supervisors were also asked to assess their intern's ability to deal with various communication technologies. Their appraisals were most positive: two somewhat (11.8%) and fifteen strongly (88.2%) agreed that their intern used these technologies effectively.

B.2. Employer needs

Less agreement was found in supervisor's assessment of intern's task performance. While four somewhat (23.5%) and ten others strongly (58.8%) agreed that their intern completed tasks efficiently and effectively, three persons somewhat disagreed with this statement. Differences of opinion were also expressed in response to the statement that the intern demonstrated the kinds of skills necessary to be successful in today's marketplace. Three somewhat (17.6%) and twelve strongly (70.6%) agreed with this assertion as compared to one who strongly and another who somewhat disagreed with it.

While this may seem to contradict the very positive opinions supervisors had of interns' communication knowledge and skills, their comments offer some insight into the kinds of

deficiencies that might undermine these interns' success. For example, one supervisor commented that interns need better writing skills. Two others talked about the importance of attitude and work readiness with respect to reliability and expectations.

Supervisors were asked to assess their intern's attitude and work readiness by responding to two statements which honed in on these factors. In one instance, they were to respond to the statement that their intern adapted to workplace cultural expectations. To this, four somewhat (23.5%) and twelve strongly (70.6%) agreed while one person somewhat disagreed. Responses to another statement regarding the intern's behavior contributing to a positive, productive work environment seemed a bit weaker. Even though three somewhat (17.6%) and eleven strongly (64.7%) agreed with this statement, one person somewhat disagreed, another was neutral and a third didn't respond at all.

B. 3. Interns' employability

In order to obtain an overall assessment of these respondents satisfaction with their interns, supervisors were asked to respond to the statement that they would have hired their intern if possible. Ten persons strongly (58.8%) agreed with this statement. However, one strongly and two others somewhat disagreed; four others were neutral.

Since the persons who disagreed with the statement are probably the same ones who have expressed disagreement throughout the survey, there is some sort of explanation for their point-of-view. However, this is not the case for the four people who selected neutral for a response. Unfortunately, they did not include any remarks about their choice.

Even so, some insight can be obtained into whether these evaluations are based upon perceived weaknesses in these interns' education or some other factor, e.g., personality. This can be gleaned from supervisors' response to the statement that the intern was academically prepared for this position. Four somewhat (23.5%) and eleven strongly (64.7%) agreed in contrast to two who somewhat disagreed with this idea. As such, this breakdown suggests that a decision to hire these interns included other factors besides communication knowledge and skills.

That aside, it is interesting to note that one person commented that s/he did hire her/his intern. Another stated that s/he hated to see her/his intern leave, thereby suggesting that this individual might have been hired if circumstances had been different.

C.   GRADUATING EXIT SURVEY

The graduate student exit survey is an open-ended response survey that was administered to students enrolled in COMM 499, the Senior Seminar in Communication. Students were asked to create a list of seven to ten questions about the program which were then reviewed by the instructor in order to insure that the various aspects of the program were addressed in the instrument. Data were subjected to content analysis by the program coordinator. When possible, trends were noted, and responses were tabulated.   A total of

thirteen students completed the survey. *(See Appendix D for a specific list of questions and student responses.)*

C. 1. Relevance of courses

Students were asked several questions which pertained to the relevance of their course work. One focused on the effectiveness of their introductory courses as foundations for upper level classes. Courses included in this group are COMM 101 (Introduction to Communication Study); COMM 105 (Interpersonal Communication) or COMM 200 (Foundations of Interpersonal Communication); and COMM 121 (Public Presentation) or COMM 201 (Public Presentation Practices). Overall, students felt these courses were appropriate.

To break this down into numbers, eight students (62%) thought COMM 101 prepared them for other courses in the program as compared to one person who did not. The remaining three students had not taken the course. When asked to make a similar evaluation of COMM 105 and COMM 200, ten students (77%) felt the course was an important foundational class; whereas, three others were not so sure it was needed for upper level classes. This same type of scrutiny was not applied to COMM 121 and COMM 201. While eleven students (85%) felt that this course was a very important one in terms of building public speaking skills and confidence, no one mentioned whether it was needed as a foundation for 300 and 400 level classes. Of the two remaining students, one disclosed that s/he didn't enjoy the class given his/her speaking apprehension; the other had taken the course at another institution.

As an adjunct to this line of query, students were also asked if there was a problem with redundancy of information between and across courses. Eleven (85%) felt that such redundancy was appropriate; whereas, one called for more variety in classes. Another student remarked there was little redundancy among classes and said instead there was "a lot of relate-ability" among classes. Overall, students found the redundancy effective. They thought the repetition of information underscored the importance of the subject matter and helped with retention.

Students were given an opportunity to suggest improvements to the program by identifying those courses they would add or subtract from the major. Almost everyone had a different response so that no trend emerged. Some of the courses that at least two students mentioned as being a valuable addition to the major were diversity, advanced public speaking, and research. All in all, 7 students (54%) felt that the range of electives offered were sufficient given their career goals and areas of personal interest. In fact, some said they wish they could have taken more of the electives currently being offered such as Communication and Conflict. Even so, three persons (23%) expressed dissatisfaction with the electives currently being offered because they felt these courses were not tailored to specific careers such as broadcasting.

When identifying courses which should be deleted from the major, two in the area were noted: COMM 101 and COMM 499. ISYS 105, an introduction to computer software

which is required for students in the B.S. program, was also mentioned. In fact, seven students (54%) felt ISYS 105 is no longer needed given the degree of computer savvy that today's students have. Even so, four students (31%) stated they had benefited from the class.   Altogether, five students (39%) suggested deleting a course from the program. Three students (23%) made no recommendations for adding or subtracting courses from the curriculum.

C. 2. Application to the workplace or minor

Along with evaluating communication courses, students were asked to assess whether their minor program (B.A. students) or their application to the workplace (B.S. students) requirement was valuable and appropriate. Given the responses, it was not always evident if a student was doing a minor or the workplace application so no attempt has been made to group them separately. As a whole, the results are mixed: six students (46%) replied positively; five (39%) were negative; one (8%) identified pros and cons; one other (8%) didn't have an opinion. Those who responded positively said they enjoyed their minor/application and felt it was relevant to their career path. Relevance did seem to be a factor among those who were negative about their minor/application. One noted the need to have a minor/application with "a specific purpose" while another explained s/he is no longer interested in the application s/he is pursuing. Relevance surfaced again in the comments made by the student who noted pros and cons about his/her choices. Specifically, s/he found value in his/her minor but wished s/he had received more guidance when making the choice.

One student suggested it might be helpful to do a mini-career exploration project in a 200 level course in order to better determine the career path one should pursue. This, in turn, would assist one in selecting a minor/application. It was also recommended that concentrations be added to the major which would provide some sort of direction for the student.

C. 3. The internship

In addition to course work students were asked to evaluate their internship experience as a supplement to course information and a means of career preparation. This question did not apply to three students since they were enrolled in the B.A. and an internship is not part of that program. Two of the remaining ten students had not done their internship and, therefore, were not in a position to judge the experience. Of the eight persons remaining, four (31%) viewed the internship positively; three (23%) were very critical; and one (8%) thought it did not supplement course information but was helpful. Few comments were made by those who found the experience beneficial. However, one person noted that it made her/him feel more comfortable in the workplace and that s/he was able to apply knowledge s/he gained in the classroom. A second person reiterated this latter point by pointing out that s/he used the knowledge s/he had gained "from the study of interpersonal, small group and conflict management on a daily basis." One of those that held a negative view about the internship complained that it lacked focus. Another said it was a source of stress due to the difficulty of finding one.

C. 4. Perceptions of faculty

Two questions were asked about the faculty. Both pertained to the assistance they offered students.

The first pertained to student satisfaction with academic advising. Their responses were pretty evenly split. More specifically, five (39%) were positive, six (46%) were negative, one (8%) was mixed, and one (8%) felt that the subject did not apply to him/her. Those who had positive experiences noted their advisor really looked out for their welfare by making sure their academic program was planned, directing them to courses that double-counted in terms of meeting requirements, offering to write letters of recommendation and by being available when students needed them. Those who had negative opinions basically said the opposite: the advisor offered no assistance regarding course selection; the advisor blew him/her off by telling the student to see the program coordinator; the advisor was not knowledgeable about the program. Along with these factors, one student admitted s/he didn't try to meet with his/her advisor and simply followed the check sheet only to discover later some assistance would have been helpful. In order to offset these problems, two persons recommended that one person be hired to do the advising for the entire major.

Students were also asked to evaluate whether instructors were available to help students outside the classroom. Their responses were overwhelmingly positive. Twelve (92%) of the thirteen felt the faculty made an effort to make themselves available to students. The remaining one noted that s/he didn't have time to meet with faculty outside class but that was not the instructors' fault. Students commented that their professors were speedy responding to e-mail, were available during posted office hours, were encouraging and enthusiastic, etc.

C. 5. Textbooks and instructional methods

In addition to the topics already discussed, students were asked if textbook selections and instructional methods reflect the expected or intended learning outcomes. Evidently, the subject of texts hit a nerve since all comments elaborated on that topic, i.e., analysis of instructional methods was limited to the extent to which professors utilized texts in their courses.

Keeping that point in mind, three students (23%) responded positively to the question, five (39%) had a negative view, and five others (39%) sat on the fence. No comments were made by those who had a positive opinion except for one person who added she/he becomes annoyed when a text is not used in a course. This same point was made by those who are critical of current practices. In addition, some noted texts are often boring even though the subject isn't. Those who didn't totally agree or disagree with the claim that textbook selections reflect desired learning outcomes made such comments as "kind of," "I guess," "Depending on the teacher and the class," etc.

D. STUDENT SURVEY

This survey was developed in consultation with Institutional Research and Testing. Based on past experience, there was concern that few students would respond to a survey that was e-mailed. For this reason, it was decided a paper copy of the survey would be given to students. Two approaches were used in an effort to draw the largest sample. Students enrolled in courses that were required for majors and/or minors were asked to complete the survey in class, e.g. COMM 299, COMM 352, etc. Then, a survey was mailed to students, and they were asked to complete it if they had not already done so in class. The response to the written request was minimal. In all, fifty-six students completed the survey. Of that group, thirty-eight were majors and the remaining eighteen were minors or A.A. students. To break this down further, thirty-two were enrolled in the B.S., six in the B.A., two in the A.A., thirteen in the minor, and two in the teaching minor.

Responses were coded by Department of Humanities' support staff and submitted to Institutional Research and Testing for analysis. The data were analyzed in three different ways: all responses; the majors' responses; all the minors and A.A. degree students' responses. Overall, responses were similar across the groups. Therefore, the aggregate responses will be the only ones mentioned in the discussion which follows unless there is a notable difference between the two groups. *(See Appendix E in order to compare the responses across groups.)*

D.1. Students' perception of the program

Students were asked three questions about the program to which they provided very positive responses. For example, thirteen somewhat (23.2%) and thirty-one strongly (55.4%) agreed that the communication program had provided them with a sound foundation in the discipline. One person somewhat and two others strongly disagreed with this view; only one of these persons was a major. Responses were not quite as strong when replying to the statement that the program had prepared them for future graduate work. Twenty-one somewhat (37.5%) and twenty-two strongly (39.3%) agreed with this point. The number who disagreed remained the same although all these persons were B.S./B.A. students. The third statement pertained to the communication program preparing students to be successful in today's marketplace. Fifteen somewhat (26.8%) and twenty-six strongly (46.4%) agreed with this claim. Two persons somewhat and one strongly disagreed; all were majors.

In their comments, students noted the program was "good," that it provided "skills that are beneficial in the professional/work 'world,'" and that classes were "enjoyable." One suggested that regular debates be required in class and projects be assigned that would help them prepare for the kinds of jobs they can get after graduation. Another recommended the number of hours in the minor be reduced so that it would be more comparable to others on campus. Several students pointed out they had just begun their minor and didn't feel they had the background to answer some of the questions. This, in

turn, may shed some light on the "neutral," "don't know," and "missing" responses that were found throughout the survey.

D. 2. Students' perception of the faculty

Students were asked to respond to a number of statements about faculty. Some dealt with competency. For example, one pertained to their perception of faculty's expertise about the field. Their response was overwhelmingly positive. Specifically, five somewhat (8.9%) and forty-five strongly (80.4%) agreed that the communication faculty is knowledgeable about the field. Three communication majors strongly disagreed with this statement, and one minor remained neutral. In an effort to determine if students felt this knowledge translated into effective classroom teaching, they were asked if they agreed communication faculty provided interesting and meaningful instruction. Seventeen somewhat (30.4%) and twenty-eight strongly (50.0%) agreed with this point. Those that disagreed, three persons, or were neutral, five persons, were all majors. The issue of competency was probed a little differently by asking students if faculty held reasonable expectations in the classroom. Twenty-four somewhat (44.6%) and twenty-five strongly (44.6%) agreed faculty's course expectations were fair and reasonable. Three majors disagreed with this view.

Students were also asked to assess the assistance they receive from faculty. Fourteen somewhat (25.0%) and thirty-one strongly (55.4%) agreed that the faculty is available to help students when problems are encountered. Four persons disagreed: three of these persons were majors. Two other majors were neutral on this matter. The subject of assistance was examined further through two more questions: one was about academic advising and the other about mentoring. Fourteen somewhat (25.0%) and twenty-one strongly (37.5%) agreed that they receive adequate academic advising. However, eleven persons were neutral and six others disagreed with this statement. All but two of these persons were majors. When asked about mentoring, eight persons said they didn't know, three others didn't respond and eight more were neutral. Of those that remained, seventeen somewhat (30.4%) and eighteen strongly (32.1%) agreed that faculty mentor students by helping them with paper submissions, speech and debate competitions, etc. Only two people disagreed, and they were majors.

Since expertise in communication involves more than a knowledge of text material, students were asked to evaluate the extent to which faculty encouraged their involvement in activities outside the classroom. Twenty-three somewhat (41.1%) and fifteen strongly (26.8%) agreed that the faculty encourages students to participate in professional organizations such as the Ferris Communication Association, Lambda Pi Eta, etc. Five persons disagreed; four of them were majors. Seven other persons were neutral on the subject, four said they didn't know and two left the response blank. When asked if the faculty encourages students to involve themselves in community service, ten somewhat (17.9%) and eight strongly (14.3%) agreed that faculty did. However, twelve (21.4%) persons disagreed with this statement; nine were majors. Seventeen (30.4%) others were neutral, seven (12.5%) said they didn't know, and two (3.6%) didn't provide any response. As such, there seems to be a significant group (46.5%) who didn't express a

view on this matter. As a final question on this topic, students were asked if they thought faculty provided them out-of-class opportunities to improve their communication skills. Twenty-one somewhat (37.5%) and fifteen strongly (26.8%) agreed that they did as compared to three persons who disagreed. Eight remained neutral on the subject and seven said they didn't know.

The perceived value of involving themselves in such activities was also examined. In particular, they were asked if they believed participation in various professional activities can help one develop leadership skills. Seventeen somewhat (30.4%) and 26 strongly (46.4%) agreed that such improvement can occur through this involvement. Two persons who were majors disagreed.

Few comments were made about the faculty but they do reinforce points already raised. One person noted that the program has "the most helpful" professors. Another added that improvement was needed in advising as well as encouraging students to become involved in activities outside the classroom. A third person emphasized the need for better advising.

D. 3. Students' perception of themselves

Students were asked two questions about themselves. One pertained to their motivation which they viewed in a favorable way. To elaborate, fifteen somewhat (26.8%) and twenty-five strongly (44.6%) agreed that communication students are motivated to be successful in school. Four persons disagreed while eight were neutral on this subject. A second question pertained to the academic performance of communication students. Specifically, they were to express whether they agreed that students in the communication program are academically comparable to students in other programs on campus. Seven somewhat (12.5%) and twenty-seven strongly (48.2%) agreed with this statement. However, five disagreed, nine were neutral and six said they didn't know which altogether amounted to 35.7% of the respondents.

D. 4. Students' perception of the university's support

Students were asked three questions about the support the university provides. One pertained to the resources available in the library. Thirteen somewhat (23.2%) and fifteen strongly (26.8%) agreed that the library holdings are current and sufficient. This is in contrast to eight persons who disagreed with this statement, ten who were neutral and seven others who said they didn't know. A second question referred to classroom conditions. Fifteen somewhat (26.8%) and fifteen strongly (26.8%) agreed that classrooms are satisfactory. However, twelve persons disagreed. Of this group, seven voiced strong disagreement, thus making this statement the one which received the greatest number of strongly disagreeing responses in the entire survey. The third question examined students' view of the support services offered. Fourteen somewhat (25%) and twenty strongly (35.7%) agreed that campus support services such as tutoring, counseling, etc. are adequate. Four persons disagreed with this statement, eight were neutral and seven said they didn't know.

The only comments students made about university support services referred to classroom conditions. One student noted the communication classrooms are "below average compared to the rest of the university." Another complained about the temperature in classrooms: "I find myself freezing in summer months and overheating in the winter." A third comment related to the sounds frequently heard in the rooms: "The constant clinking of the vent system is strongly distracting." A fourth student mentioned the cold classrooms and also expressed displeasure over outdated computer programs and classroom lighting. In sum, more criticisms were made about the classrooms than any other aspect of the program.

D. 5. Program satisfaction

Students were asked to respond to two statements in an attempt to assess their satisfaction with the program. One focused on whether a student would major, minor or pursue an A.A. degree in communication given what s/he now knew. Seven somewhat (12.5%) and thirty-five strongly (62.5%) agreed that they would do it all over again. Two persons who were majors disagreed. Seven of which four were majors were neutral, and three persons all of whom were majors said they didn't know. The second statement was concerned with recommending the communication program to others. Fourteen somewhat (25%) and 35 strongly (62.5%) agreed they would do so. Two persons including one major disagreed and two others of which one was a major were neutral. One major said s/he didn't know.

Only a couple of students commented about the program. One noted that s/he "would recommend the program to others and hopes it continues to improve." Another stated that s/he was "happy" about his/her choice and that s/he "thoroughly enjoyed" his/her experience.

E. FACULTY SURVEY

This instrument was developed with the assistance of Institutional Research and Testing. It was distributed to the faculty in two ways: as a paper copy which was placed in each mail box and as an Internet-hosted survey which was distributed via a link in e-mail. Those who opted to use the paper copy were instructed to submit their survey to office staff. They, in turn, coded the data and forwarded responses to Institutional Research and Testing for analysis. Six of the eleven tenured/tenure-track faculty, or 55% of those persons contacted, completed the survey. It should be noted, though, that two of the eleven faculty members were not on campus spring semester: one was out due to illness and the other did not teach that term. *(See Appendix F)*

E. 1. Faculty perceptions of the program

The faculty was asked a number of questions about program goals and value as well as program content. Overall, faculty agreed that the goals of the program were consistent

with the mission of the university although two people were neutral on this matter. No follow-up questions were asked nor was any feedback given regarding the cause for their selection, e.g., whether there was a lack of clarity concerning the university's mission, the program area's goals, etc.

A lack of knowledge might also have been responsible for the weak response to a statement which claimed the communication program compares favorably with similar ones throughout the state. Two persons chose the neutral response and a third just didn't answer the question. Of the remaining three, one strongly and another somewhat agreed with the statement; whereas, the third person somewhat disagreed.

Responses were mixed when asked if the program prepared students for careers in today's world as well as for graduate study. Two faculty members strongly and one somewhat agreed that the program produced students who were ready for the job market as compared to one person strongly and another somewhat agreeing that the program prepared students for graduate work. In each instance, one respondent somewhat disagreed with these views. The remaining respondents checked either the neutral or don't know box when replying to these questions.

When the faculty was asked if the communication area was responsive to the needs of employers, further insights were obtained. Only one person strongly believed the area was responsive as compared to two individuals who somewhat disagreed with this view. The remaining three persons took a neutral position on this subject.

The breakdown was a little more positive in response to a statement concerning the area's receptivity to the changes occurring within the broader discipline. While three persons once again chose a neutral response, two persons somewhat agreed as opposed to one individual somewhat disagreeing with this idea.

The variation found in these responses may point to different visions of what a communication program should be. The field of communication is a very broad-based discipline as seen in the fact that communication studies is usually housed in its own college or school which, in turn, allows different sub-areas to develop their own programs as is seen in the case of Michigan State University. In institutions where this is not the case, communication studies is a department in its own right quite often because of the discipline's breadth, i.e., rhetorical and presentational studies, organizational communication and training, intercultural and development communication, interpersonal and health care communication, mass communication and new technologies, etc. All of these areas are well-defined within the field: they have journals specific to their area and even their own conferences. Anyone who has completed a PhD program has his/her own specialization and holds beliefs as to what a communication program should offer based upon his/her interests. This can lead to negative or weak evaluations by faculty when the current program does not incorporate the courses which s/he thinks it should.

Even so, faculty members do recognize that the field of communication is a multi-disciplinary one. This is reflected in their responses to a statement that communication

studies draws upon the humanistic and social scientific traditions. Given the range of responses to the previous questions, it is worth noting there was agreement on this point. To be more specific, two persons somewhat agreed and four others strongly agreed with assertion.

Faculty also concurred in their assessment of the program's value to student's general education. In fact, five members strongly agreed and another somewhat agreed that the area contributes to the general education of all university students by providing basic courses that build communication competency.

This sentiment was also expressed in response to a statement which claimed that the communication program contributes to the development of an informed and effective citizenry. Three faculty members strongly and three others somewhat agreed with this view.

As such, these faculty members considered the program's contribution to general education and to educating citizens to be its most positive ones

E. 2. Faculty perceptions of students

Overall, faculty members have quite different views about communication students' skills. For example, half of the respondents, i.e., three persons, somewhat disagreed with the statement that communication students demonstrated effective writing skills. However, one person strongly and another somewhat agreed with this remark while a third person opted for a neutral response. When asked a similar question regarding students' oral skills, the responses were more positive. Three individuals somewhat and one other strongly agreed that students demonstrate effective oral skills. This is in contrast to one person somewhat disagreeing with this point and another remaining neutral.

The faculty's view of students' motivation was not as optimistic. In fact, when faculty were asked to respond to the statement that communication students are motivated to be successful in school, three somewhat and one strongly disagreed with the statement. The other two faculty members were noncommittal: one said s/he didn't know and the other was neutral.

This negative perception prevailed in responses to the statement that communication students compare favorably with students from other majors. To be more precise, four persons somewhat disagreed with this point. The other two persons chose neutral and don't know for responses.

One faculty member made a couple of suggestions for improving the student population. One focused on developing an active recruiting strategy that involved more persons than the program coordinator. Another recommendation was to increase the rigor in all courses including general education in order to rid students of the perception that communication is a "fluff" major.

E. 3. Faculty perceptions of administrative support and resources

The faculty was asked several questions about resources. Some pertained to the facilities available to them such as the condition of classrooms, e.g., heating and air conditioning in classrooms, blackboard space, etc. In terms of this matter, one person strongly and three others somewhat disagreed with the statement that instructional facilities and equipment are sufficient to meet program needs. However, two other persons somewhat agreed with the claim. While no one provided any explanation for their choice, the differences found in responses may be due to the fact that some faculty members teach in Johnson Hall and others teach in Starr.

When faculty responded to the statement that their offices are sufficient for completing needed tasks, three somewhat disagreed as compared to two persons who strongly agreed. One person was neutral. Once again, no one provided reasons for their assessment. Yet, it should be noted that faculty offices are quite different from one another in terms of size, furnishings and location (some are on the third floor and some are on the first.) In addition, many do not have air conditioning despite the fact that these persons teach during summer and have long been tenured.

There was more concurrence in responses to the statement that faculty offices are well located for meeting faculty and program needs such as networking, program visibility, etc. Two strongly and three persons somewhat disagreed with this statement. Even so, one person strongly agreed with this view.

Additional questions were asked about such resources as clerical and support staff, library and research resources and technological assistance. Most faculty felt that the number of staff persons is sufficient to meet program needs, i.e., two persons strongly and two others somewhat agreed with this statement while two remained neutral on the matter. However, two persons somewhat disagreed with the statement that library and research resources are sufficient for meeting program needs; whereas, one person somewhat and three others strongly agreed with this point. There was also greater agreement in responses to the statement that the faculty receives adequate technological assistance. Specifically, three people somewhat and two others strongly agreed as compared to one person who somewhat disagreed with this claim.

Despite the issues already discussed, the faculty, overall, had a favorable view of the support the administration provides the area. To break it down, three somewhat and one person strongly agreed that the administration supports the program. This is compared to one person who somewhat disagreed with this statement and one other who was neutral.

E. 4. Faculty perceptions of the advisory board

When asked to respond to the statement that the program is guided by an effective advisory board, three persons somewhat agreed, two were neutral and one individual somewhat disagreed. While all appear to be weak responses, they lean toward the more

positive end of the spectrum. Since no one commented on this subject, any explanation would be a conjecture.

E. 5. Faculty self-perceptions

The faculty was asked to respond to statements which pertained to advising, teaching, service and professional development. Their answers showed the greatest agreement when compared to the other areas assessed in this survey and were most positive overall. For instance, two persons somewhat and four others strongly agreed that faculty make themselves accessible to students. When asked about advising, the response was not quite as strong. Even so, five somewhat and one other strongly agreed that the faculty advises students effectively. Faculty appraisals were quite favorable when evaluating classroom performance: two somewhat and four strongly agreed that faculty members are effective instructors. Greater agreement was expressed in responses to the statement that the faculty engages in university service since all strongly agreed with this point. Responses were almost unanimous when replying to the statement that faculty members participate in a variety of professional development activities since five persons strongly agreed and one person said s/he didn't know.

The only criticism that was directed toward faculty was that there should be more "buy in" to the major and assessment by all faculty. Unfortunately, no additional explanation was provided that might have clarified these points.

F. ADVISORY BOARD SURVEY

Advisory board perceptions were obtained through a survey that was prepared in consultation with Institutional Research and Testing. It was set up as an Internet-hosted survey and distributed via an e-mail link to the nine members of the board. A cover letter was included. Three persons responded to the first request. For this reason, the survey was sent a second time with another cover letter. In all, seven of the nine board members (78%) completed the survey. *(See Appendix G)*

F.1. Advisory board perceptions of the program's curriculum

Four respondents strongly agreed that the communication program reflects what is needed to be successful in today's marketplace. One stated s/he somewhat agreed with this view; another was neutral; and a third strongly disagreed with this statement.

There was greater consensus when asked about the program's effectiveness in preparing students for graduate school. Six persons somewhat agreed that the program prepares students to continue their education on the graduate level. One person strongly disagreed.

Two respondents made comments that pertained to the program's curriculum. One person felt that more attention should be paid to writing in a clear and coherent manner.

The other called for the integration of the communication area, media and marketing in order for students to be prepared for "the real world" as a communication professional.

F. 2. Advisory board perceptions of the program's graduates

Four persons strongly agreed and one other somewhat agreed with the statement that graduates have the skills and expertise to pursue a variety of career paths. One respondent was neutral on this matter, and another strongly disagreed with this assertion.

When asked about graduates' employment prospects, two respondents strongly agreed and two others somewhat agreed that the outlook was positive. In contrast to this, one person somewhat disagreed and another strongly disagreed with this idea. One respondent remained neutral on the subject.

It was hoped that some light would be shed on the replies to the previous question by asking board members whether graduates are viewed favorably within the business community. Two strongly and one somewhat agreed with this statement. One strongly disagreed with this remark. Two said they didn't know and one other selected neutral as a response.

F. 3. Advisory board perceptions of the faculty

Four board members strongly agreed and one somewhat agreed that faculty are knowledgeable and draw upon current research in the field. One remained neutral on this matter and one other strongly disagreed with this statement. While no negative comments were made about faculty, one person stated that s/he felt the faculty was "very professional and highly committed to helping their students succeed."

When asked if faculty had adequate resources to effectively serve students in the program, one strongly and three somewhat agreed that they did. One person said s/he didn't know and another was neutral on the subject. One board member strongly disagreed with the statement.

F. 4. Advisory board perceptions of institutional resources

When advisory board members were questioned about instructional facilities, three strongly and two somewhat agreed that they were conducive to learning. However, one person strongly disagreed with this statement and another stated s/he didn't know.

A more detailed question followed which pertained to the university's effectiveness in providing students with the resources they need in order to succeed in the program. Two strongly and four somewhat agreed that students were receiving the support they needed. However, one person strongly disagreed.

F. 5. Board's self-perception

Five advisory board members strongly agreed with the statement that their suggestions were encouraged. One member strongly disagreed and one other was neutral on the subject.

Three strongly and three others somewhat agreed with the claim that board members are well informed about the program. In contrast to this, one person strongly disagreed.

The breakdown was similar in response to the statement that board members are knowledgeable about the field. Four strongly and two somewhat agreed with this point; one person strongly disagreed.

One respondent commented that s/he had not been involved in the program for several and didn't feel s/he "was up to speed on what the program offers." It should also be noted that the board added a couple of new members this past year and it may have been difficult for them to reply to some of these statements given what they know.

It would be interesting to know if the same person selected strongly disagree throughout the entire survey since that response was selected for every question and no more than one person checked it. This clearly calls for some discussion between the board and the faculty since no comments were included to provide the program any substantive direction.

SECTION 3: PROGRAM PROFILE

A. PROFILE OF STUDENTS

A.1. Student demographic profile:

The following sections contain student demographic information available on the Ferris State University web page for Institutional Research and Testing.

A.1.a. Gender, race/ethnicity, age

STUDENT PROFILE (Communication BA)											
TERM	ENROLLED	SEX		ETHNICITY							AGE
		Male	Female	Blank	Black	Hispanic	Indian/ Alaskan	Asian/Pac. Islander	White	Int'l	(Average)
2002F	9	3	6	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	19.3
2003F	25	7	18	1	9	0	0	0	15	0	19.5
2004F	29	8	21	1	9	0	0	1	18	0	20.5
2005F	24	5	19	0	5	0	0	0	19	0	22.1
2006F	24	7	17	0	5	1	1	0	17	0	22.8

STUDENT PROFILE (Applied Speech Communication BS)											
TERM	ENROLLED	SEX		ETHNICITY							AGE
		Male	Female	Blank	Black	Hispanic	Indian/ Alaskan	Asian/Pac. Islander	White	Int'l	(Average)
2002F	56	25	31	3	23	1	0	2	27	0	23.8
2003F	47	18	29	2	20	0	0	0	34	1	23.8
2004F	54	22	32	1	18	1	0	0	34	0	23.5
2005F	49	21	28	1	16	1	0	0	31	0	23.5
2006F	39	13	26	0	14	0	0	1	24	0	23.7

Enrollment in the B.A. program has more than doubled since 2002 with the greatest increase being seen in female enrollment which has almost tripled. When comparing racial representation in the program over time, the proportion of Black students within the major has almost remained the same: 22% in 2002 as compared to 21% in 2006. In addition, the number of Black students in the program has grown although recent

numbers are not as high as they were in 2003 and 2004. This drop is somewhat offset by the enrollment of a Hispanic student and Indian/Alaskan student in the program. As a result, the ethnic and racial representation in the B.A. program has grown from 22% of all majors in 2002 to 29% in 2006. The average age of all students increased from 19.3 to 22.8, thus showing a change of 3 ½ years.

Enrollment in the B.S. program has decreased by 17 students since 2002. This decrease has primarily occurred among the male population of students. As of 2006, there were twice as many females as males in the program. The number of Black students has also dropped since the last program review, i.e., from 23 to 14 students. Even so, 36% of the B.S. program's majors identified themselves as "Black" in 2006. The average age of all students remained almost the same: 23.8 in 2002 as compared to 23.7 in 2006.

When viewed in the aggregate, our student population is increasingly female, slightly older, and less diverse racially. It is tempting to presume that the growth in the B.A. program and the waning numbers in the B.S. major is simply the consequence of students transferring from one program to the other. However, this, in itself, does not provide a complete explanation for the observed changes since the male attrition rate in the B.S. program is not offset by a comparable growth in the number of males majoring in the B.A.

A.1.b. In-state and out-of state

STUDENT PROFILE (Enrollment/Residence) Communication BA						
TERM	ENROLLED			RESIDENCE		
		Full-Time	Part-Time	Midwest Compact	In-State	Out-of-State
2002F	9	9	0	0	9	0
2003F	25	25	0	1	24	0
2004F	29	28	1	0	29	0
2005F	24	24	0	0	24	0
2006F	24	21	3	0	23	1

STUDENT PROFILE (Enrollment/Residence) Applied Speech Communication BS						
TERM	ENROLLED			RESIDENCE		
		Full-Time	Part-Time	Midwest Compact	In-State	Out-of-State
2002F	56	46	10	1	55	0
2003F	47	40	7	0	46	1
2004F	54	45	9	0	54	0
2005F	49	44	5	0	49	0
2006F	39	34	5	0	39	0

The B.A. and the B.S. overwhelmingly draw students from within the state of Michigan. Combined, 64/65 (98.4%) students were residents of Michigan in the fall of 2002. In the fall of 2006, 62/63 (98.4%) students were residents of Michigan. Thus, in-state enrollment percentages remain unchanged.

A.1.c. full-time and part-time

Students in the programs typically enroll full-time. In the fall of 2002, 55/65 (84.6%) of the students were enrolled full-time. In the fall of 2006, 55/63 (87.3%) of the students were enrolled full-time. Thus, we have seen an increase of 2.7% in full-time enrollment.

A.1.d-f. Course Scheduling and Format

Courses have been scheduled on a variety of days at different times and locations. According to enrollment numbers, students prefer courses offered during the day which will allow them to have a Monday – Thursday schedule.

While many faculty members may engage in the use of WebCT, very few communication courses are delivered fully on-line or in a mixed delivery format. There are occasional on-line versions of COMM 221: Small-group Decision Making for students enrolled in the HVAC program. This course also is offered at some off-campus locations for UCEL. Some sections of COMM 336: Technical and Professional Communication are offered through UCEL locations.

A.1.g. impact of student demographics

The impact of the changes in student demographics has not had a considerable impact upon scheduling or delivery methods since most of our students are full-time, on-campus residents. However, the drop in the B.S. program's enrollment does call for further examination especially with respect to the curriculum. Some discussion has already occurred on this matter, and suggestions have been made about the addition of tracks or concentrations to the major.

A.2.a. Quality of students
Figures on enrolled students

STUDENT PROFILE (Academic History) Communication BA						
TERM		ACT		FSU GPA (Cumulative)		
	Min.	Avg.	Max.	Min.	Avg.	Max.
2002F	15	22.3	32	2.217	2.837	3.477
2003F	13	20.3	32	2.061	3.089	3.965
2004F	14	20.5	32	1.854	3.008	3.903
2005F	15	21.8	28	1.5	2.931	3.906
2006F	15	22.1	30	2.1	2.825	3.77

STUDENT PROFILE (Academic History) Applied Speech Communication BS						
TERM	ACT			FSU GPA (Cumulative)		
	Min.	Avg.	Max.	Min.	Avg.	Max.
2002F	11	18	27	1.883	2.761	3.914
2003F	11	17.5	27	2.071	2.845	4
2004F	11	18	27	1.421	2.556	3.919
2005F	11	18.1	27	1.633	2.631	3.947
2006F	8	18	23	1.75	2.856	3.94

According to 2006 data obtained from Institutional Research and Testing, the average GPA of students enrolled in the B.A. program is 2.8 with the minimum grade point being 2.1 and the maximum being 3.8. The B.A. students' average ACT score is 22.1. The scores range from 15 – 30.

Students in the B.S. program have an average GPA of 2.9. Within this group, the GPA ranges from 1.8 to 3.9. The average ACT score for 2006 is 18 with scores falling between a low of 8 and a high of 23.

When the students in both of these programs are assessed on the basis of these criteria, their overall performance is quite comparable for the 2006 year even though the B.A. students, as a group, enter the program with better qualifications. When the two groups are viewed over time, the B.A. students clearly perform better academically as seen in their average GPAs. Even so, there are some fine students in the B.S. program as seen in the maximum GPA scores.

A.2.b.   Quality of graduating students

Figures for graduating students:

STUDENT PROFILE (Academic History) Communication BA						
TERM	ACT			FSU GPA (Cumulative)		
	Min.	Avg.	Max.	Min.	Avg.	Max.
2001-2002	28	28	28	3.907	3.907	3.907
2002-2003	19	19	19	3.564	3.564	3.564
2003-2004	15	22.6	30	3.142	3.557	3.842
2005-2006	21	23.8	27	3.015	3.498	3.917

STUDENT PROFILE (Academic History) Applied Speech Communication BS						
TERM	ACT			FSU GPA (Cumulative)		
	Min.	Avg.	Max.	Min.	Avg.	Max.
2001-2002	15	19	22	2.9	3.222	3.805
2002-2003	7	16.1	24	2.683	2.982	3.95
2003-2004	10	16.5	26	2.414	2.894	3.762
2004-2005	10	11	13	2.033	2.396	2.85
2005-2006	11	14.6	19	2.033	2.671	3.637

The average GPA for students graduating with the B.A. was 3.5 for the 2006 year. Within this time frame, GPAs ranged from 3.0 to 3.9. The average ACT score was 23.8 with 21 being the minimum and 27 the maximum.

The average GPA for students graduating with the B.S. was 2.7 for the same academic year. The minimum GPA was 2.0 and the maximum was 3.6. The average ACT score was 14.6 with 11 being the low and 19 being the high.

Since the last program review, the average GPA for graduates in the B.S. has dropped from 3.0 to 2.7 and the average ACT has dropped from 16.1 to 14.6. A similar drop is found in the B.A., where the average GPA has dropped from 3.9 to 3.5 and the average ACT has dropped from 28 to 23.8. When appraising these changes, it is important to remember the B.A. program was only approved in 2002. As a result, any statistics about graduates refer to a very small number of persons. For example, it appears as though only one person was graduated from the program in 2001-2002 as well as in 2002-2003 when the scores are compared across categories.

A.2.c. Other screening measures for program applicants

At the present time, the area uses no assessment instruments to evaluate the quality of students entering the program. Faculty have raised concerns about the writing skills students demonstrate, and there has been discussion regarding the need to establish some sort of writing standard which students must meet in order to be admitted. Some faculty members have suggested that the area administer some sort of writing exam to potential majors which they, in turn, must pass in order to achieve entrance into the program.

A.2.d-f. Scholarly or creative activities and awards

Since the last program review, communication students have been involved in a number of activities for which they have received recognition. Some of these will be discussed in

the paragraphs which follow. As a point of clarification, the activities cited should not be seen as a comprehensive list but rather an illustration of the kinds of things our students do.

For example, Ira Childress initiated, produced and hosted a weekly 30 minute TV show, "Between the Lines," on WFQX-Fox 33. It featured Ferris students, coaches, faculty and staff. The program began in fall '03 and ran a second year under the direction of host/producer, Phillip Mooney.

Allison Oswald presented her award-winning speech on Anna Howard Shaw to the Big Rapids Kiwanis Club. Oswald received "All-American" recognition at the national Pi Kappa Delta forensics honorary tournament and convention in Baltimore in March '03 and placed in the top five in the event.

In winter '04, Leslie Harrison and Belinda Jackson organized the campus broadcast of the National Teleconference on Service Politics which originated in Lansing. The teleconference connected students, faculty and staff in twenty states. Harrison received the "Commitment to Service" award as the result of being the top student member of the Ferris Michigan Campus Compact volunteer group for the year.

In winter '04, Zack East, president of Bulldog Radio, launched programming on Charter Cable, Channel 21, as a service to the Big Rapids community. The Michigan Campus Compact also recognized East for his work in '04. By winter '05, East had expanded Bulldog Radio to include shortwave FM on FSU's North Campus.

In fall '05, the following Communication students presented papers at the National Communication Association: Kelly Brastram, Melissa Cauchon, Maria Knirk and Bill Ehle. Knirk also served as president of the Associated Student Government during this period.

In winter '05, Ross Saur and Kyle Webster, members of the Ferris Debate team, participated in a public debate with members of the Council on International Debate and Discussion, Mladen Petkov of Bulgaria and Dan Cristea of Romania.

In spring '07, the following communication students presented a paper at the Central States Communication Association conference in Minneapolis. Shauna Nicholson, Brianna Richardson and Andrew Gallavan. They also presented their work to the Ferris community at the Humanities Department Undergraduate Student Scholarship Colloquium.

Activities like the ones described increase the program's visibility both on- and off-campus. In addition, they perform an informative function by demonstrating the different directions one can take as a communication major. This can be especially beneficial to other communication students since these activities illustrate the range of opportunities available to them.

A.3.a-f. Employability of students

Since information pertaining to the questions raised in these subsections has already been discussed in Section 2, A.1 of the report, it will not be repeated here. However, a word of caution should be given before drawing any conclusions from these data. Only eighteen (16%) of 115 graduates responded to the survey which weakens the degree to which the findings can be generalized to the entire population of graduates. Even so, the data is intriguing. For instance, responses indicate that graduates had difficulty gaining desirable employment in the marketplace; yet, fourteen (77.8%) strongly felt the program prepared them for today's job market. This suggests other factors were at play but exactly what is unclear.

While two of the eighteen respondents expressed some dissatisfaction with the career assistance they were given, it is important to note that the Office of Student Employment and Career Services has made a laudable effort to inform the area of upcoming interviews for potential positions. That information has been provided to the program coordinator who, in turn, has had it posted on the bulletin board in Johnson Hall, on the doors to the restrooms and the classroom doors. In addition, those faculty teaching upper division courses have announced these forthcoming visits to their classes so that students are aware of upcoming opportunities.

Career Services has also been very responsive to area requests to recruit employers who are hiring communication graduates for on-campus interviews. Unfortunately, their efforts have not always been rewarded. They told us more than once last year that no communication majors showed up for interviews with these employers. When students were polled by faculty, some said they forgot, others said they were too busy and a few expressed disinterest in the potential position.

A.3.g-h. Graduate Studies

Nine graduates (50%) expressed interest in or said they were attending graduate school. No single graduate school emerged as a primary choice: only Ferris and Central Michigan University were mentioned twice. While other in-state universities were mentioned, out-of-state institutions were also identified. One person said s/he was considering an on-line program. *(See Appendix B)*

B. ENROLLMENT

B. 1. Anticipated fall enrollment for the program

According to the College of Arts and Sciences, fifty-three students plan to enroll in the B.S., B.A. and A.A. programs for the fall. This number will most likely grow since we have students who do not pre-register and choose, instead, to enroll in classes once they are on-campus in the fall.

B. 2. Increase or decrease in enrollment and student credit hour production (SCH) since last program review

DEPARTMENTAL STUDENT CREDIT HOURS				
PREFIX	YEAR	FALL	SPRING	TOTAL
COMH	2001-02	333	0	333
COMH	2002-03	405	0	405
COMH	2003-04	576	0	576
COMH	2004-05	591	0	591
COMH	2005-06	624	0	624
COMM	2001-02	4,533	4,440	8,973
COMM	2002-03	4,857	4,646	9,503
COMM	2003-04	5,135	4,494	9,629
COMM	2004-05	5,101	4,214	9,315
COMM	2005-06	5,148	4,380	9,528

Student credit hour production has increased from 8,973 in 2001-02 to 9,528 in 2005-06. Communication Honors production also has increased from 333 in 2001-02 to 624 in 2005-06. This trend is expected to continue. As a result, two additional sections of COMH 121 have been added to the fall schedule.

Enrollment numbers have already been discussed. The reader may refer to Section 3, A.1.a., to review that material.

B. 3-5. Student applications, admissions and enrollees

STUDENT PROFILE (New Enrollments) Communication BA, Applied Speech Communication BS, Applied Speech Communication AA			
Term	# Applied	# Accepted	# Enrolled
2002F	81	18	65
2003F	107	28	74
2004F	95	24	82
2005F	111	24	74
2006F	65	37	64

The information presented in the table above was provided by the College of Arts and Sciences. The second column lists the number of students who have applied to the program beginning with fall of 2002. The third column identifies the number of applicants accepted. The fourth column lists the new and continuing students who have enrolled in the program.

The communication area was not able to obtain the number of newly admitted students who have actually enrolled in the program. The College of Arts and Sciences did not have this information available nor did Admissions and Records. However, it appears as

though the number is small, most likely ranging from three - five students. This is supported by the responses of the eighteen newly admitted persons who were contacted in spring '07: only two had decided to attend Ferris.

B. 6. Current enrollment goals, strategy, and efforts to maintain, increase, or decrease the number of students in the program.

Given the resources presently available, we would like to see the program grow to 80 – 100 students. Based on past history, a strategy to achieve this increase should not rely on new admissions. As the previous table indicates, admissions to the program are up. However, our data found that educational costs and institutional image were the factors that affected a decision to attend, viable concerns which faculty cannot readily change. While marketing efforts such as updating and revamping web pages may result in an increased number of admissions, the concerns affecting those newly admitted to the program today will most likely loom large in decisions made by those admitted in the future.

As a result, other initiatives should be undertaken in an effort to increase enrollment. Faculty members have discussed the possibility of redesigning COMM 101 into a hybrid course that would be offered as one of the communication competency choices in the General Education curriculum. In conjunction with skills-based activities, this course would provide an overview of the area which would highlight the various careers one can pursue with a degree in communication. This could be most helpful to those students who are undecided about their major. This is the group which seems to be the population we need to tap since most of our students decide to major in communication after they have been at Ferris for a couple of semesters.

C. PROGRAM CAPACITY
What is the appropriate program enrollment capacity, given the available faculty, physical resources, funding, accreditation requirements, state and federal regulations, and other factors? Which of these items limits program enrollment capacity? Please explain any difference between capacity and current enrollment?

The General Education communication courses are running at capacity. For example, during the fall of 2006, 100% of seats were full in COMM 105, 98% in COMM 121, and 93% in COMM 221.

The honors sections of the General Education communication competency curriculum are analyzed separately. In fall '06, there were eight sections running at 97% capacity. For fall '07, there will be nine sections which presently show 103% capacity.

In fall '06, there were fifty-three sections of lower division courses which had an average of 94% capacity. Thus far, for fall '07, there are forty-seven lower division courses which have filled to a 95% capacity. Most likely, additional sections of courses, e.g.,

COMM 121, will be added before the semester begins since this has historically occurred in the communication area due to late registrations.

Enrollment in 300+ COMM courses in fall '06 averaged 63.4% overall. As a result, the number of upper-division courses was reduced for fall '07, i.e., ten as opposed to eleven. Currently, they are at 69% capacity. However, capacity would be higher if one course which is normally offered yearly in the spring was not on the fall schedule since it is showing a current enrollment of six with a cap of twenty-five. In addition, an experimental course is being offered which has not peaked student interest and currently has an enrollment of ten with a cap of twenty-eight. While there are reasons for offering these courses this fall, they are clearly affecting capacity percentages so that current figures don't reflect the state of the program under "normal" conditions.

Based upon the capacity percentages that are available, it appears the program could handle between 80 – 100 majors given the faculty we have at the present time. If we were able to add adjunct faculty to teach lower division courses, then that number could be increased. If that scenario were to occur, we would have a problem with space. Presently, our support staff struggles to find appropriate classroom space for the courses we are teaching. The difficulty is heightened by the fact that some classrooms need to have movable chairs for group discussions as in COMM 221, others need to have appropriate technology for power point as in COMM 121, and still others need to have Internet access as well as soft ware programs such as SPSS for courses such as COMM 300, Research Methods. Right now, we have classes in Johnson Hall, Starr, and NEC with the consequence that faculty members are running back-and-forth across campus hoping to get their class on time.

D. RETENTION AND GRADUATION

D. 1. The annual attrition rate (number and percent of students) in the program

Most of our students have transferred from other programs at Ferris or from other colleges and universities, so attrition rate numbers from Institutional Research and Testing do not provide an accurate representation of program success. Relatively few students drop out of the program. We estimate we lose about five students (10%) per year; typically, one or two will return to complete their degree.

D. 2. The program's current goals, strategy and efforts to retain students

Almost all of the students who drop out of the program leave for personal reasons not programmatic ones, i.e., a job opportunity, illness, pregnancy, etc. Occasionally, someone may be dismissed due to unsatisfactory academic performance, but this is unusual. Despite the rarity of these situations, there is an expectation among the faculty that every member will make a sincere effort to help any student who needs assistance. Both graduating students (92%) and alumni (88.9%) strongly believed that faculty members have been available to help when they have encountered problems.

In addition to this strategy, the faculty, under the initiative of the program coordinator, has traditionally met with students every semester to share "pizza and pop." This has provided students an opportunity to raise issues or concerns that they may have and has given faculty a medium through which they can attempt to keep students on track (clarifying procedures, informing students of scheduling changes, etc.) as well as soliciting their input. This activity, along with others such as our professional association and fraternities, has contributed to the creation of community for our students.

D. 3. Trends in number of degrees awarded in the program

Between sixteen and eighteen degrees are awarded annually for completion of the B.A., B.S. or A.A. Given the greater number of majors, it is not surprising that more B.S. degrees are awarded than any other, ranging from nine – twelve during the past four years. There has been a downward trend in the completion of A.A. degrees. During the past three years, no more than three were awarded as compared to five being awarded in 2003-2004. Overall, the area would like to see an increase in the number of degrees awarded so that twenty-two – twenty-five are completed each year.

D. 4. Number of students enrolled in the program and graduating within prescribed time

While the communication program is designed so that it can be completed within a four-year period, many of our students do not finish it within that time frame. This is primarily because they typically enter the program in their sophomore or junior year and have some catch-up to do in the core and even in General Education. In addition to this, some students work a substantial number of hours per week and, thus, need to take a reduced load which delays their graduation. This situation is further compounded for those who are in the B.S. program since they need to complete an internship and often chose to do it the summer after they have completed all their course work.

D.5. Average length of time to complete the program

Due to all the factors previously explained, most students need nine semesters to complete the program although some take even longer. This situation may improve as a result of the reduction in the number of credit hours for graduation, i.e., from 126 to 120. However, most Ferris students only enroll in fourteen hours per semester. This factor coupled with the points already raised suggest that it would be more likely students would have to attend at least one summer term if they are to graduate within four years.

E. ACCESS

E. 1. Program's actions to make itself accessible to students

In addition to the courses offered on the main campus, a number of classes can be taken at campuses around the state, including Traverse City, Flint, Ludington and Grand Rapids. Scheduling is handled by the site director so that the courses are taught at times

which will allow non-traditional students the opportunity to attend them. All of these courses are taught by qualified instructors and in many instances tenure or tenure-track faculty perform this outreach.

The program accepts transfer credit from many institutions, and students can begin working on their degree any semester throughout the academic year. Students completing a Ferris A.A. degree can use that study as their "Application to the Workplace," which facilitates their movement through the B.S. program in Applied Speech Communication.

Access has also been enhanced by the use of the Internet. Several faculty use mixed delivery in their courses, e.g., COMM 352. Recently, COMM 221 has been put on-line, and there is discussion about putting another General Education course on-line.

E. 2-3. Effects of these actions on the program including program goals and priorities

Students interested in a degree in communication can begin their course of study off-campus either by taking a course off-site or at their local community college/university, assuming that an articulation agreement has been reached. In this way, they become situated for entry into a four-year course of study which facilitates their movement into the program. In addition, off-site courses enhance the visibility of the program and may help to generate student interest in further study. Thus far, the faculty serving off-site centers has chosen to do so and consequently has not found it a burdensome task. From the student's point-of-view, off-site classes can reduce monetary costs in terms of living expenses and travel. The same can be said for on-line classes.

However, the value of taking on-line classes in the communication area needs to be weighed in relation to the reduced opportunity to improve one's verbal and nonverbal skills as well as his/her ability to analyze others. It would be disadvantageous to the area if students were graduated who didn't make eye contact when they spoke, didn't use effective turn-taking behavior, didn't speak with appropriate volume, etc. Virtually every faculty member in communication has had students who demonstrate such behavior. Therefore, the likelihood that this could occur should not be underestimated if a professor's only contact with a student is through the written mode. As such, it underscores the importance of moving carefully into this type of course delivery.

The B.S. program offers those students, who are pursuing a two-year degree in such fields as dental hygiene, an option for utilizing their time at Ferris in a productive way since many are wait-listed given enrollment caps. With careful planning, they can complete both degrees within a reasonable time frame, an additional year including summer term, and have a greater array of choices available to them. Hence, a number of students have decided to pursue the B.S. which has contributed to the area's enrollment.

F. CURRICULUM

F.1.Program requirements

The Communication curriculum is built on a set of foundation courses which become prerequisites for upper-level courses. These foundation courses parallel the General Education communication competency courses.

Foundation Courses Required for All Degrees		
General Education	**Program Requirement**	**Credit Hours**
COMM 105 Interpersonal Communication	COMM 200 Foundations of Interpersonal Communication	3
COMM 121/COMH 121* Public Speaking	COMM 201 Public Presentation Practices	3
COMM 221 Small Group Decision Making	COMM 221 Small Group Decision Making	3

*Sections of Public Speaking, designated COMH 121, are offered for freshmen in the Honors Program.

These three foundation courses are requirements for the Associate in Arts (A.A.) in Applied Speech Communication, Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Applied Speech Communication, Bachelor of Arts (B.S.) in Communication degrees, as well as the Communication minor and the Speech Communication (Teaching) minor.

Since many students who transfer into the communication program have already taken a communication competency course as part of their General Education requirements, COMM 105 and COMM 121 can be substituted for COMM 200 and COMM 201 if a grade of "C" or better has been earned.

In addition to the foundation courses, students are required to take "core" courses appropriate to each degree:

"Core" Courses Required by Degree				
A.A.	B.S.	B.A.	Communication Minor	Speech Communication (Teaching) Minor
COMM 251 Argumentation and Debate: (meets General Education Communication Competency)	COMM 251			
COMM 299 Communication Theories	COMM 299	COMM 299	COMM 299	
	COMM 300 Research Methods	COMM 300		
				COMM 352 Directing Communication Activities
	COMM 365 Intercultural Communication: (required for Health Care Administration)			
	COMM 380* Organizational Communication			
	COMM 421 Leadership in Small Groups (required by Management)			
	COMM 460 Communication Rights and Responsibilities			
	COMM 493 Internship (6 credits required; up to 8 credits available)			
	COMM 499 Senior Seminar in Communication	COMM 499		

*The addition of COMM 380 to the B.S. "core" was made upon the recommendation of the Communication Advisory Board during the 2001 program assessment process.

The A.A., B.S., BA, and Communication Minor require students to elect additional communication courses:

Number of Elective Courses			
A. A.	**B.S.**	**B.A.**	**Communication Minor**
2 COMM courses (6 credit hours)	3 COMM courses: (9 credit hours, 6 at 300+ level)	5 COMM courses: (15 credit hours; 9 at 300+ level)	3 COMM courses: (9 credit hours at 300+ level)

The Speech Communication (Teaching) minor requires students to take 5-6 credits in Theatre, including THTR 255 Educational Theatre, and 3 credits in mass media (either TVPR 110 Introduction to Video or JRNL 251 Understanding Mass Media)

In addition to the required courses, students may choose from an array of electives. Some of these courses are offered regularly; some are offered on a rotating basis.

Communication Electives and Frequency of Offering			
COMM 205	Listening	F W S	(required for programs in the College of Business)
COMM 231	Oral Interpretation of Literature	F (EVEN)	(meets General Education Cultural Enrichment)
COMM 252	Speech Activities	F W	(2 credits for participation on the Debate or Forensics teams)
COMM 301	Interviewing	F	
COMM 305	Communication and Human Relations	F	
COMM 310	Nonverbal Communication	W	
COMM 315	Gender Communication	W (EVEN)	(meets General Education Race, Ethnicity and Gender)
COMM 325	Script Writing	F (ODD)	
COMM 332	Persuasive Speaking	F W	(required for programs in the College of Business)
COMM 333	Theories of Persuasion	W (ODD)	
COMM 336	Technical and Professional Presentations	F W S	(required for programs in the College of Technology; and recommended for programs in the College of Business)
COMM 370	Communication and Conflict	F	
COMM 385	Broadcast Writing	W	(recommended for programs in Television and Digital Media Production)
COMM 387	Broadcast Presentation	F	(recommended for programs in Television and Digital Media Production)
COMM 396	Cross-Cultural Communication Field Studies	S	
COMM 491	Internship	F W S	For students in the B.A. program; range of credits from 1-8

Since 2001 several courses have been offered as "Special Topics."

Special Topics		
COMM 390	Family Communication*	W '03, W '05
COMM 390	Diversity and Communication (meets General Education Race, Ethnicity and Gender)	W '05 F '07
COMM 390	Gender Communication**	W '02, W '04
COMM 390	Political Communication	F '04, F '06
COMM 390	Health Communication	W '07

* offered as COMM 3xx in W '07, but insufficient enrollment
** added to the curriculum as COMM 315 in W '06

Several courses are being proposed as "Special Topics" for spring '08 with the intent of generating career pathway foci for majors:

Special Topics for Spring 2008		
COMM 290	Client Communication	(target audience includes students interested in customer service)
COMM 290	Mass Communication	(target audience includes students interested in broadcasting and journalism)

In the B.S. program students can either complete an existing minor to complement their communication coursework, or they may develop their own "Application to the Workplace." The "Application to the Workplace" is a course of study developed under the advisement of a faculty member outside the communication area and enables a student to take courses that are not designated as an official minor. The first "Application" program was developed with Television and Digital Media so that students interested in careers in broadcasting could get some training and study in the essential aspects of television production.

Students interested in careers in business have struggled to construct an acceptable concentration of courses in areas such as advertising, marketing and public relations, which have not offered minors. Recent discussions with faculty in the College of Business have resulted in a new business minor: Integrated Marketing Techniques. It incorporates two communication courses in its curriculum: COMM 333, Theories of Persuasion, and COMM 385, Broadcast Writing. This minor offers communication majors an opportunity to apply their communication skills to the fields of advertising, marketing, and public relations and exposes students with those majors to communication studies.

F.1.a. Directed electives and General Education courses

The program does not require students to take certain electives or General Education courses in order to graduate.

F.1.b. Hidden prerequisites

There are no hidden prerequisites.

F.2-3. Curricular or program changes undertaken or under review

No significant changes have been made to the program or the curriculum since the last program review. Currently, no changes of this nature are under review.

F.4. Plans to revise the current program

As already mentioned, the area is considering changes to the program in an effort to offer students more direction in their pursuit of a career and to draw more students into our courses. Specifically, the program is considering concentrations that would consist of three-to-four courses which would highlight a career pathway. These concentrations might also be "packaged" as certificates for non-communication majors. The faculty has discussed the development of one in Health Communication, another in Customer Service, and a third in Mass Communication. Recent tenure-line faculty hires in the communication area have been made with this purpose in mind.

G. QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

G.1-2. Student, alumni, advisory committee and intern supervisors' perceptions of the quality of instruction

Since this topic is already discussed in detail in Section 2, the reader is directed to that portion of the report. Specifically, one is referred to A.2-3 (the alumni survey), B.1 and 3 (internship supervisors' survey), D.1-2 (the student survey), and F.2 – 3 (the advisory board survey).

G.3. Department and individual efforts to improve the learning environment

Since the last program review, the department has installed large viewing screens in Johnson Hall classrooms to replace the TV monitors that had been used. These viewing screens are connected to the class computer so that power point and Internet information can be displayed to the class as a whole. Faculty members have incorporated various media into their classes and utilize the Internet in class to access information, provide illustrations, etc. In addition, students can now include material in their speeches and presentations in ways that would not have been possible before.

While all of this is desirable, faculty and students have not been satisfied with the screens. One reason is that the video screens are so large that they distort media clips so that the clarity of the picture is a problem. This issue is compounded by the fact that most of the blinds in the Johnson Hall classrooms are broken so that the light cannot be adequately blocked out for students to actually see what's on the screen.

The department also purchased new cameras for recording speeches and other presentations. Cameras were definitely needed since the old ones were breaking down on a regular basis. The new ones, however, uses a DVD to record, and this presents another problem since the disk must be finalized. In the past, students were given their tape once they finished recording their speech; now it takes five-to-eight minutes to finalize the disk before a student may have it. Some faculty members are taking two cameras to a class so that one can be used to record and the other can be finalizing the disk of the previous speaker. Other faculty members are taking the disks on which speeches have been recorded and finalizing them in their office, thereby dealing with the disruption of changing a disk every few minutes.

G.4. Professional Development

Faculty members are engaged in a range of professional development activities. Faculty members have been involved in the Center for Teaching and Learning as participants as well as facilitators and workshop leaders. Faculty members present papers and programs at a number of professional conferences. Several of these presentations have focused on pedagogical issues such as service learning and developing an informed citizenry through participation in the Political Engagement Project. In addition to this, faculty members hold offices in a number of professional associations and serve as evaluators in assessing programs. *(See Appendix A)*

G.5. Efforts made to increase the interaction of students with faculty and peers

There are a number of activities for students to interact with faculty and peers. Some are organizational in nature such as the Ferris Communication Association, Lambda Pi Eta, and Pi Kappa Delta. Others are periodic "pizza" gatherings in which faculty and students sit down to answer questions and discuss concerns. In addition to these social functions, faculty members work one-on-one with students as coaches in debate and forensics and as mentors when preparing a student for a job interview or submitting a paper for presentation at a conference.

G.6. Extent to which inclusive pedagogy and curriculum infuse teaching and learning

Given the nature of communication studies, students are actively engaged in the classroom. This involvement may take the form of group presentations, dialogues which have been created to illustrate a concept, peer evaluation of speeches, discussion of topics which students have suggested, student selection of guest speakers, etc.

In particular, COMM 499, the senior seminar in communication, is designed with the intent of affording students an opportunity to provide input into the program which can be incorporated into teaching and the curriculum. For example, the assessment tool students developed for COMM 105 was pilot tested this spring after some minor modifications were made to the instrument.

G.7. Effects of actions described in G.5. and G.6 on the quality of teaching and learning in the program

In line with the aims of the field of communication, such action has helped to develop a community in which there is on-going dialogue. This has helped to create an atmosphere of openness in which faculty engage in listening as well as speaking. While there may be differences of opinion on some issue(s), students know that their views are valued and that their feedback may lead to changes in the curriculum. This, in turn, has fostered student ownership in the program as well as building individual confidence in one's ability to express his/her voice in an effective way.

H. COMPOSITION AND QUALITY OF FACULTY

H.1.a. Rank and qualifications of program faculty

Professor

Sandra Alspach, Ph.D.
Lon Green, Ph.D.
Robert Loesch, Ph.D.
George Nagel, Ph.D.
Neil Patten, Ph.D.
Donna Smith, Ph.D.
John Watkins, Ed.D.

Associate Professor

Cami Sanderson, Ph.D.
Elizabeth Wilson, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor

Matthew Thatcher, Ph.D.
Stephanie Thomson, Ph.D.

H.1.b. Promotions and merits since last program review

Sandra Alspach	Full Professor	2002
Robert Loesch	Full Professor	2004
George Nagel	Merit	2007
Neil Patten	Merit	2007
Donna Smith	Merit	2004
Cami Sanderson	Associate	2006
Elizabeth Wilson	Associate	2004

H.1.C. Professional activities of program faculty since last program review

See Appendix A.

H.2. Faculty workload

H.2.a. Standard Loads/Overloads

The standard load for communication faculty is twelve credit hours a semester: four courses of three credits each.

With the exception of spring '07, the overloads indicated below are the result of our general education commitments. These overloads are for COMM 121 (public speaking), COMM 105 (interpersonal communication), and COMM 221 (small group decision making).

'07 SP 4 faculty taught overloads due to a faculty member being on medical leave
'06 F   5 faculty taught overloads
'06 SP 5 faculty taught overloads
'05 F   7 faculty taught overloads
'05 SP 0 no overloads
'04 F   7 faculty taught overloads
'04 SP 3 faculty taught overloads
'03 F   7 faculty taught overloads
'03 SP 7 faculty taught overloads
'02 F   8 faculty taught overloads
'02 SP 4 faculty taught overloads

H.2.b. Activities for which faculty receive release time

The program coordinator has one quarter (.25) release time per semester. The debate coach has one half (.5) release time per semester.

H.3. Recruitment

H.3.a. Recruiting process for new faculty

The communication area follows the university's affirmative action guidelines in our recruitment of new faculty. Generally, open positions are advertised in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and on the CRITNET site of the National Communication Association. These are the two most utilized sites for learning about job opportunities. Job opportunities are also posted at Howard University in Washington D.C.

Applicants participate in both phone and on-campus interviews with search committee members and the department head. Reference checks are completed before the on-

campus interview. On-campus interviews include sessions with the search committee, open forums, and a teaching demonstration.

H.3.b. Qualifications (academic and experiential) typically required for new faculty

New faculty members are required to hold a terminal degree in communication or a related field that is appropriate for the position. Candidates who have completed all requirements for the degree but have not yet defended the dissertation may be considered if the search committee and candidate's dissertation committee are confident that the dissertation will be defended during the summer before the beginning of fall semester.

Typically, new faculty members have prior experience teaching on the university level before coming to Ferris. All new faculty members must demonstrate teaching competence and are observed by their tenure committee members and the department head each semester until reaching tenure.

H.3.c-d. Program's diversity goals for both gender and race/ethnicity in the faculty

The communication program strives to recruit a diverse faculty so that it is inclusive in terms of sex and race/ethnicity. While job opportunities have been posted at historically African-American universities as well as with minority job registers, we have not been successful in recruiting persons that would provide racial and /or ethnic diversity. We have, however, done much better achieving a balanced representation with respect to sex. Currently, five of the eleven tenured/tenure-track positions are held by females.

H.4. Orientation process for new faculty: descriptions and assessment

All new faculty members participate in the Center for Teaching and Learning pre-semester orientation kick-off week activities and also in the first year activities which continue through spring semester. New faculty members are assigned mentors who work with them during the first year. Mentors meet with new faculty regularly, often for lunch and dinner. Mentors serve as a source to new instructors who may seek advice about tenure, promotion, and other matters. The department head also meets with new faculty regularly to discuss tenure and promotion processes.

The orientation process for new faculty can almost be overwhelming since it is meeting intensive. That, plus the myriad of things one must do as a new faculty member, can lead people to regard these activities as a burden despite the good intentions which underlie them. While that can occur, faculty in the communication area seem to agree that the mentor system is a very valuable approach to integrating new people into the Ferris community.

H. 5. Reward structure for faculty

H.5.a. Description of reward structure and eligibility criteria

The Department of Humanities does have professional development funds for which communication faculty can apply. These funds are awarded by a committee which includes the department head. Those presenting papers at meetings or conferences receive higher monetary awards than those simply attending. Generally, a faculty member will not receive funding for more than one meeting/conference per year. Faculty also may apply for a Timme grant to offset conference expenses. Many faculty also acquire PDI awards for participating in the programs offered by the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development.

H.5.b. Impact of existing salary structure on the program's ability to recruit and retain quality faculty

The current salary structure has been adequate to recruit new faculty. However, recent figures published by the National Communication Association and the *Chronicle of Higher Education* indicate that future hires will command higher salaries than our most recent hires. As things presently stand, there is an issue regarding equity among the faculty. This is especially true among those who did not benefit from the equity adjustment included in the last contact, e.g., those who were promoted but did not receive equity since they were not tenured. New faculty hires are earning almost as much as these individuals are despite their years of teaching at Ferris. This promises to become more of an issue in the future.

H.5.c. Adequacy of the current reward structure to support faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service

Many faculty in the area would like to become more involved in research, but a heavy teaching load combined with university/department/area committee work preclude that from occurring. Due to class sizes of 28 – 32 students in performance based classes, there doesn't seem to be any way to get out under the load. While the university as a whole does offer some modest funding or seed money for research work, communication faculty really need to be freed up in terms of time. It would help immensely if faculty could apply for release time in order to complete a manuscript for submission, to search and apply for grants, to conduct field research, etc. Such support would certainly result in outcomes that would enhance the visibility of the institution and contribute to a positive institutional image.

H.5.d. Enhancing diversity and inclusion as a component of the reward structure

The Department of Humanities does not provide grants for enhancing diversity and inclusion in our current funding program.

H.6. Graduate Instruction

The communication area has no graduate program.

H.7. Non-Tenure-Track and Adjunct Faculty

H.7.a. Full-time non-tenure-track and adjunct faculty who taught courses in the program

	Length of Appointment	Years of Service
Kristi Gerding-Scholten, Ph.D.	9-month-appointment	three
Gayle Martin	9-month-appointment	seven
Brook Moore	9-month-appointment	one
David Schrock	9-month-appointment	one
Shannon Ousley	9-month-appointment	two

H.7.b-c. Courses taught by non-tenure track/adjunct faculty and their qualifications

The non-tenure-track and adjunct faculty teach several courses although none teaches any class that is 300 level or above. These faculty members primarily teach the communication competency courses that are part of General Education, i.e., COMM 121/COMH 121, COMM 105, and COMM 221. While the 100 level courses are not listed as program requirements, virtually every major takes one of these courses which is then substituted for COMM 200 and COMM 201. For this reason, it can be argued that all the classes they teach are part of the program although technically this is not the case. In addition to the foundation classes which make up the bulk of their teaching schedule, these instructors teach COMM 251 which is a required course for A.A. and B.S. majors as well as COMM 205 which is an elective for communication majors but required by some programs in the College of Business.

Dr. Gerding-Scholten is the debate coach and teaches all sections of COMM 251. The remaining faculty hold master's degrees in communication or a related area. Altogether, these instructors teach about 31% of the courses in the area.

H.7.d. Appropriateness of using non-tenure-track faculty

Faculty members have different views concerning the appropriateness of using non-tenure-track faculty. Since these persons have no service or advising responsibilities, some feel it puts an additional load on the tenured/tenure-track faculty. In addition, there is no incentive for non-tenure track faculty to become actively engaged in the field. Both of these factors can affect the degree of visibility the program achieves both on- and off-campus. Others see things differently. They don't want a tenure line in debate, for example, since they want tenure-track positions to be filled by persons with other areas of expertise. Others believe it is good to have non-tenure-track positions since there is

turnover in these slots which can be refreshing to both faculty and students in terms of offering new ideas and approaches to content matter.

H.8.e. Accrediting body's position regarding non-tenured/adjunct faculty

The communication program is not accredited.

I. SERVICE TO NON-MAJORS

I.1. General Education Courses

I. a) General Education service courses provided by the program faculty for other departments at FSU:

GENERAL EDUCATION SERVICE COURSES			
PREFIX	TITLE	CREDITS	GE DESIGNATORS
COMH 121	Fundamentals of Public Speaking	3	Comm. Comp.
COMM 105	Interpersonal Communication	3	Comm. Comp.
COMM 121	Fundamentals of Public Speaking	3	Comm. Comp.
COMM 200	Found of Interpersonal Communication	3	Comm. Comp.
COMM 201	Public Presentation Practice	3	Comm. Comp.
COMM 221	Small Group Decision Making	3	Comm. Comp.
COMM 231	Interpretive Reading	3	C
COMM 251	Argumentation and Debate	3	Comm. Comp.
COMM 315	Gender Communication	3	REG
COMM 396	Cross-Cultural Communication Field Studies	3	G, C

Several communication courses are part of the General Education curriculum. As the chart above indicates, seven communication courses meet the communication competency requirement in General Education. Two other courses are designated as cultural enrichment while a third satisfies global consciousness and a fourth race, ethnicity and gender.

I. 1. b. Non-General Education service courses or courses required for other programs.

The non-General Education courses the area provides to other programs on campus are noted in Section 3, F.1. In particular, the reader is referred to two tables: one is entitled "'Core' Courses Required by Degree;" the other "Communication Electives and Frequency of Offering." Perusal of this information will show that the area offers six courses that are either required or recommended by other programs on campus.

Interaction between the communication area and these departments/programs occur as needed. For example, the program coordinator may contact faculty in order to schedule these courses at an appropriate time for their students. On other occasions, an instructor may want to discuss some changes they are considering in a course with department/program faculty.

I. 1. c. The impact of the provision of General Education and non-General Education courses on the program.

The communication program does benefit from its service function. First, the program does recruit majors from its General Education offerings. Second, the area is able to offer courses that might not otherwise be taught if they weren't recommended or required by other programs/departments on campus. This contributes to the richness of the program and adds to the number of choices majors have. It also creates a more diverse classroom for students which can broaden their perspective and enhance their understanding.

That being said, it should also be noted that some of these courses have low enrollment; yet, continue to be offered as a service to these other programs/departments. In addition, some faculty members are concerned about one of the courses presently being taught. While enrollment is always high in the class, faculty question whether the topic is appropriate for a full semester of study, and, thus, have doubts about the overall substantive quality of the course. Despite these reservations, it continues to be taught because it is required in other programs/departments.

I. 1. d) The program's plans to increase, decrease, or keep constant its level of service courses.

As a result of the increase in enrollment in the Honors Program, two more sections of COMH 121 will be offered in fall 2007. It is also anticipated that some additional sections will be offered in spring 2008.

In addition to adding sections to this course, the program does plan to increase the number of its General Education offerings. These are courses that are presently being taught that should have a social awareness designation given the content of the

material. In the past, the communication area has run into a stone wall every time an effort has been made to include one of our courses as social awareness. The area has been told that our courses cannot have a social awareness designation since our program is housed in the Department of Humanities. Such reasoning is fallacious since the communication discipline draws upon the social scientific as well as the humanistic traditions, a point which was noted earlier in this report. The resistance we have encountered is hurting our program for it has led to the perception that we are falling far short of other programs in the College of Arts and Sciences even though we may have more majors than they do. The difference, though, is that the upper division courses in these programs have higher enrollments that ours and that, we believe, is due to the fact that those courses have a social awareness designation. The area can no longer afford to let this matter slide given the emphasis placed upon enrollment numbers. Hence, this will be one of our priorities this fall.

J. DEGREE PROGRAM COST AND PRODUCTIVITY DATA

J.1. Degree program cost

The following average degree program costs are based upon the most recent data available from Institutional Research and Testing:

B.A. in Communication	$20,037.58
B.S. in Applied Speech Communication	$21,028.16
A.A. in Applied Speech Communication	$ 7,252.11

J.2. Productivity data

 As the table which follows indicates, faculty in the communication area are quite productive.

Credit Hour Production Per Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (2002-2006)		
Prefix	**Year**	**SCH/FTEF**
COMH	2002-03	540.00
COMH	2003-04	512.00
COMH	2004-05	591.00
COMH	2005-06	624.00
COMM	2002-03	589.33
COMM	2003-04	579.19
COMM	2004-05	560.30
COMM	2005-06	593.92

K.1-4. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Prior to winter '06, the communication area had not formally assessed graduating students' mastery of essentials even though program outcomes for graduating students had been established. (*See Section 1, A.1*) That term, trial instruments were developed and administered to students enrolled in COMM 499, the Senior Seminar in Communication, which is a capstone course. Students' knowledge in three areas was examined: interpersonal communication, public speaking, and small group decision making. These, then, were the variables that were tracked.

One trial instrument attempted to measure content knowledge in interpersonal communication. It was prepared by a communication faculty member and given to the capstone classes in winter '06 and fall '06. A benchmark standard was established for this assessment: 80% of the students should score 80% or higher on the instrument. The winter '06 and fall '06 classes were able to meet the benchmark. However, the instrument was abandoned because students found the directions confusing and the terminology was too textbook specific.

In spring '07, a different approach was used. A team of students in the capstone class was asked to write a dialogue that would demonstrate the key concepts listed in the course outcomes for interpersonal communication. The team generated a dialogue between two women and then developed a number of multiple choice questions about the dialogue which focused on the key concepts. Once again, the students met the 80% benchmark.

The second variable examined in the assessment process was public speaking. Beginning with winter '06, the content knowledge of graduating majors was measured using an existing proficiency test. More specifically, a truncated version of the proficiency test given to those who want to opt out of COMM 121, Public Speaking, was administered to these students. All met the benchmark of 80% on this instrument. In addition to this, students were asked to complete an attitude survey used for pre- and post-testing in the General Education communication competence assessment of public speaking.

In order to assess public speaking skills, students were asked to prepare an overview of the career field they hoped to enter, using materials obtained through the Student Employment and Career Services website as well as other "trade" sources. They, then, presented a five to eight minute summary of their research to the class. The instructor evaluated the presentation according to the rubric used to proficiency out of the General Education communication competence (Public Speaking) course. All assessed classes met the average benchmark of 80% on the skills instrument.

The third variable to be assessed was small group decision making. Classes in winter and fall '06 were measured using an instrument that was developed by a faculty member. It focused on content knowledge which had been identified for small group decision making by the faculty. While both classes were able to meet the benchmark of 80%, the instrument was deemed inappropriate because it focused entirely on content knowledge.

In spring '07, a team was assigned the task of preparing an assessment tool which was based upon the outcomes developed for small group decision making. The team decided they would have students watch selected scenes from the film "The Breakfast Club" in which five high school students assigned to all-day detention develop into a "group" through the course of their interaction. Two scenes were shown; after each, students were instructed to answer a series of multiple choice items based upon the dialogue that had occurred. Students were also asked to answer a number of multiple choice questions that tested their knowledge of small group concepts and to complete a matching exercise which focused on nonverbal communication terms. The class average met the 80% benchmark.

Based upon the scores achieved on each of the assessment measures, it was concluded that program outcomes were being met. Graduating students had demonstrated competency in interpersonal communication, public speaking and small group decision making.

L. ADMINSTRATION EFFECTIVENESS

L.1. Adequacy of administrative and clerical support for the program

The administrative and clerical support for the program is excellent. The program administrative structure includes a program coordinator (a faculty member with .25 release time) and the department head. Clerical support for the department includes one full time secretary 2 and one temporary part-time clerical position which was added to the department this past academic year. This part-time position has contributed to the effectiveness and efficiency of the department since the office was clearly understaffed in the past.

Departmental staff persons, Ella Shaw and Crystal Joslin, ably assist program administrators and faculty. They, in turn, are supported by several student employees. The department has a reputation for being a good place for students to work which is seen in the number of student employees who return each year as their class standing allows.

L.2. Efficiency of program and department administration

The program coordinator is currently Dr. Elizabeth Wilson who replaced Dr. Sandy Alspach in winter '07. She works closely works with the Department Head, Dr. Grant Snider, who replaced Mr. Don Flickinger in summer '06. A comfortable working relationship prevails, and scheduling, staffing, and general communication needs and responsibilities are well met. Faculty are kept informed of program needs, professional development opportunities, student activities, and financial concerns.

The administrative structure and personnel allow the program to run in an efficient manner. Given that the department is very diverse (several academic areas) and quite

large, it is necessary to use financial, time, personnel and space resources well. This is compounded by the program and department responsibility to meet not only program needs, but to fulfill general education assignments as well. Involving the faculty in these areas has assisted in the over-all efficient operation of the program.

L.3. Efficiency/effectiveness of course schedule and preparation

The area and department have an established, effective and efficient rotation system for offering/scheduling courses which must be integrated with the large number of general education classes offered by the area. Since the communication area's policy is that no faculty member "owns" a course, instructors communicate openly and directly about teaching schedules and the rotation of teaching opportunities. Students have often commented that they appreciate the fact their program required courses are taught by different faculty members.

L.4. Ability of students to take needed courses in a timely manner

The program coordinator and department head have worked together to schedule courses so that students can make timely progress in the completion of their programs. There is a clear rotation (including summer) of required courses, and advisors work with students to insure that students are aware of their needs and progress. In addition, the program and department realize the importance of being responsive to off-campus and web-based learning needs which will increase as the program continues to grow.

There is concern that the increasing emphasis accorded to enrollment numbers could result in the cancellation of upper division courses needed for graduation. While economic factors certainly must enter into decisions regarding course offerings, it is also important that students are able to take the courses required for graduation in a timely manner. This can be a difficult balancing act, but it is hoped that the administration will err on the side of the student's interest so that s/he can complete the program with fewer setbacks.

<center>**SECTION 4: FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT**</center>

A.1-5. INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The communication area manages four classrooms in Johnson Hall, all of which are equipped with computer technology. The classrooms are Johnson 101, 102, 103, and 104.

In addition, the communication area shares eight classrooms with other programs in Starr. Five of these classrooms do not have computer technology. They are Starr 126, 214, 216, 226, and 322. The three classrooms that do have computer technology are Starr 136, 223, and 233.   There are also three classrooms in the National Elastomer Center which the area shares with other programs. These rooms are NEC 116, 201, and 203. All three are equipped with computer technology. Based upon the previous description, it becomes obvious that appropriate classroom space in terms of room size, technological enhancements and location can be a challenge.

The situation is further compounded by the condition of the classrooms in Johnson Hall. The radiators emit clanging noises that are very audible, especially during student speech presentations. These noises are distracting and cause frustration to both students and faculty. The paint is peeling from the walls and is unsightly. The window blinds are broken so that they are impossible to close completely, creating difficulty for students to view any image on the classroom screen. In addition, the rooms are equipped with large tables that snag clothing due to the fact that the outer plastic surface is torn off in places. The large tables also make group work very difficult which becomes a most significant matter in the small groups' classes. The chairs are very uncomfortable and the plastic is split on many of them creating sharp edges and slits in the seats, let alone that some are wine-red and others are popsicle-orange. Students do not like the classrooms and make negative comments concerning the conditions.   In fact, students who took the survey made more negative comments about these classrooms than any other facet of the program.

Even so, these four rooms in Johnson remain the most popular with the faculty primarily because their offices are in Johnson Hall which is where their teaching materials and resources are. An instructor has to be pack-horse to transport the amount of equipment needed for communication classes (stop watch, easel, video camera, tripod along with lecture notes, handouts, papers, etc.) when teaching in Starr. The situation becomes impossible if a faculty member is teaching in Starr as well as in Johnson or NEC, and it's a back-to-back schedule. However, this does happen to faculty members every semester due to spatial constraints and scheduling needs. Teaching in Johnson becomes an issue that faculty are willing to fight for. As one professor said, "I'm willing to teach any class at any time as long as I can teach in Johnson Hall. I've spent years running to Starr, and I've had it."

<center>63</center>

There have been rumblings for a number of years that Johnson Hall is going to be torn down. However, there is no indication that will be occurring in the near future. The communication area is trying to get some other chairs for the Johnson Hall classrooms through the campus-wide sale of surplus furniture. Other than that, no renovations or repairs are scheduled to be done.

B. COMPUTER ACCESS AND AVAILABILITY

B.1-4. Computing resources outside classrooms and offices

The Communication Program has no computer facilities beyond those in the classrooms and offices.

B.5-6. Efficacy of online services and adequacy of computer support

According to the faculty survey, most faculty members feel they receive adequate technological assistance. Those who have developed courses through WebCT/FerrisConnect have commented that they have received valuable assistance through the Center for Teaching and Learning. A number of faculty members utilize WebCT/FerrisConnect for mixed delivery of courses. Some faculty use the technology interactively and others non-interactively. Currently, the only communication course fully on line is COMM 221, small group decision making.

This past year a number of faculty received new computers and monitors which certainly improved computer capacity and performance. Due to this change, some faculty members required the assistance of technology support systems and that office was most effective in responding to questions and concerns in a expeditious manner.

C. OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Since this has already been discussed, the reader is referred to Section 3, G. 3.

D. LIBRARY RESOURCES

D.1. Adequacy of print and electronic resources

Because communication is more article than book-oriented, the library allocates a modest sum each year for book purchases. The current annual library book budget for communication is just over $1000. Main areas of book collection development include public speaking and compilations of essays such as the Sage series of Communication Handbooks purchased last fall. In recent years, the library has been responsive to book requests from the communication faculty and, in particular, has attempted to acquire the key texts listed on the reading list for COMM 499.

The library has not always provided an adequate journal collection. As a result, the physical journal collection is still spotty, but several core titles, such as *Communication Quarterly*, *Southern Communication Journal*, and the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, have recently been reinstated as print subscriptions after only being microfiche subscriptions for many years. This inadequacy is offset by the library's subscription to the electronic, full-text database, Communication and Mass Media Complete, which was done shortly after the product was first released in early 2005.

For many years, the availability of online indexing and full-text journal articles resided in the multi-subject InfoTrac OneFile database, which contains recent full-text for many communication journals, and PsycInfo, which selectively indexes journal titles in communication. The library did respond quickly when the Communication and Mass Media Complete (CMMC) database became available by subscribing soon after it became available. CMMC contains current and back file full-text for dozens of communication journals, including many core titles. Retrospective indexing is provided for many other titles not included in the full-text package. Early this year, the library added a subscription to Communication Studies, a database containing current full-text of 19 journals published by Sage which are not included in CMMC.

Given that the communication degree programs are still relatively new and that more work improving the collection needs to be accomplished, the library's adequacy in providing students and faculty research support through its journal collection has improved greatly mostly via subscriptions to online databases.

D.2. Instructional Services

Librarians often work with COMM 121 classes, offering students research tips and reinforcing the importance of fact confirmation when preparing for public speaking. The library liaison to the communication area, Paul Kammerdiner, has presented more advanced sessions to communication majors taking upper-level classes.

D.3. Adequacy of FLITE budget

Overall, the FLITE budget has adequately met program needs. The electronic data bases have provided valuable information and are an important resource to both faculty and students. The print copies of some of the more popular journals in the field have been a welcome addition to the collection since microfiche is often cumbersome, and students frequently attempt to avoid it.

SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS

A. Relationship to FSU mission

The communication program clearly advances the mission of the university which is to prepare students for productive careers in a changing society. It is difficult to imagine anyone in today's workforce who does not utilize communication in the course of his/her daily activities whether it is on an interpersonal level, within a small group context or in a presentational setting. Hence, the study of communication is an important part of anyone's career preparation. This can be undertaken in two ways: through communication competency courses included within the General Education curriculum or through more comprehensive programs of study which focus upon the knowledge and skills needed to pursue a communication career in today's marketplace.   In this way, the program operates on two levels and, in doing so, responds to the needs and interests of a diverse public.

B. Program visibility and distinctiveness

The program distinguishes itself in a number of ways. First, a student has the option of enrolling in the B.S. or B.A. program and, thus, can choose between a more structured academic experience or one that will allow him/her to take more electives as well as courses from other disciplines. In this sense the student is given a degree of freedom to individualize his/her program of study. Even with this flexibility, the curriculum which shapes these two programs is broader based than many others that are offered in the state. As a result, a Ferris communication graduate has a breadth of information and experience which will help him/her to effectively deal with a range of situations, a point which alumni raised and praised about the program.

The visibility of the program has been enhanced through a variety of activities. Students have drawn attention to the program through food drives and recycling efforts which were undertaken as a community service by the Ferris Communication Association. They have also won acclaim for their scholarly and presentational work which, in turn, adds to the program's visibility. In particular, the forensic and debate teams have built a national reputation for having a program that produces outstanding competitors. Most recently, in spring '07, the program's as well as the university's visibility was enhanced when more than 600 students from 60 colleges and universities attended the 45th Annual Convention and National Tournament of Pi Kappa Delta at Ferris.

C. Program value

While this in itself underscore the program's value to the university, it's important to emphasize the degree of service the communication faculty contributes to the academic community. A review of Appendix A readily reveals the impressive amount of service that the communication faculty performs for the department, college and overall institution.   In addition to this, faculty members are also heavily involved in regional and

national associations acting as officers, program reviewers, workshop presenters, etc. This work is complemented by the local outreach efforts faculty undertake such as judging local speech contests, giving presentations to local organizations and engaging in dispute resolution with the area courts.

D. Enrollment

While enrollment in the B.A. program has remained fairly stable during the past four years, there has been a significant drop in the number of persons pursuing the B.S. during the past year. This drop has occurred in the male population of students for reasons that are not at all clear. Obviously, this is a matter that the area is going to have to examine further. While this is a definite concern, the area is pleased that we continue to draw African American students into our program. This suggests to us that the area has created a classroom climate in which all students feel they have an opportunity to excel, an outcome which all communication faculty attempt to achieve.

Students continue to enroll in the communication minor and are coming to us from all areas of the university, e.g., construction management, chemistry, criminal justice, etc. Due to the present method of declaring and completing a minor in the College of Arts and Sciences, an accurate account is not available. Based upon what can be gleaned, it does appear as though there are between twenty and thirty students presently completing a minor.

Very few students are involved in the speech (teaching) minor. This is evident given the number of students who enroll in COMM 352, Directing Communication Activities, which is a required course offered every other year. Even then, enrollments rarely exceed nine students and generally range from five – six persons. The course is important since it helps to prepare teaching minors for their state test and also covers valuable material pertaining to methods and classroom management issues. This is the only course specifically tailored to this minor. It is one the area supports even though the enrollment numbers may count against us.

Similarly, enrollment in the A.A. program is quite low. The number hovers between two-three persons although it has gone as high as five in the past. Most students enroll in this program due to financial aid requirements and then ladder into the bachelor's program once they become eligible.

E. Characteristics, quality and employability of students

In many respects, our students are typical of those who attend Ferris. However, many faculty feel they are not as motivated to be successful in school as students in other programs. The students, on the other hand, don't see themselves that way. Similarly, faculty's comparison of communication majors to other students was not nearly as positive as students' appraisal of themselves in relation to others.

Faculty have expressed concern about the quality of majors in the program in terms of their writing and oral communication skills. Faculty have discussed the use of a writing proficiency exam as a requirement for program admission. They have talked about requiring another public speaking course to improve content and delivery. Thus, several ideas have been placed on the table for consideration.

According to responses obtained through the alumni and student surveys, some graduates and students are lost when they are expected to translate their knowledge and skills into a career. Among this group, there seems to be a lack of direction because they don't have a focus, a defined career path.

F. Quality of curriculum and instruction

The communication area is considering ways in which this issue can be addressed. One strategy is to offer concentrations of three-four courses which would point students toward a particular field such as health communication.

Both students and alumni evaluated the program very positively. Both felt the program provided a sound foundation in the discipline, prepared them for future graduate work and also for the marketplace. Internship supervisors concurred with this view by agreeing that their interns were academically prepared for their position.

Graduating seniors did express some reservations about the relevance of the "Application to the Workplace" as well as the internship requirement, both of which are included in the B.S. program. Such criticism points to the need to review the B.S. program, especially given the drop in enrollment.

Both students and alumni had many positive things to say about the faculty. They felt faculty members were extremely knowledgeable, provided interesting and meaningful instruction and made every effort to help students. Even so, some dissatisfaction was expressed over academic advising. This is an issue that must addressed in order to insure that students are given the information they need in order to complete their studies in a timely manner.

G. Composition and quality of faculty

The communication area presently consists of eleven tenured/tenure-track faculty and five non-tenure track instructors. All tenured/tenure-line faculty hold terminal degrees as well as the debate coach and faculty member, Kristi Gerding-Scholten. In addition to being effective class room instructors, the faculty are actively engaged in a number of professional activities as well as service work.

H. Offices and instructional facilities

 The communication area struggles with a number of physical impediments that can undermine the effectiveness of the program. Faculty offices are located on the first and

third floors of Johnson Hall so that daily contact with peers often doesn't occur. This is particularly disadvantageous to new faculty since they are physically isolated from the rest of the tenured faculty. Some have commented that they feel disconnected from the program because they are not engaged in the everyday conversations that shape professional life. To some extent, this has affected these new hires' job satisfaction which is a concern for the rest of the faculty.

In addition to this, classroom facilities do not allow faculty to teach their courses as effectively as they would like. While some rooms are not technologically enhanced, others have not been outfitted properly so that media or the Internet can be utilized. This is particularly true of the classrooms in Johnson Hall which are in dire need of attention. The condition of these classrooms was the most frequent criticism students made about the program and, thus, points to the significance that such factors have to them.

APPENDIX A: FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS (ACCOMPLISHMENTS)

FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

Professional Development

Alspach, Sandra –

"The Future of Pi Kappa Delta"
Presenter
Pi Kappa Delta Luncheon
Province of the Northern Lights Tournament
Gustavus Adolphus College
2006

"Public Speaking Skill: Vital to Today's Democracy"
Presenter
Hillsdale Toastmasters Club meeting
2006

Edward Everett Oratory Contest
Judge
Hillsdale College
2006

Political Engagement Project and American Democracy Project
Participant
2006

National Communication Association Convention, San Antonio
Chair, General Meeting of Pi Kappa Delta
Pi Kappa Delta representative to Council of Forensics Organizations (COFO)
Participant, Pi Kappa Delta-sponsored Pre-Conference, "Supporting Forensic
Activities through Friend-Raising and Fund-Raising"
Presenter, "Group Building from Ground Zero to 24/7: A Study Abroad
Experience," Interpersonal and Group Communication Division
Paper reader, Argumentation and Forensics Division
2006

American Democracy Project
Participant
2005

Study Abroad in Communication, Michigan Association of Speech
Communication (MASC)
Chair
2005

Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League annual meeting, Lansing
Participant
2005

National Communication Association Convention, Boston
Chair, General Meeting of Pi Kappa Delta
Pi Kappa Delta representative to Council of Forensics Organizations (COFO)
Short Course in Using Instructional Technology in the Communication Course
Paper reader, Argumentation and Forensics Division
2005

Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League annual meeting, Lansing
Participant
2004

National Communication Association Convention, Chicago
Participant, Pi Kappa Delta Business Meetings
Paper reader, Argumentation and Forensics Division
2004

"Grantsmanship"
Participant
Center for Teaching, Learning and Faculty Development
2003

"Preparing for Your First Semester (using WebCT)"
Participant
Center for Teaching, Learning and Faculty Development
2003

Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League annual meeting, Lansing
Participant
2003

National Communication Association Convention, Ypsilanti
Panelist, "Reaching Out/Researching In: Teaching Communication Through
Travel Experiences," Experiential Learning in Communication Commission
Participant, Pi Kappa Delta Business Meetings
2003

Spring Learning Institute
Participant
Ferris State University
2002

"Equity in the Classroom" Conference
Participant
Mt. Pleasant, MI
2002

Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League annual meeting, Ypsilanti
Participant
2002

National Communication Association Convention, New Orleans
Panelist, "Reaching Out/Researching In: Teaching Communication Through
Travel Experiences," Experiential Learning in Communication Commission
Participant, Pi Kappa Delta Business Meetings
2003

Jim Crow Museum
Facilitator
From: 2001   To: Present

Nagel, George –
International Alliance for Learning's 32nd International Conference
"Deep in the Heart of Learning," Austin, Texas
Certification, Level 1
2007

"Civil Rights Mediation Training"
Dispute Resolution Center, Grand Rapids, Michigan
2005

"Community Dispute Resolution Program (40 hours) Mediator Training"
Ferris State University, sponsored by Grand Rapids Dispute Resolution Center
2003

"Teaching and Assessing for Critical Thinking and Deep Learning"
Videoconference, Ferris State University
2003

"Web CT: Preparing for Your First Semester"
Ferris State University
2003

"Training the Trainer: Critical Thinking Seminar"
Sonoma, California
2002

Smith, Donna

Developed an on-line version of COMM 221
Taught summer of 2005, 2006 and 2007

Wilson, Elizabeth –
Political Engagement Project
From: 9/06   To: present

Jim Crow Museum Facilitator
From: 5/05   To: present

Peer Mentor
Faculty Learning Community
Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning
From: 9/04   To: 5/05

"A Cambodian-American View of Satisfying Communication: A Study of
Cultural Adaptation," Humanities Colloquium, March 21, 2002.

Conference Presentations and Publications

Alspach, Sandra –
"Teaching Communication through Travel Experience," *The Insider*, Ferris State
University publication, 2006.
Building Community through Public Speaking. Thomson Learning/Custom
Publishing, 2003, 2004.
The Communication Web: An Introduction to Human Communication Theories.
Kendall-Hunt and online publication, 1996, 2004.
Internship Manual. (updated annually since 2001).

Green, Lon –
"Effects of type and source of forewarning on conformity behavior." Presented to
the annual conference of the American Association of Behavioral and
Social Science, Las Vegas, NV, February 16, 2005.
"Leading through crises: management strategies for communicating during
difficult times." Presented to the Annual Convention of the American
Society of Business and Behavioral Science held at Las Vegas, NV,
February 21-24, 2004.
"Conformity as self-persuasion: theory and test." Presented to the annual
conference of the American Association of Behavioral and Social Science,
Las Vegas, NV, February 11, 2003. To be published in *Perspectives: the
Journal of the AASBBS*. Fall, 2003.
"Organizational culture as a determinant of leadership style and success."
Presented to the Annual Conference on Emerging Issues in Business and
Technology, held at Myrtle Beach, SC, November 10, 2000. Also selected

for publication in *The Insider—The Ferris Faculty Journal*, 2002 edition (v.5, May, 2002), pp. 7-15.

"Effective conflict resolution strategies for managers." Presented to the Annual Convention of the American Society of Business and Behavioral Science held at Las Vegas, NV, February 17-21, 2000. Published in the *Conference Proceedings*.

Loesch, Robert –

"A View from the Trenches: Developing the Pilot for an Honors Level Service Learning Class in Public Address." With N.A. Patten & D.A. Smith. Presented at the Annual Convention of the National Communication Association, New Orleans, November, 2002.

"Identity Issues: Asian Americans and Cross-Cultural Identity in Asian American Organizations." With D.A. Smith. Presented at the annual convention of The Southern Speech Communication Association, Winston-Salem, April, 2002.

Nagel, George –

"Critical thinking underlies evidence based decision making." With K. Beistle and D. Smith. *Registered Dental Hygienist (RDH)*. June 2006, Vol. 26, No. 5, 74-75.

"Socratic questioning and the application of critical thinking in communication courses." Central States Communication Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 2007.

"Work that Works: Applying Critical Thinking in the Classroom and on the Job for Success." Central States Communication Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 2007.

"Communication and Learning Across Disciplines Through Critical Thinking." Short Course, Western State Communication Association Conference, Palm Springs, California, February 2006.

"Teaching Students How to Think Critically and Communicate Reflectively." Short Course, Western State Communication Association Conference, Palm Springs, California, February 2006.

"Critical thinking in the classroom." 24th International Conference on Critical Thinking, Palo Alto, California, July 2004.

"How can general education speech communication courses establish a foundation for a university-wide culture of critical thinking?" 23rd International Conference on Critical Thinking, Rohnert Park, California, July 2003.

"The importance of questions in critical thinking training." 23rd International Conference on Critical Thinking, Rohnert Park, California, July 2003.

"Maximizing Student Learning Through Critical Thinking." Poster Session, Lily North Conference, 2006.

"Communication and Learning Across Disciplines Through Critical Thinking," Western States Communication Association Convention, Palm Springs, California, presentation, 2006.

"Teaching Students How to Think Critically and Communicate Reflectively," Western States Communication Association Convention, Palm Springs, California, training, 2006.

"Critical Thinking Across Campus: Nurturing an Institution-Wide Critical Thinking Initiative," Twenty Fifth International Conference on Critical Thinking, Berkeley, California, presentation, 2005.

"Problem Solving Through Critical Thinking," International Conference on Critical Thinking, Palo Alto, California, training, 2004.

"Results of the Inaugural Ferris State University Critical Thinking Workshop," International Conference on Critical Thinking, Sonoma, California, presentation, 2003.

"How Can General Education Speech Communication Courses Establish a Foundation for a University-wide Culture of Critical Thinking?" International Conference on Critical Thinking, Sonoma, California, presentation, 2003.

"Meta Analysis of Critical Thinking at Ferris State University," Critical Thinking Institute, Betty Stolarek, lead researcher, 2006-07.

"Multivariate Analysis of Critical Thinking Activity, Frequency, and Sequence in Introductory Speech Courses." With Donna Smith, 2006-07.

Patten, Neil –

"Strategies for Institutional Renewal-The Role of Service Learning in the Revival of Olivet College." With D. Smith. *Ferris State University Insider-*Faculty Journal. Big Rapids, MI: May 2002.

Instructor's Resource Manual (for Cheryl Hamilton's *Essentials for Public Speaking*, 2nd edition)   Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2002.

"A Closer Look: Perspectives on a Three-Year Service Learning Honors Speech Study and Student Attitudes Towards Service." With D. Smith. Western States Communication Association Conference, Palm Springs, CA, February 2006.

"Stewardesses a go-go! A Reconsideration of Prefeminist Female Friendship Narratives In *Coffee, Tea or Me* in the *Sex in the City* Post-Feminist Era." Women's Caucus. National Communication Association, Chicago, IL, November 2004.

"Reaching the Community: Service Learning Nuts and Bolts." With D. Smith. National Communication Association, Miami, FL, November 2003.

"A View from the Trenches: Developing the Pilot for an Honors Level Service Class in Public Address." With D. Smith. National Communication Association, New Orleans, LA, November 2002.

"The Engaged Discipline-Communication in Action-Breakfast Roundtables." Instructional participant. National Communication Association, New Orleans, LA, November 2002.

 "Reclaiming the Primacy of Character Development in Higher Education: Service Learning as a Tool for Institutional Renewal – the Olivet College Case." With D. Smith. Southern States Speech Convention, New Orleans, LA, March 30, 2000.

Sanderson, Cami –

"The use of Instant messenger as an advising tool." Presented at the National Communication Association National Convention, San Antonio, 2006.

"Women in Science Fiction: Women's wear in the future: No way in the Galaxy." Presented at the National Communication Association National Convention, Boston, 2005—unable to present due to health issues.

"Motorcycle Mayhem: The men of Orange County Chopper. Presented at the Nation Communication Association National Convention, Chicago, 2004.

"Why we should study communication in the customer service context." Presented at the National Communication Association National Convention, Chicago, 2004.

"Slim Chance: Communication with Airline Gate Agents (What they don't want you to know). . ." Humanities Colloquium, Ferris State University, 2001.

"Communication and the Airline Industry." Presented at the National Communication Association National Convention, Atlanta, 2001.

"Womentoring." National Communication Association National Convention, San Antonio 2006.

"Connecting the generations: women's journeys in the field – An intergenerational dialogue." National Communication Association National Convention, San Antonia 2006.

"Womentoring III" presenter on panel which focuses on issues that women face in academia. National Communication Association National Convention, Boston 2005. Unable to be present due to health issues

"Women Issues of Today" creator and presenter on this panel which discussed women's issues of today. National Communication Association National Convention, Chicago 2004.

Meet Danny B." Currently being updated for publication.

"Why we should study communication in the customer service context." Currently being edited for an edition of *The Insider*.

"Measurement of Customer Service." A paper on the need for better measurement practices of customer service in the airline industry. Currently being revised.

Smith, Donna –

"Critical thinking underlies evidence based decision making." With K. Beistle and G. Nagel. *Registered Dental Hygienist (RDH)*. June 2006, Vol. 26, No. 5, 74-75.

"Socratic questioning and the application of critical thinking in communication courses." Central States Communication Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 2007.

"Students motivating students: An honors public address class speaks to area high schools about affordable energy and a sustainable environment for the future." Central States Communication Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 2007.

"Work that Works: Applying Critical Thinking in the Classroom and on the Job for Success." Central States Communication Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 2007.

"A closer look: Perspectives on a three-years service learning honors speech study and student attitudes toward service." Western States Communication Association Conference, Palm Springs, California, February 2006.

"Communication and Learning Across Disciplines Through Critical Thinking." Short Course, Western State Communication Association Conference, Palm Springs, California, February 2006.

"Teaching Students How to Think Critically and Communicate Reflectively." Short Course, Western State Communication Association Conference, Palm Springs, California, February 2006.

"Critical thinking in the classroom." 24th International Conference on Critical Thinking, Palo Alto, California, July 2004.

"The importance of questions in critical thinking training." 23rd International Conference on Critical Thinking, Rohnert Park, California, July 2003.

"How can general education speech communication courses establish a foundation for a university-wide culture of critical thinking?" 23rd International Conference on Critical Thinking, Rohnert Park, California, July 2003.

"Reaching the community: Service Learning Nuts and Bolts." National Communication Association Conference, Miami, Florida, November 2003.

"A View from the Trenches: Developing the Pilot for an Honors Level Service Learning Class in Public Address." National Communication Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, November 2002.

"Identity Issues: Asian-Americans and Cross-Cultural Identity in Asian American Organizations." Southern State Communication Association, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, April 2002.

"Feminist Advising: How to Gain Credit for Nurturing Young Scholars in a Research Environment." National Communication Association, Seattle, Washington; November 2000.

"Thinking Globally, Acting Locally: The Promise of Servicing Learning in University Communication Departments." Southern States Communication Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 2000.

"Reclaiming the primacy of character development in higher education: Service learning as a tool for institutional renewal—the Olivet College case." Southern State Speech Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 2000.

Thatcher, Matthew –

"Marginalizing difference in personal relationships: A dialogic analysis of how partners talk about their differences." L. Baxter and M. Foley. Submitted to the *Journal of Communication Studies*.

"Bakhtin applied: Employing dialogism to analyze the interplay of the ideologies of individualism and community within the discourse of Alcoholics

Anonymous." *Journal of Applied Communication Research.* 2006, 34.4, pp. 349-367.

"Ha. . . you think: Defining the surrealist act in film." Berkeley, CA: UC Berkeley Library.

"M. Disciplining Difference in Partner Relationships." L. Baxter and M. Foley. Interpersonal Communication Interest Group, National Communication Association Conference, San Antonio, Texas, 2006.

Wilson, Elizabeth –

"Moving beyond disciplinary bounds: Using the intercultural communication course to foster political engagement," Central States Communication Association Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 29, 2007.

"Taking it to the street: Incorporating service learning into the intercultural communication course," 88th Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, New Orleans, November 22, 2002.

"Identity issues: Asian American and cross-cultural identity in Asian American organizations," with Donna Smith and Robert Loesch. Southern States Communication Association, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, April 2002.

Service to Ferris (on-campus/internal)

Alspach, Sandra –

Ferris Speech Team
Coach
From: 1994   To: Present

Martin Luther ing Day Program
Presenter
From: 2002   To: Present

Search Committee, Rhetoric and Public Address
Chair
From: 2005   To: 2006

All-Campus Public Speaking Contest, "Political Engagement"
Co-sponsored by Lambda Pi Eta Communication Honor Society and
Pi Kappa Delta National Forensics Honorary
Director
November 2006
All-Campus Public Speaking Contest, "Civic Engagement"
Co-sponsored by Lambda Pi Eta Communication Honor Society and
Pi Kappa Delta National Forensics Honorary
Director
November 2005

High School Student Leadership Institute
Co-director
October 2004, October 2003, February 2003

Senior Project, two exchange student from Saxion School of Professional
Education, Enschede, The Netherlands
Co-director
2002

Program Coordinator for Communication Area
From: 2000   To: 2006

Communication Advisory Board
Planner/Chair
From: 2001   To: 2007

Internship Director, Applied Speech Communication and Communication
Programs
From: 1997   To: Present

Judge
Ferris Communication Association Public Speaking Contest
From: 1993   To: Present

Department of Humanities' Department Head Search Committee
From: 2005   To: 2006

Department of Humanities Promotion and Tenure Committee
From: 2004   To: 2005

Department of Humanities Curriculum Committee
Chair
From: 2004   To: Present

Teacher Education Advisory Council
Member
From: 2002   To: Present

President's Search Committee for Chief Diversity Officer
2006
University Curriculum Committee
From: 2004   To: Present

President's Communication Task Force
Co-chair
Fall 2004

Adjutant for Academic Honors Convocation
Winter 2004 and 2005

General Education Assessment and Student Learning Committee
2004

Career Pathways Program, Educational and Career Counseling
Presenter
From: 2003   To: Present

College of Arts and Sciences Academic Senate
Senator
Fall 2003

Academic Senate Diversity Committee
Chair (2001-2003)
From: 1999   To: 2003

Adjutant for Commencement Ceremonies
From: 1997   To: Present

General Education Assessment; Speech Communication Competence Area
From: 1995   To: Present

Green, Lon –
Academic (faculty) Senate
2004-2005

Arts & Sciences Planning Committee
2003-Present

Athletics Advisory Committee
Chair, 2003-2004
Vice-chair, 2001-2003

Loesch, Robert –
Various, Department Search Committees

Speech Communication General Education Committee
From: 2003   To: Present

Human Subjects Review Committee (Institutional Review Board)
From: 2000   To: Present

Advisor, Pi Lambda Phi
From: 1989   To: Present

Vice President, Student Affairs Greek Life Task Force
From: 2005   To: 2006

College Graduate Education Committee
Chair, 2003-2005
From: 2003   To: 2006

Academic Senate
Secretary, 2003-2004, Vice President, 2004-2006
From: 2002   To: 2006

President's Taskforce on Technology
From: 2004   To: 2005

Graduate and Professional Council
From: 2002   To: 2005

Vice President for Academic Affairs, General Education Subcommittee
From: 2003   To: 2004

Mace Bearer and Marshal at Commencement Exercises
From: 2003   To: 2004

Student Fees Committee
From: 2002   To: 2004

Facilitator for President Faculty Orientation
2004 August

Nagel, George –
Faculty Research Committee
Chair
From: 2006   To: 2007

Academic Senate
Senator
From: 1997   To: 2007

Critical Thinking Institute
Ferris State University
From: 2002   To: 2007

University Planning Committee
From: 1999   To: 2004

Strategic Direction Subcommittee
University Planning Committee
2004

Panel Discussion on Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Recovery,
Scholar Program
2004

Faculty Research Committee
College of Arts and Sciences
Secretary
2003

High School Leadership Institute
Facilitator
From: 2003   To: 2006

Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning
Advisory Group
From: 2006   To: 2007

Faculty Research Committee, University Wide Committee
From: 2002   To: 2006

General Education Communication Competency Committee
From: 2003   To: 2006

Academic Program Review, Nursing B.S.
2003

Summer Planning Institute
University Planning Committee
2002

Charter Revision Committee, Academic Senate
From: 2002   To: 2003

Curriculum Committee, Department of Humanities
From: 2005   To: 2007

Sabbatical Leave Committee, College of Arts and Sciences
From: 2003   To: 2006

Interpersonal Communication Outcomes Assessment Committee, Communication
Area
From: 2003   To: 2007

Small Group Communication Outcomes Assessment Committee, Communication Area
From: 2003   To: 2007

"Critical Thinking," New Faculty Orientation
2006

Critical Thinking," Faculty Learning Communities
From: 2004   To: 2005

"Subordinate/Superior Communication," Food Services Managers and Supervisors
Ferris State University
2003

Fall Semester Commencement
Adjutant
From: 2002   To: 2006

Student Judicial Services
Ferris State University
Adjudicator
From: 2003   To: 2004

Entertainment Unlimited Banquet
Keynote Address
2003

University Planning Summit
From: 2002   To: 2003

Patten, Neil –
University Arts and Lectures Committee
Vice-Chair and Secretary—five year term

Standards and Policies Committee in College of Arts and Sciences
Member—two year term

Ferris Communication Association
Faculty Advisor

Campus-Wide Public Address Contest
 Supervisor

Honors Public Speaking Contest
Coordinator

University Task Force for the Promotion of Equality and Diversity
Member

Communication Professional Guest Lecture
Coordinator

Department Head Search Committee for Humanities Dept
From: 2005   To: 2006

Adjutant for graduation
Three years

Sanderson, Cami –
The myth, the madness, and the magic: Customer Service
Consultant to TAC and ITAP student workers
Fall semester 2006

Distinguish Teaching Award Committee
From: 2006   To: 2007

Diversity Committee Member
From: 2002   To: 2003

Chair of Diversity Committee
From: 2005   To: 2006

Advisor for Bulldog Radio
From: 2003   To: Present

Academic Senate – Ferris State University
2002 – 2004, 2006-2008

General Education Task Force Member
2003

Professional Development Committee
From: 2003   To: 2004

Academic Senate Diversity Committee Member
From: 2002   To: 2003

Ferris Professional Women Awareness Chair
From: 2002   To: 2003

Advisor for Women's Rugby Team
From: 2002   To: 2003

Adjutant for Graduation Ceremonies
Winter 2001, 2002

Search Committee Member - Communication Area
Humanities Department
From: 2002   To: Present

Department of Humanities Colloquium:
Open Student/Faculty Debate
February, 2006

Judge for Annual Speech Contest
From: 2001   To: Present

Assistant Individual Events Forensics Coach
From: 2001   To: Present

Humanities Colloquium: What the airlines don't want you to know
Presented to the College of Arts and Sciences Ferris State University
Fall 2003

High School Leadership Conference Facilitator
From: 2003   To: Present

Humanities Curriculum Committee Member
Fall: 2002   To: 2005

Small Group Assessment Committee Chair
From: 2003   To: 2004

Lambda Pi Eta – National Communication Honor Society
Guest Speaker
Winter 2002

Arts and Sciences Dawg Days
Participant
Winter 2002

Smith, Donna –
Minority Recruitment Committee
From: 2002   To: Present

University Minority Recruiting and Hispanic Initiative Committee
From: 2002   To: Present

Chair of three tenure committees & member of a fourth
From: Fall 2001   To: Present

Social Norming Committee
From: 2001   To: Present

Communication Area Assessment Committee
From: 2000   To: Present

Communication Program Review Committee
From: 2000   To: Present

University Communication Committee
Co-Chair
From: 2000   To: Present

University Planning Committee
From: 2000   To: Present

University Programmatic Marketing Committee
From: 2000   To: Present

Adjutant for FSU graduations
From: 1991   To: Present

Put COMM 221 fully on line summer of 2005, 2006 and 2007

Conducted 3 faculty learning communities in critical thinking beginning spring
2005

Adjutant for FSU presidential inaugural
October 2003

President, Ferris Professional Woman
From: Fall 2002   To: Fall 2003

Adjutant for FSU honors convocation
February 2003

Mentor to two new communication faculty members
From: 2002   To: 2003

University Quality Improvement for Program Promotional Materials
Development Fall   From: 2002   To: 2003

Thatcher, Matthew –
        Faculty Advisory Group
        Member
        Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning
        From: 2006   To: 2007

        Strategic Planning and Resources Council
        Communications Officer
        From: 2006   To: Present

        Ferris State Spaghetti Bridge Competition
        2007

        Scholarship Committee
        Department of Humanities, Communication Area
        Chair
        From: 2006   To: 2007

        Faculty Search Committee
        Department of Humanities, Communication Area
        Member
        2006

Wilson, Elizabeth –
        Program Coordinator
        Communication Area
        From: 1/07   To: present

        Tenure Committee, Chair
        From: 9/06   To: present

        Communication Area Program Review, Chair
        From: 9/06   To: present

        Non-tenure Track Search Committee
        From: 2004   To: 2006

        Mass Communication Search Committee, Chair
        From: 9/06   To: 3/07

        Faculty Search Committee
        From: 2005   To: 2006
        Chairperson
        International Advisory Committee
        From: 10/04   To: 9/05

Facilitator
High School Student Leadership Institute
Ferris State University
October 26, 2004

International Advisory Committee
From: 9/02   To: 9/05

Global Consciousness Committee
General Education
From: 10/03   To: present

Senator for College of Arts and Sciences
Academic Senate
From: 5/02   To: 5/04

Curriculum Committee
Department of Humanities
From: 9/02   To: 6/03

Adjutant
Arts and Sciences Commencement
May 11, 2002

Director of Ceremonies
Academic Honors Convocation
April 7, 2002

Service to entities external to the University (accreditation bodies, professional organizations, editorial boards, etc.)

Alspach, Sandra –

Lambda Pi Eta (National Communication Association Undergraduate Honor Society)
Delta Epsilon Chapter
Advisor
From: 1995   To: Present

Tournament Director, Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League Fall Tournament, 2006
Tournament Director, Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League Novice Tournament, 2003

Tournament Director, Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League Fall Tournament, 2001
From: 1994   To: Present

Pi Kappa Delta National Forensics Honorary
President 2005-2007
President-elect 2003-2005
Chair: Centennial Planning Committee 2003-Present
National Council, Province Coordinator 2001-2003
Chapter Director, Michigan Iota, Ferris State University 2005-Present
From: 1985   To: Present

Loesch, Robert –

Pi Lambda Phi International Education Foundation, scholarship committee
2001-2002

Keynote Speaker, Lambda Pi Eta honor society, initiation
"Then and Now: Lessons I've learned."
2001

Nagel, George –

Accreditation Team Specialist, Critical Thinking,
Reaffirmation Committee
South University, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
2005

Annual Alumni Homecoming Breakfast, Communication
Ferris State University
From: 2004   To: 2005

Young Beautiful Black Women Banquet
Guest Speaker
2003

"The Art and Science of Interpersonal Communication," McGraw Hill
Book Reviewer
2006

"The C.H.E.E.S.E. Factor: Why You Are the Way You Are and How You Can
Overcome Life's Common Problems," VMI Publishing
Book Reviewer
2005

"SOS Guide: Peer Mentoring," Prentice Hall

Book Reviewer
2005

Advisory Board, National Council for Excellence in Critical Thinking
From: 2004   To: 2006

"Critical Thinking: The Art of Life-Long Learning," Prentice Hall
Book Reviewer
2005

Book Reviewer, "Inter-Act: Interpersonal Communication Skills and Concepts,"
Oxford
2002

Patten, Neil –

Communication for Business and Professions.
Patricia Hayes Andrews and John Baird. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001
Reviewer for the Eighth edition of this business communication text.

The Interpersonal Communication Book.
Joseph A. Devito.   Belmont CA: Wadsworth, 2001.
Reviewer for the Ninth edition of this interpersonal communication text

West Michigan Council for the Humanities, 2003-2004.
Library Reading Project-Doug Stanton's *In Harm's Way*.
Reviewed this grant project that promoted a community reading project involving
over ten local Michigan libraries.

Sanderson, Cami –

Communication in the Future Division
National Communication Association
Secretary
From: 2002   To: 2006

National Communication Association
1st Chair of the Women's Caucus
From: 2004   To: 200

Thatcher, Matthew –
Health Communication Interest Group
Paper Reviewer
92nd Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago
2007

Wilson, Elizabeth –
       Organizational and Professional Communication Division
       Central States Communication Association Annual Meeting
       Paper reviewer
       March 2007

       Executive Board
       Ferris Faculty Association
       Arts & Sciences Representative
       From: 5/06   To: present

Service to public groups or community organizations

Alspach, Sandra –

       Martin Luther King Week program, "White Privilege," Facilitator
       Presenter, "It's Academic: Grades = Participation"
       Delta Zeta Regional Conference
       Ferris State University
       2006

       "Something of Value"
       Delta Zeta representative
       National Panhellenic Association at Western Michigan University
       2005

       Great Lakes Area Development Director
       Delta Zeta Sorority
       From: 2004   To: Present

       "Opportunities to Study Abroad"
       Presenter
       International Business Association
       Winter 2003

       "Challenging Our Understanding of Diversity"
       Facilitator
       Select Sixty
       Fall 2002

       Academics and Alumnae Relations
       Zeta Nu Chapter of Delta Zeta Sorority
       Faculty Advisor
       From: 2001   To: Present

Select Sixty Program
Mentor
From: 2001   To: 2005

Order of Omega Greek Leadership Honor Society
Chapter Advisor
From: 2000   To: Present

Green, Lon –

Dispute Resolution Center of West Michigan
State-certified/trained mediator/mediator trainer (volunteer)

Local junior golf program, youth soccer organization, Little League, and local
junior hockey organization
Director/coach/committee member

State of Michigan Congressional
High School Art Scholarship competitions
Critic/Judge (by invitation of US Representative)

Loesch, Robert –

Adult member, Troop 114, Boy Scouts of American
From: 1999   To: 2000

Bergelin House Furniture Museum, Mecosta County Historical Society
From: 1990   To: Present

Nagel, George –

Baker College, "Critical Thinking Workshop," Flint, Michigan
2006

Isabella District Court
Mediator
From: 2004   To: 2006

Newaygo District Court
Mediator
From: 2004   To: 2006

Kent District Court
Mediator
From: 2003   To: 2006

Kent County Administrators, "Seminar on Critical Thinking"
Trainer
2005

Dispute Resolution Center, Grand Rapids, Michigan
Mediator
From: 2003   To: 2006

Voiceovers, Distinguished Constructors
Michigan Construction Hall of Fame
2003

Young Beautiful Black Women Banquet
Guest Speaker
2003

"Problem Solving Through Critical Thinking"
Sauk Community College, Moline, Illinois
Trainer
2005

Seminar in "Problem Solving Through Critical Thinking"
Michigan Department of Education, Partnership for Success, Lansing, Michigan
Trainer
2004

"Seminar in Critical Thinking"
Ferris State University Charter Schools, Detroit, Michigan,
Trainer
2004

"Training in Critical Thinking"
Creative Technologies Academy, Grand Rapids, Michigan,
Trainer
2004

"The Art of Confrontation," Administrative Staff
Pennsylvania College of Technology
2002

Patten, Neil –

Facilitator-on site community book discussion, Reed City Public Library, Feb. 2004.

Sanderson, Cami –

Member of Africans for Africa
From: 2005   To: Present

Select Sixty Advisor
From: 2002   To: Present

Personalized Service
Training session for Fortune 500 Company --Stryker Industries in Kalamazoo, MI
Consultant
Spring 2002

Toastmaster's Big Rapids Chapter
Judge
From: 2001   To: Present

Wilson, Elizabeth –

Judge
Virtuous Woman Campus-wide Contest
My Sister's Keeper
April 2007

Invited lecture: "Communicating in the Global World"
General Federation of Women's Clubs, Northwestern District
83rd Annual Fall Convention
Big Rapids, Michigan
September 25, 2004.

Judge
Big Rapids Toastmasters Club Speech Contest
Big Rapids, Michigan
March 16, 2002

APPENDIX B: ALUMNI SURVEY AND RESPONSES

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY
Communication APR Alumni Survey

As part of the program review process, the communication area has been asked to report on the progress of our graduates. For this reason, we would like you to answer the following questions. Please keep in mind that your answers will be anonymous.

Q1 What year and semester did you graduate? (e.g., 2005 Fall, 2004 Winter)

Q2 Were you able to find a full-time position in the communication field within one year of receiving your degree?
- ○ Yes
- ○ No, but I was able to find a part-time position in the communication field
- ○ No, I was not able to find any position in the communication field

Q3 If you have been employed in the communication field, what was your starting salary?
- ○ $14,999 or less
- ○ $15,000-$19,999
- ○ $20,000-$24,999
- ○ $25,000-$29,999
- ○ $30,000-$34,999
- ○ $35,000-$39,999
- ○ $40,000 or more

Q4 Currently, are you working (Please select only one response.)
- ○ One job, full time (32 or more hrs/wk)
- ○ One or more jobs, part-time (less than 32 hrs/wk)
- ○ Attending graduate school
- ○ Attending grad school & working
- ○ Other

Please Specify:

Q5 Who is your employer? (Please provide name and address or company/organization.)

Q6 If working, what job title would best describe the work you do?

Q7 How long have you held your current position?
- ○ Less than 1 year
- ○ 1-less than 2 yrs
- ○ 2-less than 3 yrs
- ○ 3-less than 4 yrs
- ○ 4-less than 5 yrs
- ○ 5 years or more

Q8   What is your current annual pay?

- ○ $14,999 or less
- ○ $15,000-$19,999
- ○ $20,000-$24,999
- ○ $25,000-$29,999
- ○ $30,000-$34,999
- ○ $35,000-$39,999
- ○ $40,000-$44,999
- ○ $45,000-$49,999
- ○ $50,000 or more

Q9   Where do you currently live and work? (City and state)

Q10   Have you or do you plan to attend graduate school?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Q11   What graduate schools have you attended or considered attending?

Q12   Did you enter Ferris as a freshman?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Q13   Did you enter Ferris as a communication major?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Q14   Why did you become a communication major? (Choose the one that best describes your reason.)

- ○ Long-term interest in a communication career
- ○ Took a communication class & really liked it
- ○ Was not doing well in my other major
- ○ Other

Please Specify:

Q15 **Please select the option that best reflects your level of agreement with each of the following statements.**

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
The communication program has provided me with a sound foundation in the discipline.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The communication program has prepared me for future graduate work if I choose to pursue that option.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The communication program has prepared me to be successful in today's marketplace.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The communication faculty is knowledgeable about the field.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The communication faculty was available to help students when problems were encountered.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The communication faculty provided instruction which was interesting and meaningful.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The communication faculty provided adequate academic advising.	○	○	○	○	○	○
If I had to do it all over again, I would still major/do an A.A. in communication.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would recommend the communication program to others.	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q16 **Please use this space to elaborate on any of the answers that you provided or to add any comments you want to make. (You have 2500 characters available.)**

Thank you for your time and feedback.

COMM APR...Alumni

Frequencies

Prepared by: Institutional Research & Testing, 06/07

Statistics

	N		Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing			
q1 Semester graduated	18	0			
q2 Able to find full-time job in comm	16	2	2.13	2.50	.957
q3 If in Comm, starting salary	11	7	4.00	3.00	2.098
q4 Currently working	16	2	1.81	1.00	1.471
q4a Working: Other specified	18	0			
q5 Employer	18	0			
q6 Job title	18	0			
q7 How long in current position	15	3	2.53	2.00	1.846
q8 Current annual pay	16	2	4.75	5.00	2.910
q9 Currently live & work	18	0			
q10 Have/plan attend grad school	17	1	1.47	1.00	.514
q11 Which grad schools	18	0			
q12 Enter FSU as freshman	18	0	1.33	1.00	.485
q13 Enter FSU as comm major	18	0	1.67	2.00	.485
q14 Why comm major	18	0	2.39	2.00	1.145
q14a Why: Other specified	18	0			
q15a Prog: Provided sound foundation	18	0	4.72	5.00	.461
q15b Prog: Prepared me for grad work	18	0	4.39	5.00	.916
q15c Prog: Prepared me to be successful	18	0	4.44	5.00	1.294
q15d Fac: Knowledgeable	18	0	5.00	5.00	.000
q15e Fac: Available to help	18	0	4.89	5.00	.323
q15f Fac: Meaningful instruction	18	0	4.61	5.00	.608
q15g Fac: Adequate academic advising	18	0	4.56	5.00	.856
q15h Still major/AA in comm	17	1	4.41	5.00	1.004
q15i Recommend program to others	18	0	4.50	5.00	.985
q16 Additional comments	18	0			

Frequency Table

q1 Semester graduated

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1999 Winter	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
	2000 Fall	1	5.6	5.6	11.1
	2001 Winter	1	5.6	5.6	16.7
	2002 Fall	1	5.6	5.6	22.2
	2002 Summer	1	5.6	5.6	27.8
	2002 Winter	2	11.1	11.1	38.9
	2004 Winter	1	5.6	5.6	44.4
	2005 Spring	2	11.1	11.1	55.6
	2005 Summer	1	5.6	5.6	61.1
	2005 Winter	1	5.6	5.6	66.7
	2006 Fall	2	11.1	11.1	77.8
	2006 Winter	1	5.6	5.6	83.3
	2006, Winter	1	5.6	5.6	88.9
	2007 Fall	2	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q2 Able to find full-time job in comm

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	6	33.3	37.5	37.5
	No, but part-time in comm	2	11.1	12.5	50.0
	No, no job in comm field	8	44.4	50.0	100.0
	Total	16	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	2	11.1		
Total		18	100.0		

q3 If in Comm, starting salary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	$14,999 or less	1	5.6	9.1	9.1
	$15,000-$19,999	2	11.1	18.2	27.3
	$20,000-$24,999	3	16.7	27.3	54.5
	$30,000-$34,999	2	11.1	18.2	72.7
	$35,000-$39,999	1	5.6	9.1	81.8
	$40,000 or more	2	11.1	18.2	100.0
	Total	11	61.1	100.0	
Missing	System	7	38.9		
Total		18	100.0		

q4 Currently working

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 job, full time (32+hrs/wk)	11	61.1	68.8	68.8
	1 or more jobs, part-time	2	11.1	12.5	81.3
	Attending grad school & working	1	5.6	6.3	87.5
	Other	2	11.1	12.5	100.0
	Total	16	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	2	11.1		
Total		18	100.0		

q4a Working: Other specified

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		16	88.9	88.9	88.9
	2 part-time jobs over 40 hrs a wk combined	1	5.6	5.6	94.4
	CC&C Cut, clean ups, can lawn care, dunpster rental, used my Comm skills to get it started	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q5 Employer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	[See card]	1	5.6	5.6	16.7
	American Cancer Society; 1480 W Center Rd; Suite 1; Essexville, MI 48732	1	5.6	5.6	22.2
	Apollo Group, Inc.; 4615 E. Elwood St.; Phoenix, AZ 85040	1	5.6	5.6	27.8
	Chemical Bank; 840 S Chestnut; PO Box 17; Reed City, MI 49677	1	5.6	5.6	33.3
	City of Grand Rapids; GR Police Department; 01 Monroe CN; Grand Rapids, MI 49507	1	5.6	5.6	38.9
	Me!	1	5.6	5.6	44.4
	MidMichigan Health; 4005 Orchard Dr.; Midland, MI 48670	1	5.6	5.6	50.0
	Mineola School District; Mineola, NY	1	5.6	5.6	55.6
	National City Bank	1	5.6	5.6	61.1
	Peace Corps; 1111 20th Street NW; Washington, DC 20526	1	5.6	5.6	66.7
	Port Huron Hospital	1	5.6	5.6	72.2
	Pride Mobility; Quantum ReHab; 182 SusQueHanna Ave; Exeter, PA 18643	1	5.6	5.6	77.8
	Rob Calaway; Bed Tyme Mattresses & Clocks LLC; 680 Maple St Hwy 41; Peshtigo, WI 54157; 715-552-2880	1	5.6	5.6	83.3
	Self-employed; Sarah's Cleaning Ins; 717 Miller Rd; Plainwell, MI 49080	1	5.6	5.6	88.9
	Verizon Wireless; 209 E. Grand River Ave; East Lansing, MI 48906	1	5.6	5.6	94.4
	Visiting Angels; 2727 Second Ave; Detroit, MI 48201	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q6 Job title

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Academic Counselor	1	5.6	5.6	16.7
	Collection Agent	1	5.6	5.6	22.2
	Community Development Director	1	5.6	5.6	27.8
	Customer Service Representative	1	5.6	5.6	33.3
	Dumpster rental--lawn care	1	5.6	5.6	38.9
	Emergency Communications Operator	1	5.6	5.6	44.4
	Employee communication, Work process documentation, Applications for Awards Presentations (writing/giving) -HR Specialist	1	5.6	5.6	50.0
	Manufacturer's Rep/Capital Medical Equipment ReHab Product Specialist	1	5.6	5.6	55.6
	Non-Medical Assistant	1	5.6	5.6	61.1
	Owner of a residential cleaning service	1	5.6	5.6	66.7
	Para-educator	1	5.6	5.6	72.2
	Recently I received a promotion to P/R--Marketing. I design ads for papers--write stories, etc.	1	5.6	5.6	77.8
	Respiratory Therapist	1	5.6	5.6	83.3
	Retail Sales Rep.	1	5.6	5.6	88.9
	Sales Manager, I setup & control warehouse, sales on the floor, set up sales appts. I set up delivery & pricing. I work w/ any customer that has a problem w/ our product.	1	5.6	5.6	94.4
	Volunteer	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q7 How long in current position

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 yr	7	38.9	46.7	46.7
	1-less than 2 yrs	2	11.1	13.3	60.0
	2-less than 3 yrs	1	5.6	6.7	66.7
	3-less than 4 yrs	3	16.7	20.0	86.7
	5 yrs or more	2	11.1	13.3	100.0
	Total	15	83.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	16.7		
Total		18	100.0		

q8 Current annual pay

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	$14,999 or less	3	16.7	18.8	18.8
	$15,000-$19,999	1	5.6	6.3	25.0
	$20,000-$24,999	3	16.7	18.8	43.8
	$30,000-$34,999	3	16.7	18.8	62.5
	$35,000-$39,999	2	11.1	12.5	75.0
	$45,000-$49,999	1	5.6	6.3	81.3
	$50,000 or more	3	16.7	18.8	100.0
	Total	16	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	2	11.1		
Total		18	100.0		

q9 Currently live & work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		1	5.6	5.6	5.6
	215 Boldman St.Oconto WI; Live, Work Peshtigo WI	1	5.6	5.6	11.1
	Detroit, MI	1	5.6	5.6	16.7
	East Lansing, MI	1	5.6	5.6	22.2
	Grand Rapids, MI	1	5.6	5.6	27.8
	Guatemala 2007-2009	1	5.6	5.6	33.3
	Kalamazoo/Portage, MI	1	5.6	5.6	38.9
	Lathrup Village, MI; I work in Detroit	1	5.6	5.6	44.4
	Live--Gilbert, AZ; Work--AZ, NM, & El Paso, TX	1	5.6	5.6	50.0
	Live in Mesa, AZ; Work in Phoenix, AZ	1	5.6	5.6	55.6
	Midland, MI	1	5.6	5.6	61.1
	Mineola, NY	1	5.6	5.6	66.7
	Plainwell, MI	1	5.6	5.6	72.2
	Pontiac, MI	1	5.6	5.6	77.8
	Port Huron, MI	1	5.6	5.6	83.3
	Reed City, MI	1	5.6	5.6	88.9
	Sheridan, MI	1	5.6	5.6	94.4
	West Branch, MI-live; Bay City, MI-work	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q10 Have/plan attend grad school

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	9	50.0	52.9	52.9
	No	8	44.4	47.1	100.0
	Total	17	94.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	5.6		
Total		18	100.0		

102

q11 Which grad schools

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		5	27.8	27.8	27.8
	Adelphi College	1	5.6	5.6	33.3
	CMU for my MSA	1	5.6	5.6	38.9
	Consider attending University of Phoenix	1	5.6	5.6	44.4
	Considering Friarus State when I catre.	1	5.6	5.6	50.0
	Ferris State	1	5.6	5.6	55.6
	Looked into CMU	1	5.6	5.6	61.1
	Michigan State University	1	5.6	5.6	66.7
	N/A	2	11.1	11.1	77.8
	Norhtwestern Evanston, IL	1	5.6	5.6	83.3
	Not sure yet	1	5.6	5.6	88.9
	Oklahoma State University	1	5.6	5.6	94.4
	UDM (University of Detroit Mercy)	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q12 Enter FSU as freshman

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	12	66.7	66.7	66.7
	No	6	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q13 Enter FSU as comm major

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	6	33.3	33.3	33.3
	No	12	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q14 Why comm major

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Long-term interest in comm career	4	22.2	22.2	22.2
	Took comm class, really liked it	8	44.4	44.4	66.7
	Not doing well in other major	1	5.6	5.6	72.2
	Other	5	27.8	27.8	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q14a Why: Other specified

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		12	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Comm. is a program employers are interested in hir	1	5.6	5.6	72.2
	Diversity in career oppurtunities	1	5.6	5.6	77.8
	I felt that public speaking would be a great skill	1	5.6	5.6	83.3
	I knew early on it was the gift God gave me & I wa	1	5.6	5.6	88.9
	The program was new & fun.	1	5.6	5.6	94.4
	Wanted to go to Lam glit but felt that this major	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q15a Prog: Provided sound foundation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	5	27.8	27.8	27.8
	Strongly Agree	13	72.2	72.2	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q15b Prog: Prepared me for grad work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Neutral	2	11.1	11.1	16.7
	Somewhat Agree	4	22.2	22.2	38.9
	Strongly Agree	11	61.1	61.1	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q15c Prog: Prepared me to be successful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Somewhat Agree	2	11.1	11.1	22.2
	Strongly Agree	14	77.8	77.8	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q15d Fac: Knowledgeable

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	18	100.0	100.0	100.0

q15e Fac: Available to help

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Strongly Agree	16	88.9	88.9	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q15f Fac: Meaningful instruction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Neutral	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Somewhat Agree	5	27.8	27.8	33.3
	Strongly Agree	12	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q15g Fac: Adequate academic advising

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Neutral	1	5.6	5.6	11.1
	Somewhat Agree	3	16.7	16.7	27.8
	Strongly Agree	13	72.2	72.2	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q15h Still major/AA in comm

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	2	11.1	11.8	11.8
	Somewhat Agree	4	22.2	23.5	35.3
	Strongly Agree	11	61.1	64.7	100.0
	Total	17	94.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	5.6		
Total		18	100.0		

q15i Recommend program to others

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Somewhat Agree	5	27.8	27.8	33.3
	Strongly Agree	12	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

q16 Additional comments

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		5	27.8	27.8	27.8
Valid	Academic advising needs a little help. Students need to feel welcome w/ their advisor. Every professor should have & follow an open door policy.	1	5.6	5.6	33.3
	Comm classes are great; however, they give a vague area of expertise for finding a job after graduation. Employers want specifically Business, HR, or Medical for example-a Comm degree doesn't cut it-I'm either missing mktg, business credits, social work credits, education credits, or medical specific credits depending upon the job I'm applying for. I enjoyed my Comm classes, but am finding that this degree isn't getting me a job-I'll have to return to school in the near future.	1	5.6	5.6	38.9
	Comm really prepared me to excel in the real work market place.	1	5.6	5.6	44.4
	I found that this prog has been very beneficial to me in my career. The staff that I had for my class did an amazing job getting me ready for the working world. I give presentations to very high levels in my organization & still remember the tips/techniques that they taught me during each presentation. Getting my AA in Comm was the best thing I did for me & my career & I would recommend to anyone.	1	5.6	5.6	50.0
	I like to say this major did the best for me in the working field & in the public. Also, the whole comm stuff & prog are great. I tell every young student to come into the Comm prog. I am glad I took the major.	1	5.6	5.6	55.6
	I love FSU & the Comm prog for what it did for me. Good job this review--GO Bulldogs! P.S. Add more Org. Comm classes-it will help.	1	5.6	5.6	61.1
	I loved my time at FSU in the Comm prog. The staff was wonderful & I feel like I walked away w/ practical skills that carry over to any occupation. That is also one of the problems I have w/ the degree. It is so general that ppl have difficulty in focusing the major into a career path. There needs to be some sort of advisory staff that can direct people who may not know what to do w/ the degree. The most common answer I always got was "You can do anything you want w/ your comm degree." While that's true, it isn't always helpful. I thnik that's why so many ppl I know who graduated w/ a comm degree didn't end up using it afterwards. I can say my experience w/ the prog changed me & my self-confidence & poise in front of an audience. Overall, it was great! *I feel that my time on the debate team is really what made me a stronger person. I would hightly recommend this even though it will scare you to death sometimes!	1	5.6	5.6	66.7
	I think more mktg classes & computers. I'm sure it has changed a lot as we were the first to graduate from the Comm prog.	1	5.6	5.6	72.2
	I wasn't a fan of COMM 299 or 300, but I understand that a foundation of the basics of the whole field of communicating is necessary. I would have liked more classes in interpersonal/human relations, intercultural, political, & nonverbal comm. This program is very small & not a top priority for the university unfortunately. W/ time & the realization of the importance of comm this program will expand class offering, times, & faculty. I'm very thankful for all I learned: it is not what one says so much as how.	1	5.6	5.6	77.8
	I would encourage more specializations in Comm coursework (i.e. , business comm, public speaking, written comm, public relations, etc.)..	1	5.6	5.6	83.3

q16 Additional comments

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Most of the faculty were so passionate & members excited about their classes, it was easy to get excited about them, too.	1	5.6	5.6	88.9
	My only regret w/ my BS in Applied Speech Comm. is that my internship wasn't benefical. I wish more consideration was taken in my decision & that I had more direction/assistance w/ that. It would have opened more doors.	1	5.6	5.6	94.4
	The majority of faculty was available for questions/advising. Some members of faculty put much more effort into their advising.	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY
INTERNSHIP SURVEY

As part of our Communication Area Program Review, we are asking you to take just a few moments to respond to this short survey. During the program review, our communication major will be examined by a committee made up of faculty members from across the University. Your input is greatly appreciated.

Q1 **Please select the answer that best represents your opinion regarding each of the following statements.**

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a. The intern was academically prepared for this position.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. The intern demonstrated effective interpersonal skills when interacting with the public.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. The intern demonstrated effective interpersonal skills when interacting with other staff persons including supervisors.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. The intern worked effectively in groups.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. The intern demonstrated appropriate leadership behaviors.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. The intern demonstrated effective presentational skills, where appropriate.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. The intern dealt with various communication technologies effectively, e.g., phone, e-mail, the Internet, word processing, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. The intern was able to complete the tasks assigned efficiently and effectively.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. The intern has the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in today's changing marketplace.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. The intern adapted to workplace cultural expectations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. The intern displayed the kinds of behaviors which contribute to a positive, productive work environment.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. I would have hired this intern if there had been a position for which s/he was qualified.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q2   **Please use this space to elaborate on any of the above or to add any comments you want to make.**

Thank you for your time and feedback.

COMM APR...Internship

Frequencies

Prepared by: Institutional Research & Testing, 06/07

Statistics

	N		Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing			
q1a Academically prepared	17	0	4.41	5.00	1.004
q1b Effective interpersonal skills w/ public	17	0	4.82	5.00	.393
q1c Effective interpersonal skills w/ other staff	17	0	4.65	5.00	.493
q1d Worked effectively in groups	17	0	4.65	5.00	.493
q1e Appropriate leadership behaviors	17	0	4.24	4.00	.831
q1f Effective presentational skills	16	1	4.63	5.00	.500
q1g Dealt w/ various comm technologies	17	0	4.88	5.00	.332
q1h Completed tasks efficiently/effectively	17	0	4.24	5.00	1.147
q1i Has knowledge/skills to be successful	17	0	4.41	5.00	1.176
q1j Adapted to workplace cultural expectations	17	0	4.59	5.00	.795
q1k Exhibited positive, productive behaviors	16	1	4.50	5.00	.894
q1l Would have hired, if possible	17	0	3.94	5.00	1.391
q2 Elaborate/Additional comments	17	0			

110

Frequency Table

q1a Academically prepared

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	2	11.8	11.8	11.8
	Somewhat Agree	4	23.5	23.5	35.3
	Strongly Agree	11	64.7	64.7	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

q1b Effective interpersonal skills w/ public

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	3	17.6	17.6	17.6
	Strongly Agree	14	82.4	82.4	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

q1c Effective interpersonal skills w/ other staff

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	6	35.3	35.3	35.3
	Strongly Agree	11	64.7	64.7	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

q1d Worked effectively in groups

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	6	35.3	35.3	35.3
	Strongly Agree	11	64.7	64.7	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

q1e Appropriate leadership behaviors

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
	Neutral	1	5.9	5.9	11.8
	Somewhat Agree	8	47.1	47.1	58.8
	Strongly Agree	7	41.2	41.2	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

q1f Effective presentational skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	6	35.3	37.5	37.5
	Strongly Agree	10	58.8	62.5	100.0
	Total	16	94.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	5.9		
Total		17	100.0		

q1g Dealt w/ various comm technologies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	2	11.8	11.8	11.8
	Strongly Agree	15	88.2	88.2	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

q1h Completed tasks efficiently/effectively

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	3	17.6	17.6	17.6
	Somewhat Agree	4	23.5	23.5	41.2
	Strongly Agree	10	58.8	58.8	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

q1i Has knowledge/skills to be successful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
	Somewhat Disagree	1	5.9	5.9	11.8
	Somewhat Agree	3	17.6	17.6	29.4
	Strongly Agree	12	70.6	70.6	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

q1j Adapted to workplace cultural expectations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
	Somewhat Agree	4	23.5	23.5	29.4
	Strongly Agree	12	70.6	70.6	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

q1k Exhibited positive, productive behaviors

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	5.9	6.3	6.3
	Neutral	1	5.9	6.3	12.5
	Somewhat Agree	3	17.6	18.8	31.3
	Strongly Agree	11	64.7	68.8	100.0
	Total	16	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	5.9		
Total		17	100.0		

q1l Would have hired, if possible

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
	Somewhat Disagree	2	11.8	11.8	17.6
	Neutral	4	23.5	23.5	41.2
	Strongly Agree	10	58.8	58.8	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

113

q2 Elaborate/Additional comments

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		8	47.1	47.1	47.1
	I would welcome another intern from this prog.	1	5.9	5.9	52.9
	Interns needed much better writing skills.	1	5.9	5.9	58.8
	Our intern is wonderful. I would encourage (both) to take initiative in projects & not wait until something is assigned. Furthermore, if something is assigned, it should be completed in a timely manner.	1	5.9	5.9	64.7
	Our last experience w/ a FSU intern was, to say the least, an extremely positive period. He has since gone on to law school & is currently practicing law w/in our community.	1	5.9	5.9	70.6
	The intern experience w/ (name deleted) was wonderful to say the least. S/he was brilliant, eager, & quickly seen as a real asset to the office. We were sad to see him/her leave our staff, but very excited for him/her & his/her future.	1	5.9	5.9	76.5
	The last interm we had was an African-American woman who wasn't prepared in either hard skills or social skills & had expectations due to her ethnic background that made it very difficult to work w/ her.	1	5.9	5.9	82.4
	The responses above reflect our collective experiences w/ sev'l interns we've had work w/ us from the COMM/MKTG & MIMA progs. W/ the exception of 2 of the 8 or 10 interns we've worked w/ over the past 3-5 years, the interns invariably prove to be unreliable as to hrs despite the collaborative establishment of a work sched conducive to his/her own calendar. B/c of this, we haven't been able to give interns specific duties, to train them effectively nor help them develop a proj for which they can assume major responsibility.	1	5.9	5.9	88.2
	We ended up hiring intern (name deleted) to a full time position as a marketing assistant.	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
	While we haven't had an intern for about 2 yrs, the last prior intern was outstanding & very well prepared. This prog offers an opportunity for students to expand their use of comm media & technology. I've wondered why it hasn't been integrated to some degree w/ the COB PR curriculum. Good luck w/ this review process.	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
	Total	17	100.0	100.0	

114

APPENDIX D: GRADUATING EXIT SURVEY AND RESPONSES

Narrative Assessment Questionnaire

Question #1
How adequate were introductory courses in providing a foundation for 300 and 400 level classes? Respond to each listed here individually:
COMM 101 Introduction to Communication Study

COMM 105 OR 200 Interpersonal Communication or Foundations of Interpersonal Communication (105 included due to high percentage of internal program transfers)

COMM 121 Public Presentation or COMM 201 Public Presentation Practices

ISYS 105 (BS majors)

Question #2
To what extent was the redundancy of information between classes appropriate?

Question #3
Are there courses that are offered that you would ADD or SUBTRACT from your major?

Question #4
Was the range of electives offered sufficient in representing both your career goals and areas of personal interest? Do you have suggestions for additions?

Question #5
If required, was your internship experience effective in supplementing course information and preparing you for a career?

Question #6

Comment on the quality of your academic advising.

Question #7

Do you feel that the amount of help you were able to receive from instructors outside of scheduled class times was adequate?

Question #8

Do you feel that the textbook selections and instructional methods reflect the expected or intended learning outcomes?

Question #9

How valuable and appropriate was your application to the workplace and/or minor requirement? Feel free to offer suggestions for improvement.

Question #10

Do you have specific comments or suggestions for the general improvement of the communication program?

Narrative Assessment

Question #1

How adequate were introductory courses in providing a foundation for 300 and 400 level classes? Respond to each listed here individually:

COMM 101 Introduction to Communication Study
Student #1
Comm 101 laid the foundation for communication, what it is and what we can do with a communication degree. It has been a bit too long ago for me, but it did introduce what communication is, so that it could be built upon as we work our way up the scale.
Student #2
I did not take this course I had this course substituted for another.
Student #3
I honestly don't remember this class and I'm not even sure if I took it! So it probably wasn't very helpful if I in fact did take it.
Student #4
If this class is taken as the very first COMM class, as it is intended, I think it is helpful in discovering what you can actually do with the degree and what areas you may be more interested in than others. If, however, you are not a freshman when you take this class, it's pretty pointless as you already have some idea of what can be done and what you are interested in as you must have switched from another area to communication for some reason. Therefore, you probably have some idea of what you want. Did it provide any foundation for the future? No. If I never took this class in my college career, I think I would have been better off substituting something else for it.
Student #5
I understand that there has been discussion to eliminate this course from the major and I don't think that is a good idea. I liked meeting the faculty and hearing their perspective of the areas we were going to be studying. I liked that I interviewed a senior – it made me for excited to achieve my goals. I also think that examining what fields the degree have the potential to lead are helpful in determining application to the workplace for BS majors.
Student #6
Completely pointless busy work, which made 3 freshman switch majors when I took it due to Sandy's complete inability to instill any interest about the degree. It was a waste of time.
Student #7
This was a good class, which helped me get an idea of what was going to happen in the coming semesters.
Student #8
Comm. 101 adequately prepared me for the classes I took later in my collegiate career.
Student #9
The class that I took with Alspach was very well rounded. We spent equal time on the specific areas of Communication. VERY GOOD!

Student #10
This class was more challenging than its "101" suffix would suggest. I learn a lot. I had Sandy for a teacher and she really push me to be successful.
Student #11
Somewhat adequate
Student #12
I never took this class
Student #13
I liked this class. It was really informative and gave the foundations for my 300 and 400 level classes.

COMM 105 OR 200 Interpersonal Communication or Foundations of Interpersonal Communication (105 included due to high percentage of internal program transfers)
Student #1
Comm 105/200 definitely started the foundation for later classes, and these are the classes that hooked me into Comm. Learning and understanding interpersonal communication and some of the key constructs of this discipline are introduced in Comm 105/200. I feel these classes are important to this curriculum and "bring" people in to our major.
Student #2
200 laid a good foundation for upper courses by learning the terms and how to apply the terms but the students taught each chapter which I did not find helpful.
Student #3
I remember liking COMM 200, but I'm not sure you need this class in order to understand the upper level classes, it's helpful but not needed due to the fact it is not a complex subject (by complex I mean you don't need to learn things in sequence for them to make sense ex: math classes)
Student #4
I think this did provide a good foundation for the program as much of our vocabulary comes from this class and is expanded on from there. I do think that there needs to be some standard reached because some classes learn much more than others.
Student #5
I had 105 prior to declaring a program, so I did not take the 200. This course is what helped me determine that communication was the direction I wanted to pursue, so it has to be good! It was most relevant in dealing with future classmates and understanding our lives outside of the classroom. I think the concepts need to be infiltrated in upper level more to repeat and emphasize – they tend to be forgotten after the third and fourth year.
Student #6
Somewhat interesting, but the information didn't stick with me. I learned about maslows hierierchy through other class, and essentially slept through the actual 105 course.
Student #7
This was a great class for the most part. It did give me a good idea of some of the other classes to expect.
Student #8
Comm. 200 was a very useful class for me, it gave me my concentration within the communication program. I also think it is a very useful class for someone going into the career that I'm going into.

Student #9

I took 105 with Cami. And at that time she was still new to the game. We did a lot of "Teach yourselves" activities so I don't remember much from the class and it affected me later on in the program

Student #10

I had this class with Dr. Nagel and the way he teaches the class was great for mastering key concepts in Interpersonal. Appling Clarity to everything I wrote helped me create mental snap of what these concepts mean. Today as a senior, I still remember how I a lot of that information from 200.

Student #11

adequate

Student #12

I thought this class set a solid foundation in preparing me for the upper level classes

Student #13

This class was informative and helpful. COMM 200 (Interpersonal Communication) is the basis for a lot of the classes that we have to take.

COMM 121 Public Presentation or COMM 201 Public Presentation Practices

Student #1

Important, because as Comm majors, we need to feel comfortable speaking in public situations, small groups, or meetings. Public Presentation is what we are supposed to be good at. These classes prepare us for the presentations we give in our 300-400 level classes.

Student #2

121 was my first Comm. course and this did prepare me for the upper courses because it helped me break what little nervousness I did have.

Student #3

I really enjoyed COMM 121 and I do think it was a very useful class because we are required to do lots of presentations in 300 and 400 level classes.

Student #4

This is absolutely necessary for a COMM major. This class was very adequate in teaching me what the criteria are for a good speech, and how to improve my abilities in meeting these criteria.

Student #5

GREAT course that pushes out the fears and gives students confidence.

Student #6

Took at another school.

Student #7

I really enjoyed this class, and I got a lot out of it. I still use a lot of what I learned in that class, and that was the first semester of my freshman year.

Student #8

I struggle with public presentation, so I didn't enjoy the class as much as other communication classes

Student #9

I absolutely loved this class. I think that it gets students really comfortable with speaking in front of others. More class like this should be required for everyone, even those not in the program.

Student #10

This was my first Communication class. Once again Sandy was my teacher. I took this course so long ago that I didn't remember a lot from it. I just know that 121 gave me the confidence to talk in front of people.

Student #11

Very adequate

Student #12

this classed allowed me to form a speech, organize it and present it in a manner that my audience would understand

Student #13

Although a person can never be completely comfortable with public speaking, this class is good practice. This prepares a student with the basis to be able to communicate ideas in presentations. The benefit is reflected in more than just COMM classes.

ISYS 105 (BS majors)

Student #1

I personally needed this class to have a better understanding of excel and everything that word can do, I had already mastered power point because of preso's I have had to give, so it helps for writing papers, doing power point, and spread sheets. Do we need it to give good presentations in our 300-400 level classes? Some of us do I think.

Student #2

I already had an understanding of computers and the programs that were involved but ISYS 105 helped me how to apply different methods to presentations make better use of Excel.

Student #3

Waste of time!!! I took ISYS 200 something instead and I thought that class was cake I can't even imagine taking the 105 version.

Student #4

N/A

Student #5

Completely useless. Perhaps several years ago it was necessary, but today, students are more technologically savvy than some faculty are (ex: those that refuse to utilize WebCT for materials, discussion, syllabus, schedule, etc).

Student #6

Completely pointless, was added to the curriculum 10 years ago when the skill sets actually needed to be taught. It is being taken off the requirements next year apparently.

Student #7

I really already knew most of this stuff, so it was not that beneficial.

Student #8

I thought it was a pretty useless class, I knew a good amount about computers before hand.

Student #9

Although some people disagree, I think that ISYS is a great class to be required in a program. Not all students are comfortable and educated in a lot of things learned in this class.

Student #10

I had another great teacher for this course, Mrs. Lukusa. All of my computer knowledge I learned from her class. I also believe that being around computer for my college helped me retain a lot of my knowledge, but my ISYS 105 laid a great foundation for me.

Student #11

Not adequate

Student #12

not helpful

Student #13

N/A

Question #2

To what extent was the redundancy of information between classes appropriate?

Student #1

I believe the redundancy is extremely appropriate because it builds and becomes ingrained, making the concepts and theories understandable. When I hear something in a class I have learned before it just reinforces the concept and helps me to understand better.

Student #2

I like every class to be different and I get tired and bored with hearing the same information and Comm. courses do just this. The information I learned in 100 and 200 level courses I am still learning now. The Comm. courses need more variety and not cover the same material every time with little new information.

Student #3

Redundancy of information is an important part of the learning process BUT I believe that the classes as a whole need to be SMOOTHER-information needs to flow, have clarity and be more organized between professors.

Student #4

I think the redundancy was appropriate as the most important parts of communication are highlighted in each course. By revisiting the material, we learn it and remember it more readily. I think even though it sometimes seemed repetitive, I still learned something new in that specific area.

Student #5

Completely appropriate and useful for learning. Repetition and application in various disciplines helps concepts to become real.

Student #6

Fairly. It's interesting to discuss the same topics in two classes on the same day, but still have them be used differently. Also, it's easier to impress a teacher by naming topics from another course which still have impact on the current course. i.e. learning about the helix theory in one class, and then discussing it in another. Leaving a good impression allows for slacking later.

Student #7

I believe it was very appropriate. Getting a lot of the same information in one class that I learned in another, helped keep it with me and applying it in all my classes.

Student #8

There was a lot of redundancy in communication classes, but that is because every class builds upon it's predecessor.

Student #9

I mean a lot of things were redundant but I think it was a necessary amount. The things that were important and redundant I can still remember. Other important things I have forgotten because they lacked emphasis on them and were not repeated.

Student #10

I think that the redundancy was appropriate in every class I had. The more we hear/see something, the better the opportunity to retain it.

Student #11

A high extent because it keeps the terminology fresh in our mind and helps us to further understand and remember that information.

Student #12

little redundancy, but a lot of relatability from class to class

Student #13

Some of the ideas were important enough to be repeated.

Question #3

Are there courses that are offered that you would ADD or SUBTRACT from your major?

Student #1

Yes, I am graduating and I wish I would have taken Communication and Conflict, Nonverbal, and Persuasive Speaking. I have liked and learned much from the classes I did take, so I would not subtract any, just think two more should be required for a well-rounded education.

Student #2

Add more cultures dealing with diversity. The courses that are provided do not need to be subtracted but the courses need to be improved. There a lot of time I question if these professors really know what they are talking about and the information that they are giving the students.

Student #3

I really believe that having concentrated majors would be very effective!!! I personally like classes that take a different approach then the basic COMM classes. I really like Ethics and I also like research (I liked research in retrospect!!!) I disliked COMM 499 and doing my internship they just didn't spark my interest at all, I didn't feel like they should be part of the end cap of the COMM major. COMM 499 was just busy work but I found myself asking WHY? And the internship part of the COMM major is just to broad to be truly effective. In the future it might be a good idea to have a more focused internship experience based on the concentrations that Ferris may be adding.

Student #4

Add: Another speaking course, more core classes required

   Subtract: COMM 101

Student #5
There was discussion of a course that is offered that many students spoke very highly of that I did not take. I believe it is COMM 370 Communication and Conflict. By the response of my classmates, I think this one may be worthy of considering for the majors. Isys 105 should be subtracted. All the rest were fantastic.
Student #6
COMM 499. Or at least change the syllabus and teacher. Get rid of COMM 101. Research was boring.
Student #7
Yes, maybe more presentation, sales, marketing, and researching classes.
Student #8
I don't think there are any courses I would add or subtract.
Student #9
I am not a fan of research methods. I can see where it might be necessary if I wanted to be in the field of COMM and do lots of research and contribute my pieces to the concentration, but besides that I see no point in making it required.
Student #10
I wish we had an advance public speaking class and I wish we had an acting class as a requirement.
Student #11
I wouldn't add or subtract any courses.
Student #12
No
Student #13
I would take more diversity classes. Considering that my first mind was to come to Ferris and be in journalism programs, I would really like to see some Mass Communication/Media classes. This would probably draw more students.

Question #4
Was the range of electives offered sufficient in representing both your career goals and areas of personal interest? Do you have suggestions for additions?
Student #1
Yes I believe so,
Student #2
No response.
Student #3
I think a change/ more electives would be a wise decision. The electives should be specific (avoid broad COMM electives)!
Student #4
I picked a BA degree because it offered many electives, so yes, I do think I got a wide enough range of electives. I have no suggestions.
Student #5
I'd like to see a technical communication (ie: email, text messaging) included in the Effective Listening course. "Listening" within written communication, which in the workplace is becoming more universally used and expected, is a skill needing attention.

We need to be conscientious of how we communicate with written communication and often I don't think people realize they are communicating the wrong message.

Some other electives are consistently placed in the same time matrix semester after semester and I'd like to see more variety with when the electives are offered, not so much as what.

Student #6

My electives were collected from being in other majors, and somehow miraculously all fit perfectly into the Applied Speech major. I wasn't limited in my choices of electives, so I feel I am unable to give an adequate response.

Student #7

Yes, they were sufficient.

Student #8

I would've like to seen more courses offered that can translate to my specific career. But all the classes that I could've taken that translate to my career I did.

Student #9

I loved all of my electives. They were fun but challenging at the same time. I have no suggestions at this time.

Student #10

I believe that the electives were pretty good. I will not know until I am in my career how effective they really were. As for suggestions; an acting class would have been nice.

Student #11

Yes, and I don't have any suggestions to add.

Student #12

I thought the major offered a lot of classes that will help me in my career

Student #13

The sociology, social science, and communication electives were sufficient in helping me to reach my goal. I would love to see more classes on diversity and culture in America. This would especially include upper level classes for seminar style learning.

Question #5

If required, was your internship experience effective in supplementing course information and preparing you for a career?

Student #1

I will be doing my internship this summer and look forward to a great experience. I have chosen to work for the Chamber of Commerce in Mecosta County and feel it will be an opportunity to use my expertise in communication on all levels. I will be planning fund raisers, networking with business owners, and writing press releases and flyers. So I will be busy and learning, preparing for my career.

Student #2

The internship experience was not effective in supplementing course information but it did help.

Student #3

Refer to Question 3----I didn't like the internship experience because I had already done another one from another major and I got more out of my previous internship because it was more focused. I really felt that this particular internship lacked focus, which some people may love, I personally dislike like the experience for that reason.

Student #4
N/A
Student #5
Absolutely. I'm surprised at how many seniors held theirs to after 499. I think it should be mandatory between junior and senior years.
Student #6
No, it served as an issue which stressed me out due to an inability to find an internship. I have no hope that I will learn many skills from the internship, or that I will refer to it once it is finished.
Student #7
Absolutely it was.
Student #8
I plan on taking my internship in the summer, but I believe it will be a positive experience and will not turn me off to the counseling profession.
Student #9
Yes, my internship helped me very much. It got me more comfortable for the real work atmosphere, which I say I do an effective job in currently. I think everyone should have to do an internship because it physically teaches you things you can not learn in the classroom.
Student #10
Yeah my internship shows me how effective my communication knowledge can impact on my career. I use information from interpersonal, small group and conflict management on a daily bases.
Student #11
No
Student #12
No comment
Student #13
N/A

Question #6

Comment on the quality of your academic advising.
Student #1
I think the quality of my academic advising was poor. However I realize that part of this is my fault for not taking the time and effort to meet with my advisor. I could have used some guidance for my minor, or application to the work place, and I know that now. I accept my responsibility in the quality of my academic advising. I just went through the check list and took the classes I needed and wanted.
Student #2
I only went to my professor to get the hold lifted. My advisor was not helpful with what courses I should take and when specific courses are offered, I had to go to the program coordinator to receive that information.
Student #3
My advisor just tells me to go to Alspach. I have only met with my actual advisor once.

Student #4

I love my advisor. He helped me through not only my academic decisions, but my choices after college as well. He offered to write me letters of recommendation and wants to stay in touch in the future. He was also pretty available for advice.

Student #5

I have to plead conflict of interest or something here…since I do most of the academic advising in my workplace – I came prepared with the courses I had planned to take and 95% of the time had the agreement of my advisor. At one time she did need to point out to me what courses were fall-only and winter-only which helped in the planning.
That said, I am disturbed by some stories of poor academic advising from some professors, one in particular keeps coming up. These students avoid their advisor and seek advisement from the coordinator – which I also find to be appropriate. In the program I work in, ALL the academic advisement is done by the coordinator and his secretary, not the professors of the courses in the major. This coordinator also has less class load – so something to consider for an established program.

Student #6

I actually valued my advisors almost completely neurotic attitude towards my class schedule. She had me fill out quite a few forms, but those forms gave me an excellent idea of what to take, and when.

Student #7

It was there when I needed it, and it was up to me to use it.

Student #8

My academic advising was relatively poor here at Ferris, the advisor I was assigned to would tell me to take specific classes without an opinion. Since, I was unhappy about my advising I sought out Dr. Alspach who assisted me in advising decisions.

Student #9

My advisor, Cami Sanderson, was WONDERFUL. She always mad sure I only took classes I needed, and she helped me double dip when possible. I think she is a major reason why I will be graduating in 4 years only!!!

Student #10

They are not on the same page. I was told twice that I was ready to graduate and just to find out at my audit that I wasn't. They need to hire one person to do the advising for the entire major. At least they will know was going on.

Student #11

I believe that I had effective/good academic advising.

Student #12

very poor

Student #13

I have mixed emotions about my academic advising. In my career at Ferris, I have had three advisors, so I've been bounced around and I can't really say that I appreciate that. Due to the fact that the check sheet doesn't add up to 120, it seems like the faculty that are being advised to advise should be more aware of what is going on in the program that they teach. Due to the lack of understanding on the faculty end of things, my graduation is being postponed. I believe that all faculty should have the same passion for mentoring that Sandra Alspach does. She is the only advisor that I have had that I feel was of great

help. I have had one advisor in particular tell me not to pursue graduate school because it was too hard. Advisors should support and offer decisions.

Question #7

Do you feel that the amount of help you were able to receive from instructors outside of scheduled class times was adequate?

Student #1

For the most part I feel that the instructors were available outside of class for help if I needed it. If I had a question I usually was not afraid to ask.

Student #2

The help was adequate when I needed it.

Student #3

I really don't have time to meet with my instructors outside of class! But that's because of my schedule.

Student #4

Yes. In my experience, professors were speedy with email responses, and available during their office hours, or just around Johnson in general.

Student #5

Outstanding. I find the faculty to be enthusiastic, encouraging, and the best asset of the program.

Student #6

Yes, although I have never needed much time to talk to them.

Student #7

Yes, as I said above, it was there when I needed it.

Student #8

I usually didn't seek professors outside of class, but all my professors made themselves available if we needed them.

Student #9

Yes, I feel that my teachers were helpful.

Student #10

Yes!

Student #11

Yes, very adequate

Student #12

yes, teachers went over and beyond to help me

Student #13

I believe that if there was any extra help needed, I would receive it. The instructors and very helpful in this area.

Question #8

Do you feel that the textbook selections and instructional methods reflect the expected or intended learning outcomes?

Student #1

Yes, however I do get annoyed when I purchase a text and then we do not use it. I usually feel that the results meet expectations for the courses.

Student #2
NO. In a lot of my classes I did not even use the textbook. If a class is all notes and all quiz and test questions come from these notes why require a book? Personally I would rather read the book and have discussions than hear a professor talk the whole hour about non-sense.

Student #3
Pet Peeve→Teachers tell you to buy textbooks and then they don't use them or use them one time!!! That is why I wait to buy textbooks!

Student #4
Kind of. Sometimes it is not necessary to read the text in order to do well in the class or on the exams. In those cases, I don't think we got as much out of it as we should of.

Student #5
Instructional methods, yes. Textbook selections, not always. Dr. Alspach made a wise choice by making her own textbook; there is one professor that has outstanding experience and stories that teach the concepts quite effectively – why not use the powerpoint material as the material for the class? If only one chapter of the book, or even three, is going to be used – put them on EReserve and save us $30.
As for EReserves…too much can be a problem too. If enormous amounts of reading are expected to be downloaded from EReserves – pages need to be sent to the copy center to be bound and charge $5 or $10 rather than students printing the material.

Student #6
No. After the 20-ish different books from different comm. Classes I've needed to buy, I've opened less than 8 of them. The books are useless, most students don't seem to read them, and the only time people look at them seems to be when its time to return them for half of what the student bought them for, and the random odd assignment which requires the book. The only saving factor about them is that they don't cost as much as an intro to chem. Book might cost.

Student #7
I guess. Sometimes I didn't even use a text book, so sometimes they were a waste of money.

Student #8
I didn't use my textbooks that often.

Student #9
Some of my books were very boring and very simplistic. I personally am a visual learner as well, so just text and lecture doesn't cut it for me.

Student #10
Depending on the teacher and the class, I would say yes. For the most part, I would say no..

Student #11
Yes

Student #12
yes

Student #13
Some of the books that I've had have been dry, meaning dull and uninteresting. The book isn't always reflective of the subject matter.

Question #9

How valuable and appropriate was your application to the workplace and/or minor requirement? Feel free to offer suggestions for improvement.

Student #1

I have a French minor because I have enough credits in this area, I wish I would have taken marketing or public relations as a minor or application to the workplace. Although I do not regret taking French because these classes and traveling to France changed my life. A little guidance in this area would have been nice, and I did not even realize until last summer that I needed some guidance. Minor/application to the workplace should be discussed in greater detail before the junior year.

Student #2

Terrible, I did little and learned a bit.

Student #3

I think a more concentrated electives with a specific purpose would benefit students more than the "hey just pick and choose whatever" approach.

Student #4

I think my minor was very valuable and appropriate as Spanish is more and more necessary to communicate in the U.S. I have no suggestions, I think it's good the way it is.

Student #5

Mine was valuable, but I was focused on what I was doing and needed. I do think that the two need to be explained better earlier in the program. COMM 101 is a great start, but a re-evaluation needs to take place in COMM 299 perhaps. Also in 299 or 200, a mini career exploration project should be done – trying to finally figure out exactly what direction the degree is taking the student in 499 is scary, yet that is what I saw taking place.

Many other programs in other colleges at the university are adding concentrations to their majors – these should be checked out and helpful for comm students to see what actually goes together/compliments each other for an application to the workplace.

Student #6

Not very, I am an ISYS minor, but only because I took the classes for fun when I was in other majors. It's useful for the fact that my "fun" electives helped me to bypass any real thought on this issue, but beyond that I can't see how this will help me in the long term.

Student #7

Very, I have learned a lot from those classes. It will definitely help me in my career.

Student #8

My minor was very important to my career. Psychology is something that a counselor needs to be well versed with. So, I am very happy with application to the workplace.

Student #9

I did not like having to pick a minor. There weren't any that I was partial to, and the one I ended up picking I absolutely hated it. I think it should be an option, not a requirement.

Student #10

It is hard to say at this point. I will know once I go out get a job.

Student #11

It isn't valuable to me now because I picked an application to the workplace that I am no longer interested in pursuing.

Student #12
I think it is very valuable, because you get to apply what you learned in real life situations
Student #13
I love my minor. The minor that I have is what is going to be applicable to the workplace, and it also is a perfect supplement for my anticipated communication degree.

Question #10

Do you have specific comments or suggestions for the general improvement of the communication program?
Student #1
Better advising and directing students to the best minor/application to the workplace for them. I like our selection of classes, I think we cover all the bases. The minor is an important aspect that gets pushed aside it seems and it can focus ones career goals.
Student #2
Have more professor/instructors that have outside experience that can be applied to the class so that students can connect the information to the real world and how that information will be valuable to them.
Student #3
The program is good but it just needed a little bit of fine tweaking to be great. I really believe that creating electives that are more focused would do the COMM program a world of good. People often don't know what they can do with a COMM major and "you can do anything" is a little too much for people to grasp! By creating more specific electives people are then able to see what they can do.
Student #4
I think it is definitely moving in the right direction by offering more electives. I also think it should make classes more difficult and have higher demands academically so that students learn more and have to put forth an effort in order to pass.
Student #5
At times it appears the faculty are having trouble relating amongst themselves – cut it out. This is a great program and you have a lot to be proud of – the students feel mostly positive about their experience and while improvements are constantly needed – that is also positive. Experimenting with speech contests, collegiate or otherwise is a good thing.
I hope the future renovation of the building provides space specific to comm students – to hang out, gather for group projects, post announcements and generally have a place besides meetings and classes to mingle with classmates.
Otherwise – I completely satisfied with the program, courses, and faculty.
Student #6
Nope, not really. It works well enough for the ideological who hope to achieve something with the degree as well as for the slackers who are in the major out of laziness.
Student #7
Maybe one more research class and presentation class.
Student #8
No, I don't believe so. Many people who discourage communication classes are those who have never taken a class, but I don't know any communication majors or minors that truly dislike any class.

Student #9

I think that all of the teachers should be on the same page with each other and be familiar with their curriculum they are putting out there. There is no reason that the program directors are the only ones who know this.

Student #10

We need an advance public speaking course. We need to produces great presenters not just people who can speak in front of people.

I felt that none of my earlier communication course prepared me for comm. 300. Something has to be done about that.

Student #11

No

Student #12

No

Student #13

The faculty should promote the program more. My idea is that there should be a campus wide "conversation amongst great minds" where faculties actually do what they say they talk about in faculty meetings on a platform where students might be able to get involved. Classroom discussion isn't always the arena where current issues are being discussed.

APPENDIX E: STUDENT PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESPONSES

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT SURVEY

As part of our Communication Area Program Review, we are asking you to take a few minutes to respond to this survey. During program review, our communication program will be examined by a committee made up of faculty members from across the University. Your input will be very helpful.

Q1 Please select the answer that best represents your opinion regarding each of the following statements about the communication program.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a. Courses in the communication program have provided me with a sound foundation in the discipline.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Courses in the communication program have prepared me for future graduate work if I choose to pursue that option.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Courses in the communication program have prepared me to be successful in today's marketplace.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q2 Please select the answer that best represents your opinion regarding each of the following statements about the communication faculty.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a. The communication faculty is knowledgeable about the field.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. The communication faculty is available to help students when problems are encountered.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. The communication faculty provides instruction which is interesting and meaningful.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. The communication faculty provides adequate academic advising.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. The communication faculty encourages students to participate in professional activities outside the classroom, e.g., Ferris Communication Association, Lambda Pi Eta, Pi Kappa Delta, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. The communication faculty mentors students, e.g, paper submissions to conferences, speech and debate competitions, job interview coaching, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. The communication faculty encourages students to serve their communities through volunteer work, e.g., WISE, recycling, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. The communication faculty's course expectations are fair and reasonable.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. The communication faculty provides students many "out-of-class" opportunities to improve their communication skills, e.g., speech and debate teams, professional organizations, conference presentations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q3   Please select the answer that best represents your opinion regarding each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a. Students can develop their leadership skills through various professional activities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Communication students are motivated to be successful in school, e.g., turn in assignments on time, are prepared for class, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. The students in the communication program are academically comparable to students in other programs on campus.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. University library holdings are current and sufficient.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Classrooms are satisfactory, e.g., have adequate lighting, heating and ventilation, chairs, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Campus support services are adequate, e.g., tutoring, counseling, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. If I had to do it all over again, I would still (major/minor/do an A.A.) in communication.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. I would recommend the communication program to others.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q4 After graduation, I intend to pursue a career in

[ ]

Q5 Which of the following best describes your program status?

☐ B.S.
☐ B.A.
☐ A.A.
☐ Minor
☐ Teaching minor

Q6 Are you a

☐ Freshman
☐ Sophomore
☐ Junior
☐ Senior

Q7 Please use the space below to elaborate on any of the answers that you provided above or to add any comment you want to make. (You have 1000 characters available.)

[ ]

Thank you for your time and input.

COMM APR...Current Students...All Program Levels

Frequencies

Prepared by: Institutional Research & Testing, 06/07

Statistics

	N		Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing			
q1a Courses: Provided sound foundation	54	2	4.30	5.00	1.021
q1b Courses: Prepared me for grad work	52	4	4.15	4.00	.978
q1c Courses: Prepared me to be successful	53	3	4.19	4.00	.982
q2a Fac: Knowledgeable	54	2	4.65	5.00	.974
q2b Fac: Available to help	51	5	4.35	5.00	1.074
q2c Fac: Meaningful instruction	53	3	4.28	5.00	.988
q2d Fac: Adequate academic advising	52	4	3.88	4.00	1.215
q2e Fac: Encourages students-profes'l activ's	50	6	3.92	4.00	1.027
q2f Fac: Mentors students	45	11	4.09	4.00	.996
q2g Fac: Encourages students-serve communities	47	9	3.21	3.00	1.178
q2h Fac: Fair course expectations	52	4	4.33	4.00	.901
q2i Fac: Provide out of class opportunities	47	9	3.98	4.00	.989
q3a Stu: Develop leadership through pro activities	52	4	4.27	4.50	.910
q3b Stu: Motivated to be successful	52	4	4.13	4.00	1.067
q3c Stu: Academically comparable	48	8	4.15	5.00	1.130
q3d Library holdings current & sufficient	46	10	3.72	4.00	1.186
q3e Classrooms are satisfactory	53	3	3.49	4.00	1.353
q3f Campus support services adequate	46	10	4.07	4.00	1.041
q3g Still major/minor/do AA in comm	51	5	4.45	5.00	.945
q3h Recommend program to others	53	3	4.53	5.00	.823
q4 Pursue career in	56	0			
q5 Program status	55	1	2.04	1.00	1.387
q6 Class	55	1	3.42	4.00	.875
q7 Additional comments	56	0			

Frequency Table

q1a Courses: Provided sound foundation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	3.6	3.7	3.7
	Somewhat Disagree	1	1.8	1.9	5.6
	Neutral	7	12.5	13.0	18.5
	Somewhat Agree	13	23.2	24.1	42.6
	Strongly Agree	31	55.4	57.4	100.0
	Total	54	96.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	1.8		
	System	1	1.8		
	Total	2	3.6		
Total		56	100.0		

q1b Courses: Prepared me for grad work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	3.6	3.8	3.8
	Somewhat Disagree	1	1.8	1.9	5.8
	Neutral	6	10.7	11.5	17.3
	Somewhat Agree	21	37.5	40.4	57.7
	Strongly Agree	22	39.3	42.3	100.0
	Total	52	92.9	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	3	5.4		
	System	1	1.8		
	Total	4	7.1		
Total		56	100.0		

q1c Courses: Prepared me to be successful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	1.8	1.9	1.9
	Somewhat Disagree	2	3.6	3.8	5.7
	Neutral	9	16.1	17.0	22.6
	Somewhat Agree	15	26.8	28.3	50.9
	Strongly Agree	26	46.4	49.1	100.0
	Total	53	94.6	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	3.6		
	System	1	1.8		
	Total	3	5.4		
Total		56	100.0		

F

q2a Fac: Knowledgeable

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	5.4	5.6	5.6
	Neutral	1	1.8	1.9	7.4
	Somewhat Agree	5	8.9	9.3	16.7
	Strongly Agree	45	80.4	83.3	100.0
	Total	54	96.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	1.8		
	System	1	1.8		
	Total	2	3.6		
Total		56	100.0		

q2b Fac: Available to help

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	5.4	5.9	5.9
	Somewhat Disagree	1	1.8	2.0	7.8
	Neutral	2	3.6	3.9	11.8
	Somewhat Agree	14	25.0	27.5	39.2
	Strongly Agree	31	55.4	60.8	100.0
	Total	51	91.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	3	5.4		
	System	2	3.6		
	Total	5	8.9		
Total		56	100.0		

q2c Fac: Meaningful instruction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	3.6	3.8	3.8
	Somewhat Disagree	1	1.8	1.9	5.7
	Neutral	5	8.9	9.4	15.1
	Somewhat Agree	17	30.4	32.1	47.2
	Strongly Agree	28	50.0	52.8	100.0
	Total	53	94.6	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	1.8		
	System	2	3.6		
	Total	3	5.4		
Total		56	100.0		

q2d Fac: Adequate academic advising

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	7.1	7.7	7.7
	Somewhat Disagree	2	3.6	3.8	11.5
	Neutral	11	19.6	21.2	32.7
	Somewhat Agree	14	25.0	26.9	59.6
	Strongly Agree	21	37.5	40.4	100.0
	Total	52	92.9	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	3.6		
	System	2	3.6		
	Total	4	7.1		
Total		56	100.0		

q2e Fac: Encourages students-profes'l activ's

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	3.6	4.0	4.0
	Somewhat Disagree	3	5.4	6.0	10.0
	Neutral	7	12.5	14.0	24.0
	Somewhat Agree	23	41.1	46.0	70.0
	Strongly Agree	15	26.8	30.0	100.0
	Total	50	89.3	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	4	7.1		
	System	2	3.6		
	Total	6	10.7		
Total		56	100.0		

q2f Fac: Mentors students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	3.6	4.4	4.4
	Neutral	8	14.3	17.8	22.2
	Somewhat Agree	17	30.4	37.8	60.0
	Strongly Agree	18	32.1	40.0	100.0
	Total	45	80.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	8	14.3		
	System	3	5.4		
	Total	11	19.6		
Total		56	100.0		

q2g Fac: Encourages students-serve communities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	7.1	8.5	8.5
	Somewhat Disagree	8	14.3	17.0	25.5
	Neutral	17	30.4	36.2	61.7
	Somewhat Agree	10	17.9	21.3	83.0
	Strongly Agree	8	14.3	17.0	100.0
	Total	47	83.9	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	7	12.5		
	System	2	3.6		
	Total	9	16.1		
Total		56	100.0		

q2h Fac: Fair course expectations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	3.6	3.8	3.8
	Somewhat Disagree	1	1.8	1.9	5.8
	Somewhat Agree	24	42.9	46.2	51.9
	Strongly Agree	25	44.6	48.1	100.0
	Total	52	92.9	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	1.8		
	System	3	5.4		
	Total	4	7.1		
Total		56	100.0		

q2i Fac: Provide out of class opportunities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	3.6	4.3	4.3
	Somewhat Disagree	1	1.8	2.1	6.4
	Neutral	8	14.3	17.0	23.4
	Somewhat Agree	21	37.5	44.7	68.1
	Strongly Agree	15	26.8	31.9	100.0
	Total	47	83.9	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	7	12.5		
	System	2	3.6		
	Total	9	16.1		
Total		56	100.0		

q3d Library holdings current & sufficient

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	3.6	4.3	4.3
	Somewhat Disagree	6	10.7	13.0	17.4
	Neutral	10	17.9	21.7	39.1
	Somewhat Agree	13	23.2	28.3	67.4
	Strongly Agree	15	26.8	32.6	100.0
	Total	46	82.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	7	12.5		
	System	3	5.4		
	Total	10	17.9		
Total		56	100.0		

q3e Classrooms are satisfactory

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	12.5	13.2	13.2
	Somewhat Disagree	5	8.9	9.4	22.6
	Neutral	11	19.6	20.8	43.4
	Somewhat Agree	15	26.8	28.3	71.7
	Strongly Agree	15	26.8	28.3	100.0
	Total	53	94.6	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	1.8		
	System	2	3.6		
	Total	3	5.4		
Total		56	100.0		

q3f Campus support services adequate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	1.8	2.2	2.2
	Somewhat Disagree	3	5.4	6.5	8.7
	Neutral	8	14.3	17.4	26.1
	Somewhat Agree	14	25.0	30.4	56.5
	Strongly Agree	20	35.7	43.5	100.0
	Total	46	82.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	7	12.5		
	System	3	5.4		
	Total	10	17.9		
Total		56	100.0		

q3g Still major/minor/do AA in comm

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	1.8	2.0	2.0
	Somewhat Disagree	1	1.8	2.0	3.9
	Neutral	7	12.5	13.7	17.6
	Somewhat Agree	7	12.5	13.7	31.4
	Strongly Agree	35	62.5	68.6	100.0
	Total	51	91.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	3	5.4		
	System	2	3.6		
	Total	5	8.9		
Total		56	100.0		

q3h Recommend program to others

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	1.8	1.9	1.9
	Somewhat Disagree	1	1.8	1.9	3.8
	Neutral	2	3.6	3.8	7.5
	Somewhat Agree	14	25.0	26.4	34.0
	Strongly Agree	35	62.5	66.0	100.0
	Total	53	94.6	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	1.8		
	System	2	3.6		
	Total	3	5.4		
Total		56	100.0		

q4 Pursue career in

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	3.6	3.6	3.6
	?	2	3.6	3.6	7.1
	Academia, professor	1	1.8	1.8	8.9
	Broadcasting	3	5.4	5.4	14.3
	Broadcasting or Radio	1	1.8	1.8	16.1
	Comm w/Music	1	1.8	1.8	17.9
	Communication/Marketing	1	1.8	1.8	19.6
	Construction	1	1.8	1.8	21.4
	Counseling	1	1.8	1.8	23.2
	Criminal Justice	1	1.8	1.8	25.0
	Dental Hygiene/Consultation	1	1.8	1.8	26.8
	Dental Hygiene/Radio	1	1.8	1.8	28.6
	Early Childhood Ed (@ Spectrum)	1	1.8	1.8	30.4
	Education	1	1.8	1.8	32.1
	English	1	1.8	1.8	33.9
	Events Planning	1	1.8	1.8	35.7
	Grad school	1	1.8	1.8	37.5

q4 Pursue career in

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Graduate School MBA	1	1.8	1.8	39.3
	H.R. or Public Relations	1	1.8	1.8	41.1
	Healthcare Communication	1	1.8	1.8	42.9
	Hospitality	1	1.8	1.8	44.6
	Human Resource Mgmt	1	1.8	1.8	46.4
	Landscape Architecture/Small Business	1	1.8	1.8	48.2
	Law	2	3.6	3.6	51.8
	Law/Arbitration	1	1.8	1.8	53.6
	Law/Legal	1	1.8	1.8	55.4
	Major in Resort Management	1	1.8	1.8	57.1
	Marketing & Sales	1	1.8	1.8	58.9
	Marketing/Public Relations	1	1.8	1.8	60.7
	Medicinal Chemistry	1	1.8	1.8	62.5
	Military Officer School	1	1.8	1.8	64.3
	Music Industry	1	1.8	1.8	66.1
	N/A	1	1.8	1.8	67.9
	Not starving/Personal Debt Reduction	1	1.8	1.8	69.6
	Not sure yet	1	1.8	1.8	71.4
	Nuclear Medicine	1	1.8	1.8	73.2
	Nursing	1	1.8	1.8	75.0
	Nursing w/minor in Comm	1	1.8	1.8	76.8
	Organizational Communication	1	1.8	1.8	78.6
	Organizational Management	1	1.8	1.8	80.4
	Pharm Sales	1	1.8	1.8	82.1
	Psychology	2	3.6	3.6	85.7
	Public Relations	2	3.6	3.6	89.3
	Public Relations/Training	1	1.8	1.8	91.1
	Social/Human Services	1	1.8	1.8	92.9
	Sports Broadcasting	1	1.8	1.8	94.6
	Statistics	1	1.8	1.8	96.4
	Teaching History	1	1.8	1.8	98.2
	The music industry	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	56	100.0	100.0	

q5 Program status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	B.S.	32	57.1	58.2	58.2
	B.A.	6	10.7	10.9	69.1
	A.A.	2	3.6	3.6	72.7
	Minor	13	23.2	23.6	96.4
	Teaching minor	2	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	55	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		56	100.0		

q7 Additional comments

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		39	69.6	69.6	69.6
	Classrooms need improvements. I find myself freezing in summer months and overheating in the winter. Temperatures are uncomfortable.	1	1.8	1.8	71.4
	COMM prog is a good prog-it provides skills that are beneficial to the profes'l/work "world".	1	1.8	1.8	73.2
	COMM would better serve its stu's if it were a reqmt to have regular debates in class & projects that elaborate & help prepare stu's for the kinds of jobs that will be in the field.	1	1.8	1.8	75.0
	Everything in the prog is good! I love it.	1	1.8	1.8	76.8
	Having a COMM minor has proved very valuable in my life so far. I can only expect for more of the same for the rest of my life. This is a great program!	1	1.8	1.8	78.6
	Honestly, the COMM prog has the most helpful profs.	1	1.8	1.8	80.4
	I don't feel I could answer some of these q's adequately b/c I have only a minor in COMM. Thanks for allowing me to take it, though!	1	1.8	1.8	82.1
	I feel the comm prog is good/adequate but needs improvements--in advising, encouraging stu's to be involved in extra speech/conference/debate etc. along w/ extracurr activ's (WISE, Recycling, etc.). I would recommend comm to others & hope it continues to improve.	1	1.8	1.8	83.9
	I have thoroughly enjoyed my time here in the COMM prog; however, I do feel that the advising part of our prog needs improvement. At times it felt like my advisor was too busy (guidance earlier in my prog). But overall I'm happy about my choice.	1	1.8	1.8	85.7
	I haven't started working towards my COMM minor. Sorry.	1	1.8	1.8	87.5
	I just declared my minor in COMM this past semester (07Sp). My answers are based only on the few classes I've taken. I can't be a great judge of the whole prog yet.	1	1.8	1.8	89.3
	I really enjoyed my comm classes that's why I transferred into the prog.	1	1.8	1.8	91.1
	JOH 104 is one of the coldest rooms in existence. Many of the computers are outdated & need updates for the many presentations the stu's are forced to give. Also, allowing the lights to be controlled by more than one light switch.	1	1.8	1.8	92.9
	Minor could be less credits to obtain as compared to other minors across campus.	1	1.8	1.8	94.6
	N/A	1	1.8	1.8	96.4
	Our building needs work--BAD. The constant clinking of the vent system is strongly distracting.	1	1.8	1.8	98.2
	Our classrms are below average compared to the rest of the univ.	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	56	100.0	100.0	

142

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY
Communication Faculty Survey

As part of our Communication Area Program Review, we are asking you to take a few minutes to respond to this survey. Your input is greatly appreciated.

Q1   **Please select the answer that best represents your opinion regarding each of the following statements about the communication program.**

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a. The goals of the communication program are consistent with the mission of the university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. The communication program prepares students for careers in today's marketplace.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. The communication program prepares students for graduate study.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. The communication program contributes to the general education of all university students by providing basic courses that build communication competency.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. The communication program contributes to the development of an informed and effective citizenry.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. The communication program compares favorably with similar programs throughout the state.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. The communication program is guided by an effective advisory board.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q2   **Please select the answer that best represents your opinion regarding each of the following statements about the program content and faculty.**

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a. Program content is reviewed and evaluated periodically.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Program content is responsive to the needs of employers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Program content is responsive to the changes occurring within the broader discipline.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Program content draws upon the humanistic and social scientific traditions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Program faculty make themselves accessible to students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Program faculty advise students effectively, e.g., requirements for graduation, career opportunities, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Program faculty members are effective classroom instructors.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Program faculty members engage in university service.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Program faculty members participate in a variety of professional development activities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q3 Please select the answer that best represents your opinion regarding each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a. Communication students demonstrate effective writing skills.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Communication students demonstrate effective oral skills.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Communication students are motivated to be successful in school, e.g., do assignments on time, prepared for class, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Communication students compare favorably with students from other FSU major programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. The number of clerical and support staff is sufficient to meet program needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Instructional facilities and equipment are sufficient to meet program needs, e.g. heating and air conditioning, blackboard space, lighting, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Faculty offices are sufficient for completing needed tasks, e.g., heating and air conditioning, chairs for students, file space, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Faculty offices are well located for meeting faculty and program needs, e.g., networking, program visibility, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Library and research resources are sufficient to meet program needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. The faculty receives adequate technological assistance, e.g., computer support, support for developing and maintaining on-line instruction, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. The FSU administration supports the communication program, e.g., adequate operating budget, professional development opportunities, number of qualified tenure-track positions, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q4 Please use the space below to elaborate on any of the answers that you provided above. (You have 1000 characters available.)

Q5 If you have additional comments that might assist in the program review process, please include them here. (You have 1000 characters available.)

Thank you for your time and input.

COMM APR...Faculty

Frequencies

Prepared by: Institutional Research & Testing, 05/07

Statistics

	N		Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing			
q1a Prog goals consistent w/ univ mission	6	0	4.00	4.00	.894
q1b Prog prepares students for careers	6	0	3.67	3.50	1.211
q1c Prog prepares students for grad study	6	0	3.83	3.50	1.472
q1d Prog contributes to gen ed of all students	6	0	4.83	5.00	.408
q1e Prog contributes to development of informed citizenry	6	0	4.50	4.50	.548
q1f Prog compares favorably w/ similar progs in state	5	1	4.60	5.00	1.673
q1g Prog guided by effective advisory board	6	0	3.33	3.50	.816
q2a Content reviewed periodically	6	0	3.67	3.50	1.211
q2b Content responsive to employer needs	6	0	3.00	3.00	1.095
q2c Content responsive to discipline changes	6	0	3.17	3.00	.753
q2d Content draws on humanistic & social scientific traditions	6	0	4.67	5.00	.516
q2e Faculty make themselves accessible	6	0	4.67	5.00	.516
q2f Faculty advise students effectively	6	0	4.17	4.00	.408
q2g Faculty are effective classroom instructors	6	0	4.67	5.00	.516
q2h Faculty engage in university service	6	0	5.00	5.00	.000
q2i Faculty participate in professional development	6	0	5.17	5.00	.408
q3a Students demonstrate effective writing skills	6	0	3.00	2.50	1.265
q3b Students demonstrate effective oral skills	6	0	3.67	4.00	1.033
q3c Students are motivated to be successful	6	0	2.67	2.00	1.751
q3d Students compare favorably w/ those from other FSU progs	6	0	2.83	2.00	1.602
q3e Sufficient number of clerical/support staff	6	0	4.00	4.00	.894
q3f Sufficient facilities & equipment	6	0	2.50	2.00	1.225
q3g Sufficient faculty offices	6	0	3.17	2.50	1.472
q3h Faculty offices are well located	6	0	2.17	2.00	1.472
q3i Sufficient library & research resources	6	0	3.83	4.50	1.472
q3j Faculty receives adequate technological assistance	6	0	4.00	4.00	1.095
q3k Admin supports the prog	6	0	3.67	4.00	1.033
q4 Elaborate on answers	6	0			
q5 Additional comments	6	0			

Frequency Table

q1a Prog goals consistent w/ univ mission

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Neutral	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Somewhat Agree	2	33.3	33.3	66.7
	Strongly Agree	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q1b Prog prepares students for careers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Neutral	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
	Somewhat Agree	1	16.7	16.7	66.7
	Strongly Agree	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q1c Prog prepares students for grad study

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Neutral	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
	Somewhat Agree	1	16.7	16.7	66.7
	Strongly Agree	1	16.7	16.7	83.3
	Don't Know	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q1d Prog contributes to gen ed of all students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Strongly Agree	5	83.3	83.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q1e Prog contributes to development of informed citizenry

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Strongly Agree	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q1f Prog compares favorably w/ similar progs in state

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	16.7	20.0	20.0
	Somewhat Agree	1	16.7	20.0	40.0
	Strongly Agree	1	16.7	20.0	60.0
	Don't Know	2	33.3	40.0	100.0
	Total	5	83.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1	16.7		
Total		6	100.0		

q1g Prog guided by effective advisory board

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Neutral	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
	Somewhat Agree	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q2a Content reviewed periodically

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Neutral	2	33.3	33.3	50.0
	Somewhat Agree	1	16.7	16.7	66.7
	Strongly Agree	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q2b Content responsive to employer needs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Neutral	3	50.0	50.0	83.3
	Strongly Agree	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q2c Content responsive to discipline changes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Neutral	3	50.0	50.0	66.7
	Somewhat Agree	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

147

q2d Content draws on humanistic & social scientific traditions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Strongly Agree	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q2e Faculty make themselves accessible

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Strongly Agree	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q2f Faculty advise students effectively

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	5	83.3	83.3	83.3
	Strongly Agree	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q2g Faculty are effective classroom instructors

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Agree	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Strongly Agree	4	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q2h Faculty engage in university service

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	6	100.0	100.0	100.0

q2i Faculty participate in professional development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	5	83.3	83.3	83.3
	Don't Know	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3a Students demonstrate effective writing skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Neutral	1	16.7	16.7	66.7
	Somewhat Agree	1	16.7	16.7	83.3
	Strongly Agree	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3b Students demonstrate effective oral skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Neutral	1	16.7	16.7	33.3
	Somewhat Agree	3	50.0	50.0	83.3
	Strongly Agree	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3c Students are motivated to be successful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Somewhat Disagree	3	50.0	50.0	66.7
	Neutral	1	16.7	16.7	83.3
	Don't Know	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3d Students compare favorably w/ those from other FSU progs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	4	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Neutral	1	16.7	16.7	83.3
	Don't Know	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3e Sufficient number of clerical/support staff

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Neutral	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Somewhat Agree	2	33.3	33.3	66.7
	Strongly Agree	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3f Sufficient facilities & equipment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Somewhat Disagree	3	50.0	50.0	66.7
	Somewhat Agree	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3g Sufficient faculty offices

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Neutral	1	16.7	16.7	66.7
	Strongly Agree	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3h Faculty offices are well located

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Somewhat Disagree	3	50.0	50.0	83.3
	Strongly Agree	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3i Sufficient library & research resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Somewhat Agree	1	16.7	16.7	50.0
	Strongly Agree	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3j Faculty receives adequate technological assistance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Somewhat Agree	3	50.0	50.0	66.7
	Strongly Agree	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q3k Admin supports the prog

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Neutral	1	16.7	16.7	33.3
	Somewhat Agree	3	50.0	50.0	83.3
	Strongly Agree	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q4 Elaborate on answers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		5	83.3	83.3	83.3
	Recruiting students to the prog must take more priority-& not by dumping the burden on the Prog Coordinator! We must address the perception that COMM is an "easy" fluff major by increasing rigor in all courses, including Gen Ed.	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

q5 Additional comments

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		5	83.3	83.3	83.3
	We must get more "buy-in" to the major & assessment by all faculty. We must look at cross-Univ collaboration as opportunities & not be "diluted" by spreading to off-campus sites. W/out numbers in the major, we need students from other progs to "make" upper level courses.	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX G: ADVISORY COMMITTEE SURVEY AND RESPONSES

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY
Communication Advisory Board Survey

As part of our Communication Area program review, we are asking you to take just a few moments to respond to this short survey. During program review, our communication major will be examined by a committee made up of faculty members from across the University. Your input is greatly appreciated.

Q1   Please select the answer that best represents your opinion regarding each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a. Program content reflects what is needed to be successful in today's workplace.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Professors are knowledgeable and draw upon current research in the field.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. The program prepares students to continue their education on the graduate level.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Graduates have the skills and expertise to pursue a variety of career paths.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Program graduates are viewed favorably within the business community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. The employment prospects for communication graduates are positive.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Instructional facilities are conducive to learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Faculty have the resources they need to effectively serve students in the program.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. The university provides students with the resources they need to succeed in this program.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Suggestions from Advisory Board members are encouraged.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. The Board members are well-informed about the program.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Board members are knowledgeable about the field.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q2 Please use this space to elaborate on any of
the above or to add any comments you want to
make.

Thank you for your time and participation.

COMM APR...Advisory Board

Frequencies

Prepared by: Institutional Research & Testing, 03/07

Statistics

| | N | | | | |
	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
q1a Content reflects what needed for success	7	0	4.00	5.00	1.528
q1b Profs are knowledgeable/draw on current research	7	0	4.00	5.00	1.528
q1c Prepares students for grad school	7	0	3.57	4.00	1.134
q1d Grads have skills/expertise for variety of careers	7	0	4.00	5.00	1.528
q1e Grads viewed favorably	5	2	3.60	4.00	1.673
q1f Positive employment prospects	7	0	3.43	4.00	1.512
q1g Facilities conducive to learning	6	1	4.00	4.50	1.549
q1h Fac have adequate resources	6	1	3.50	4.00	1.378
q1i Univ provides students w/ adequate resources	7	0	3.86	4.00	1.345
q1j Adv Bd suggestions encouraged	7	0	4.14	5.00	1.574
q1k Adv Bd members well-informed	7	0	4.00	4.00	1.414
q1l Adv Bd members knowledgeable	7	0	4.14	5.00	1.464
q2 Elaboration/Additional comments	7	0			

154

Frequency Table

q1a Content reflects what needed for success

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Neutral	1	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Somewhat Agree	1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	Strongly Agree	4	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

q1b Profs are knowledgeable/draw on current research

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Neutral	1	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Somewhat Agree	1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	Strongly Agree	4	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

q1c Prepares students for grad school

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Agree	6	85.7	85.7	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

q1d Grads have skills/expertise for variety of careers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Neutral	1	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Somewhat Agree	1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	Strongly Agree	4	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

q1e Grads viewed favorably

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	20.0	20.0
	Neutral	1	14.3	20.0	40.0
	Somewhat Agree	1	14.3	20.0	60.0
	Strongly Agree	2	28.6	40.0	100.0
	Total	5	71.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	28.6		
Total		7	100.0		

Pa

q1f Positive employment prospects

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Neutral	1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	Somewhat Agree	2	28.6	28.6	71.4
	Strongly Agree	2	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

q1g Facilities conducive to learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	16.7	16.7
	Somewhat Agree	2	28.6	33.3	50.0
	Strongly Agree	3	42.9	50.0	100.0
	Total	6	85.7	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	14.3		
Total		7	100.0		

q1h Fac have adequate resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	16.7	16.7
	Neutral	1	14.3	16.7	33.3
	Somewhat Agree	3	42.9	50.0	83.3
	Strongly Agree	1	14.3	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	85.7	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	14.3		
Total		7	100.0		

q1i Univ provides students w/ adequate resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Agree	4	57.1	57.1	71.4
	Strongly Agree	2	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

q1j Adv Bd suggestions encouraged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Neutral	1	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Strongly Agree	5	71.4	71.4	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Page

q1k Adv Bd members well-informed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Agree	3	42.9	42.9	57.1
	Strongly Agree	3	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

q1l Adv Bd members knowledgeable

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Agree	2	28.6	28.6	42.9
	Strongly Agree	4	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

q2 Elaboration/Additional comments

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	28.6	28.6	28.6
	I've been removed from the prog for the past few yrs, so I don't necessarily believe I am up to speed on what the prog offers.	1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	My impressions of the faculty is that they are very profes'l & highly commtited to helping their students succeed.	1	14.3	14.3	57.1
	Sorry for the trouble completing this survey. I think what happened is that I sent an incomplete reply the 1st time I opened the link & then couldn't connect again for some reason. I appreciate Crystal's help in being able to open it a 2nd time. Bd meet'gs not well attended by some mem's, but no suggestions on how to improve attendance.	1	14.3	14.3	71.4
	The prog should encourage the ability to write clearly. The first step in effective oral comm'n is to organize thoughts logically & to present them grammatically & in an appropriate form for the intended audience.	1	14.3	14.3	85.7
	There's a large disconnect & competitve nature btwn the COMM dept, media, & mktg. This culture is to the detriment of the students. Integration among these schools is needed to help students prepare for the way in which the real world of comm is established.	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

157

APPENDIX H: LETTERS FROM THE DEAN
AND DEPARTMENT HEAD

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 10, 2007

To: Academic Program Review Council

From: Matthew A. Klein, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Subject: Communication Area Program Review

After review of the Communication Area Programs Self-Study document, I provide the
following observations:

1. The communication area program provides a solid background in communication
    practice that prepares program graduates for work in communication-related fields. The
    program goals are clearly in line with the mission of Ferris State University.
2. The program provides benefits to Ferris State University in several areas, including
    service-related responsibilities of the program faculty and training and preparation of our
    students. The programs have grown out of the original service function communication
    faculty served as part of the general education curriculum.
3. There are many strengths in the programs: students have presented at national
    conferences; students are engaged in activities across the campus; students have found
    both academic and professional success through their majors.
4.   The facilities and equipment meet the needs of the communication area programs. The
    communication programs receive support through the department, college, and university
    in the form of student aid grants, equipment funds, and reassigned time for the program
    coordinator.
5. The self-study has identified some areas for improvement. Connections between
    programmatic outcomes and coursework need to be emphasized. New directions for the
    program need to be explored.
6. The program is clearly meeting its expectations and should be continued.

In closing, the self-study appears to be an accurate representation of the current state of the
Communication Area Programs, and the program faculty are prepared to work with Vice
President for Academic Affairs to address the recommendations of the APRC.

Memorandum

To: Ferris State University Communication Program Review

From: Dr. Grant Snider, Academic Department Head, Humanities

Subj.:   Department Head Report

Date**:   May 14, 2007**

Perception of Program:

The Communication Program aligns with the mission statement of the University by "providing opportunities for innovative teaching and learning in career-oriented, technological and professional education." Of course, one can do many things with a degree in Communication, and businesses perennially call for graduates who have the ability to communicate effectively in a professional setting. Our degrees prepare graduates for a potential variety of careers. Graduates currently are working as Corporate Sales Coordinators, Mortgage Consultants, etc. In terms of preparing students for graduate study, the program is seeing success. Our students are engaged in excellent scholarship with faculty support. For example, three students in the Ferris Communication Association presented a paper at the Central States Conference in Minneapolis with the support of Professor Neil Patten. The students were mentioned, along with a photograph, in *Spectra*, the National Communication Association journal. They are submitting their paper for paper of the year award, and all three of them plan to attend graduate studies of some kind.

The health of the program appears to be generally good as demonstrated in the success stories of our students and graduates; in the new possibilities created by recent hires in health communication, mass communication, and rhetoric; and, in the vigorous debates regarding the future vision and curriculum of the program. This report will highlight facility/equipment resources, concerns, and goals for the program.

Facility and Equipment:

In the fall of 2007, the Communication Program will have 11 full-time faculty and five temporary faculty. The sixteen faculty members are spread across three floors of Johnson Hall. This separation creates an obstacle to fostering program identity, unity, and collaboration. The College of Technology has been very supportive regarding our use of their building; however, the growth and diversification of the Department and of the Communication Program have exhausted the capacity of Johnson Hall to house our faculty.

The four classrooms in Johnson Hall continue adequately to satisfy our pedagogical needs. During the spring of this year, a whiteboard was added to Johnson 104, giving faculty much

needed space for writing notes. (The current chalkboard is located directly behind the LCD screen and, therefore, difficult to use effectively.) While our needs are generally met by the classroom spaces, two of the classrooms (as noted in the previous APR) are unable to hold the number of students allowed under work load caps for some of our courses. Additionally, there is one major maintenance issue facing the rooms because of the noise created by the HVAC system. Pipes in the rooms often produce a loud knocking sound that can be noticeably distracting for courses that rely heavily on student presentations.

Finally, the department currently has an adequate supply of digital recording cameras for the recording of presentations; nonetheless, these cameras require extra formatting time. Thus, students and faculty often take two department cameras for one class (recording with one camera and formatting with another). This practice does not allow for the greatest use of resources or time. In addition to having some equipment available in the main office, Media Resources provides a reliable service, but having some dedicated recording equipment in the classroom might prove even more efficient. The Department Head is currently researching what other available technologies might be used for the recording of student presentations. (We might want to research the feasibility of a permanently mounted digital camera that records directly to a hard drive.)

Program Concerns:

Despite the success stories of our student scholars and the feedback generally received from internship sites and employers regarding the quality of our graduates, my own observations see room for improvement, at least in terms of presentation skills. If the student presentations in COMM 499: Senior Seminar are indicative of the presentation skills of our students, then the program faculty may want to consider analyzing the ways in which presentation is addressed in the upper-division Communication courses. My comments are not meant to isolate the quality of instruction taking place in COMM 499. They simply raise the question of the value and emphasis given to presentation across the program. Specific issues worth looking into include: the development of content, the effective use of PowerPoint, formal diction, and professional comportment. Because the presentations are used as part of our program assessment, it might be beneficial for more Communication faculty to attend these student presentations to see first hand the level of student work being produced by students nearing completion of their degrees. The students themselves even suggested making the COMM 332: Persuasive Speaking a program requirement, as opposed to an elective. There may be a number of ways to approach this issue.

Additionally, enrollment continues to be a concern. Since 2002, enrollment in the Applied Speech Communication Associates degree has dropped from nine to five students. The enrollment in the Bachelors of Science has dropped from 57-33 students. The enrollment in the Bachelors of Arts degree has increased from nine to 24 students. Thus, overall enrollment has dropped three students since 2002. It is believed that most of our students do not enter the Communication program as freshmen; rather, they transfer from other Ferris programs. This issue is widely recognized. Currently, Liz Wilson, Program Coordinator, is working with Angie Mishler to update the program's marketing, its web page, and tracking of students who express an interest in Communication at Ferris. This semester Liz arranged to have Communication majors call students who had been admitted to the program.

Program Goals:

The Communication Program is at a pivotal point in its history. A few factors have converged this year to create this opportunity. The program has a new coordinator, there are three new faculty members who bring new skills to the program, the program is involved in planning discussions—as part of a department-wide initiative for the new department head—and the requirement of self-reflection provided by the Academic Program Review itself. One key issue being discussed during the planning sessions has been the possibility of adding suggested concentrations or tracks to the degrees. Possible tracks include: Health Communication, Mass Communication, and Client Communication. In my opinion, the addition of these, or other, tracks would help us market our program to freshmen or transfer students. They might also serve to help our graduates as they describe their skills to potential employers; moreover, the creation of these tracks provide excellent opportunities for the Communication program to work collaboratively with other programs on campus (from programs related to health care, to business, and to television and video production). This clarification of program focus, combined with logical collaborations across campus and the marketing efforts just underway, are hoped to have a positive impact on enrollment. Increased course and program assessment will be expected and should help us better understand how to improve the presentation skills of our graduates. Finally, as planning discussions continue into next year, I am optimistic that feedback from the Academic Program Review Committee will add insights into the emerging vision for the program.

APPENDIX I: YEARLY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

Yearly Administrative Review: December 2006   Program: COMM B.S.

Purpose of Administrative Program Review

1. to facilitate a process led by the deans and department heads/chairs to assess and evaluate programs under their supervision
2. to facilitate long term planning and recommendations to the VPAA
3. to collect and analyze information that will be useful in the University's accreditation efforts; Academic Program Review deliberation; and assessment.

Instructions: Please prepare a report following the outline below.

I.   Summary of Modifications since last report:

Please provide a brief summary of the changes that have taken place in the program since the last report. There have been no significant changes in the B.S. in Communication program since the last report.

II.   Program Assessment/Assessment of Student Learning

a) What are the program's learning outcomes?

Graduates from the COMM B.S. Program should be able to:

7. demonstrate understanding of the human communication process; including message construction, dissemination, and interpretation
8. demonstrate understanding of how messages construct personal identity
9. demonstrate the ability to interact appropriately and effectively with another person, both verbally and nonverbally (COMM 105: Interpersonal Communication and COMM 200: Foundations of Interpersonal Communication)
10. demonstrate the ability to construct appropriately and deliver effectively a public speech (COMM 121: Public Speaking and COMM 201: Public Presentation Practicum)
11. demonstrate the ability to participate appropriately and effectively in performing a group problem solving activity (COMM 221: Small Group Decision Making and COMM 421: Leadership in Small Group Communication)
12. demonstrate understanding of how communication theories inform research and build knowledge in the field (COMM 299: Theories of Human Communication)
13. demonstrate understanding of how research is conducted in communication (COMM 300: Applied Research Methods of Communication)

14. demonstrate understanding of and ability to participate appropriately and effectively in organizational settings (COMM 380: Organizational Communication and COMM 499)
15. demonstrate understanding of and ability to participate appropriately and effectively with people from different cultural backgrounds (COMM 365: Intercultural Communication)
16. demonstrate understanding of legal and ethical principles governing appropriate and effective communication (COMM 460: Communication Rights and Responsibilities)
17. Demonstrate successful application of communication skills and knowledge (Graded Internships and COMM 499)

b) What assessment measures are used, both direct and indirect?

There are several points in the Program where assessment is or soon will be taking place. First, given that many students take the COMM 101 course at the beginning of their studies, then COMM 299 midway through the program, and cap their studies in COMM 499, it makes sense to use each of these courses to gage student progress toward the program outcomes. Various assignments and projects along the way can easily be adapted to collect useful assessment data.

For example, this fall's graduating seniors in COMM 499 devised and administered tests to themselves in the content supposedly covered in Interpersonal, Public Speaking, and Small Group Decision Making. Such an approach, combined with a similar test in COMM 101 and COMM 299, can serve as a kind or pre/post-test analysis. While some data can be collected at this point, there is no official oversight or clear sharing of this information.

There are also small groups of faculty in the process of gathering information on the three foundation courses.

Other feedback mechanisms are in place related to the Graded Internships required in the program. For example, currently the Internship Coordinator receives three reports from the on-site internship supervisor and makes, when possible, one site visit with the supervisor and intern together. While such meetings have been conducted as part of the internship process, there does not appear to be a formal documentation, sharing, and discussing of that data among the program faculty.

It is hoped that by the end of the spring 2007 semester, a comprehensive and organized assessment plan will be in place for both the General Education Communication courses and for the Communication Program.

c) What is the assessment cycle for the program?

Communication students will be assessed relative to the basic skills covered in COMM 105, 121, and 221 in their assignments in COMM 299 (this course provides a midpoint between the freshmen orientation class (COMM 101) and the senior capstone class (COMM 499). While students completing the associates degree and students enrolled in one of the bachelor degrees both take this one course, the course itself provides an opportunity to view the skills assumed to be covered in the three foundation courses (105, 121, and 221) . This fall COMM 299 was cancelled due to low enrollment; however, there are 30 students

already enrolled for the course in spring 2007. Assessment of these courses also falls under the General Education assessment cycle, and the Humanities Department will be conducting during 2007 a wide ranging assessment of all of its General Education offerings.

While there is debate ongoing regarding the effective scheduling of COMM 499, a debate over how many times per year the course should be offered, it is clear that the course itself provides an excellent opportunity to assess the Program outcomes in graduating seniors. There are 11 students enrolled for the spring 2007 semester.

The Communication Programs are under the Academic Program Review this year, and the draft report is due in June, 2007.

d) What assessment data were collected in the past year?
Since the last report in March, only minimal new data has been gathered. The cancellation of COMM 299 this fall hurt the collection of data; however, the students enrolled in the fall section of COMM 499 have produced a report regarding the effectiveness of the Communication Program. That report was submitted the week of final examinations. Thus, the details have yet to be studied closely or shared with the wider Communication faculty.

e) How have assessment data been used for programmatic or curricular change?
Assessment of the data is forthcoming.

III.   Course Outcomes Assessment

a) Do all multi-sectioned courses have common outcomes?
COMM 105, COMM 121, COMM 221 contain the outcomes required for General Education courses. All syllabi have been reviewed to insure the presence of outcomes.

If not, how do you plan to address discrepancies?

b) How do individual course outcomes meet programmatic goals?
One of the interesting features of the three foundation courses is that they will be assessed in the future from two points of view. On the one hand, these courses will be reviewed for the effectiveness in meeting the General Education outcomes. On the other hand, these courses will be assessed for their ability to provide the foundation for study in the upper-level Communication Program courses. Thus, the general education outcomes do represent in some way the foundational skills required for the more specialized study in the higher electives and required courses in the Communication Program. Most other Communication courses are not offered in multiple sections.

IV.   Program Features

1. Advisory Board
a) Does the program have a board/committee? When did it last meet? When were new members last appointed? What is the composition of the committee (how many alumni, workplace representatives, academic representatives, etc.)

The Communication Program does maintain an active advisory board. The board met this October, and a new member was introduced at that meeting. The current configuration of the Board is three Ferris State University alumni (not all in COMM), six members of the professional work force, and one faculty member (the Program Coordinator). The meeting this fall provided an opportunity for the new Department Head to meet the board, a variety of faculty to interact with the members, and for University administrators to share their visions with the Board. The Board was also introduced to the strategic planning process for the Department of Humanities and the upcoming APRC Report that would involve their contributions and insights.

b) If no advisory board exists, please explain by what means faculty receive advice from employers and outside professionals to inform decisions within the program.

c) Has feedback from the Advisory Board affected programmatic or curricular change?

Historically, the ideas of the Advisory Board have been incorporated in program modifications, and the Program looks forward to seeing the results of the survey that the Board members are in the process of completing.

2. Internships/Cooperative or Experiential Learning

a) Is an internship required or recommended?

Required

b) If the internship is only recommended, what percentage of majors elect the internship option?

c) What challenges does the program face in regard to internships? What is being done to address these concerns?

- Students underestimate the complexity and time-commitment involved in securing an appropriate internship, despite the fact that the Coordinator makes every effort to encourage students to start locating sites at the beginning of the fall semester before they plan to intern
- There is a perception among some faculty that on-campus internships do not challenge the interns in the same way as off-campus internships

d) Do you seek feedback from internship supervisors ?

If so, does that feedback affect pedagogical or curricular change?

The current Internship Coordinator requires three written reports from the on-site internship supervisor and attempts to make one on-site visit with each intern and supervisor. As a result of some feedback, the current Internship Coordinator this semester has begun using WebCt to facilitate communication with and among the interns.

3. On-Line Courses

a) Please list the web-based courses, both partial internet and fully online, offered last year.

A variety of COMM courses make use of WebCT technology. This summer COMM 221 was delivered successfully on-line for the second summer

b) What challenges and/or opportunities has web-based instruction created?

> Human communication and personal interaction make on-line delivery difficult, especially in performance courses, and there is a debate among faculty regarding the appropriateness of on-line delivery for some of these courses.

c) What faculty development opportunities have been encouraged/required in order to enhance web-based learning within the program?

> No current initiatives are in place at the Program or Department level that directly impact these courses.

d) How has student feed-back been used to enhance course delivery?

> Donna Smith has retooled several modules and included additional analysis of the individual students group work in their off-campus location.

e) Is there any plan to offer this program on-line? If yes, what rationale is there to offer this program online?" (emerging market opportunity?, expand enrollment?, demand for niche program offering?, etc.)

> Currently, as part of a strategic planning effort on behalf of the department head, the faculty in Communication are debating the direction of the program and of its delivery format.

4. Accreditation

a) Is the program accredited or certified? NO
b) By whom?
c) When is the next review?
d) When is the self-study due?
e) How has the most recent accreditation review affected the program?

5. Student/Faculty Recognition

a) Have students within the program received any special recognition or achievement?
b) Have faculty within the program received any special recognition or achievement?

> No new recognitions have been documented since the previous report.

6. **Student Engagement**

V. Academic Program Review Recommendations:

Please indicate the recommendations (enhancements or changes) made by APRC in the most recent review of the program by the APRC council. What actions have been taken in response to these recommendations?

From the November 27, 2001, APRC memorandum Applied Speech   Communication program recommendations:

> "The following steps need to be taken to maintain the program's quality.
>
> - Because a student can ladder into the B.S. program with an associate degree, the program should consider marketing the program to other two-year programs at FSU.
>   - ➢ Collaboration efforts are ongoing with other communication(s) programs at the University. Printing, TVP, Mass media, public relations and visual design are all programs in the dialogue.

> ➢ During the fall 2006 semester, Communication Program faculty, the Humanities Department Head, and members of the College of Business met on several occasions to share ideas regarding each group's programs. The COB solicited our input on new configurations of it Integrated Marketing program (and some COMM courses that are a part of that plan). The COB reciprocated when we shared some of our preliminary strategic planning ideas.
> ➢ With the addition of Dr. Matt Thatcher in Communication, we now have a Health Communication expert who is already helping our recruitment of students from Allied Health, especially students from the Dental Hygiene program.

a) Is volunteerism and student engagement a structured part of the program?

In the fall semester, COMH 121 engagement was a structured part of the courses that support the Honors Program

b) Does the program utilize service learning in the curriculum?

No

c) Does the program participate in the American Democracy Project?

Yes, several of our Communication courses are active in the Political Engagement Project: COMM 385: Broadcast Writing; COMM 251: Argumentation and Debate; COMM 365: Intercultural Communication; COMM 121: Patten's Public Speaking; COMM 390: Political Communication. Additionally, the Communication Program hosted a campus-wide speech contest, the theme of which was political engagement.

Areas of Strength:

The program has a number of important strengths:

- It is central to Ferris' mission.
- The program utilizes already existing courses also included in many other degree programs and general education
- It provides a service to the state and nation by placement of its graduates.
- The faculty is experienced, well qualified, active in professional organizations, and involved in publishing scholarly works.

Areas of Concern (and proposed actions to address them)

- The increasing reliance on temporary faculty who are not expected advise, or take ownership of any part of the program. This issue will be resolved by a combination of effective scheduling and the hiring of additional tenure-track faculty.
- Low enrollment in courses: Several three-hundred level courses are seeing lower enrollment. It is hoped that by offering fewer of these courses in a given semester

167

that students will be guided into the remaining course, thus increasing productivity there.

- There appears to be a lack of progress in assessing courses, general education, and the program. It is hoped that with the addition of the strategic planning project taking place department wide, with the creation of a Humanities Department Assessment Committee, and with the APR due this year, that strides will be made toward creating a more effective assessment/decision structure.

Future Goals:
- Establish clear, on-going assessment of the program, of the courses, and of General Education with the Communication Program
- Increased dialogue with programs in Allied Health and the College of Business.
- Work carefully to schedule the appropriate number of electives and core courses.

Other Recommendations:

- Create a smooth transition as Liz Wilson takes over the Program Coordinator role vacated by Sandy Alspach.

Utilize the strategic planning process to rethink or refocus the various program requirements, perhaps by creating recommended concentrations or pathways.

Yearly Administrative Review: December 2006   Program: COMM B.A.

Purpose of Administrative Program Review

> 4. to facilitate a process led by the deans and department heads/chairs to assess and evaluate programs under their supervision
> 5. to facilitate long term planning and recommendations to the VPAA
> 6. to collect and analyze information that will be useful in the University's accreditation efforts; Academic Program Review deliberation; and assessment.

Instructions: Please prepare a report following the outline below.

V.   Summary of Modifications since last report:

Please provide a brief summary of the changes that have taken place in the program since the last report. There have been no significant changes in the B.A. in Communication program since the last report.

VI.   Program Assessment/Assessment of Student Learning

c) What are the program's learning outcomes?

Graduates from the COMM B.A. Program should be able to:

18. demonstrate understanding of the human communication process; including message construction, dissemination, and interpretation
19. demonstrate understanding of how messages construct personal identity

20. demonstrate the ability to interact appropriately and effectively with another person, both verbally and nonverbally (COMM 105: Interpersonal Communication and COMM 200: Foundations of Interpersonal Communication)
21. demonstrate the ability to construct appropriately and deliver effectively a public speech (COMM 121: Public Speaking and COMM 201: Public Presentation Practicum)
22. demonstrate the ability to participate appropriately and effectively in performing a group problem solving activity (COMM 221: Small Group Decision Making and COMM 421: Leadership in Small Group Communication)
23. demonstrate understanding of how communication theories inform research and build knowledge in the field (COMM 299: Theories of Human Communication)
24. demonstrate understanding of how research is conducted in communication (COMM 300: Applied Research Methods of Communication)
25. demonstrate understanding of and ability to participate appropriately and effectively in organizational settings (COMM 380: Organizational Communication and COMM 499)
26. demonstrate understanding of and ability to participate appropriately and effectively with people from different cultural backgrounds (COMM 365: Intercultural Communication)
27. demonstrate understanding of legal and ethical principles governing appropriate and effective communication (COMM 460: Communication Rights and Responsibilities)
28. Demonstrate successful application of communication skills and knowledge (Graded Internships and COMM 499)

d) What assessment measures are used, both direct and indirect?

There are several points in the Program where assessment is or soon will be taking place. First, given that many students take the COMM 101 course at the beginning of their studies, then COMM 299 midway through the program, and cap their studies in COMM 499, it makes sense to use each of these courses to gage student progress toward the program outcomes. Various assignments and projects along the way can easily be adapted to collect useful assessment data.

For example, this fall's graduating seniors in COMM 499 devised and administered tests to themselves in the content supposedly covered in Interpersonal, Public Speaking, and Small Group Decision Making. Such an approach, combined with a similar test in COMM 101 and COMM 299, can serve as a kind or pre/post-test analysis. While some data can be collected at this point, there is no official oversight or clear sharing of this information.

There are also small groups of faculty in the process of gathering information on the three foundation courses.

Other feedback mechanisms are in place related to the Graded Internships required in the program. For example, currently the Internship Coordinator receives three reports from the on-site internship supervisor and makes, when possible, one site visit with the supervisor and intern together. While such meetings have been conducted as part of the internship process, there does not appear to be a formal documentation, sharing, and discussing of that data among the program faculty.

It is hoped that by the end of the spring 2007 semester, a comprehensive and organized assessment plan will be in place for both the General Education Communication courses and for the Communication Program.

f) What is the assessment cycle for the program?

Communication students will be assessed relative to the basic skills covered in COMM 105, 121, and 221 in their assignments in COMM 299 (this course provides a midpoint between the freshmen orientation class (COMM 101) and the senior capstone class (COMM 499). While students completing the associates degree and students enrolled in one of the bachelor degrees both take this one course, the course itself provides an opportunity to view the skills assumed to be covered in the three foundation courses (105, 121, and 221) . This fall COMM 299 was cancelled due to low enrollment; however, there are 30 students already enrolled for the course in spring 2007. Assessment of these courses also falls under the General Education assessment cycle, and the Humanities Department will be conducting during 2007 a wide ranging assessment of all of its General Education offerings.

While there is debate ongoing regarding the effective scheduling of COMM 499, a debate over how many times per year the course should be offered, it is clear that the course itself provides an excellent opportunity to assess the Program outcomes in graduating seniors. There are 11 students enrolled for the spring 2007 semester.

The Communication Programs are under the Academic Program Review this year, and the draft report is due in June, 2007.

g) What assessment data were collected in the past year?
Since the last report in March, only minimal new data has been gathered. The cancellation of COMM 299 this fall hurt the collection of data; however, the students enrolled in the fall section of COMM 499 have produced a report regarding the effectiveness of the Communication Program. That report was submitted the week of final examinations. Thus, the details have yet to be studied closely or shared with the wider Communication faculty.

h) How have assessment data been used for programmatic or curricular change?
Assessment of the data is forthcoming.

VII.   Course Outcomes Assessment

c) Do all multi-sectioned courses have common outcomes?

COMM 105, COMM 121, COMM 221 contain the outcomes required for General Education courses. All syllabi have been reviewed to insure the presence of outcomes.

If not, how do you plan to address discrepancies?

d) How do individual course outcomes meet programmatic goals?

   One of the interesting features of the three foundation courses is that they will be assessed in the future from two points of view. On the one hand, these courses will be reviewed for the effectiveness in meeting the General Education outcomes. On the other hand, these courses will be assessed for their ability to provide the foundation for study in the upper-level Communication Program courses. Thus, the general education outcomes do represent in some way the foundational skills required for the more specialized study in the higher electives and required courses in the Communication Program. Most other Communication courses are not offered in multiple sections.

VIII. Program Features

6. Advisory Board

d) Does the program have a board/committee? When did it last meet? When were new members last appointed? What is the composition of the committee (how many alumni, workplace representatives, academic representatives, etc.)

   The Communication Program does maintain an active advisory board. The board met this October, and a new member was introduced at that meeting. The current configuration of the Board is three Ferris State University alumni (not all in COMM), six members of the professional work force, and one faculty member (the Program Coordinator). The meeting this fall provided an opportunity for the new Department Head to meet the board, a variety of faculty to interact with the members, and for University administrators to share their visions with the Board. The Board was also introduced to the strategic planning process for the Department of Humanities and the upcoming APRC Report that would involve their contributions and insights.

e) If no advisory board exists, please explain by what means faculty receive advice from employers and outside professionals to inform decisions within the program.

f) Has feedback from the Advisory Board affected programmatic or curricular change?

   Historically, the ideas of the Advisory Board have been incorporated in program modifications, and the Program looks forward to seeing the results of the survey that the Board members are in the process of completing.

7. Internships/Cooperative or Experiential Learning

a. Is an internship required or recommended?
   Recommended

b) If the internship is only recommended, what percentage of majors elect the internship option?

   Very few

c) What challenges does the program face in regard to internships? What is being done to address these concerns?

> Not know at this time

d) Do you seek feedback from internship supervisors?

> If so, does that feedback affect pedagogical or curricular change?
>> For those that intern, the communication area received regular feedback from supervisors and respects the comments that the internship supervisors provide

e) Do you seek feedback from internship supervisors?

> If so, does that feedback affect pedagogical or curricular change?
> The current Internship Coordinator requires three written reports from the on-site internship supervisor and attempts to make one on-site visit with each intern and supervisor. As a result of some feedback, the current Internship Coordinator this semester has begun using WebCt to facilitate communication with and among the interns.

8. On-Line Courses
f) Please list the web-based courses, both partial internet and fully online, offered last year.

> A variety of COMM courses make use of WebCT technology. This summer
COMM 221 was delivered successfully on-line for the second summer

g) What challenges and/or opportunities has web-based instruction created?

> Human communication and personal interaction make on-line delivery difficult, especially in performance courses, and there is a debate among faculty regarding the appropriateness of on-line delivery for some of these courses.

h) What faculty development opportunities have been encouraged/required in order to enhance web-based learning within the program?

> No current initiatives are in place at the Program or Department level that directly impact these courses.

i) How has student feed-back been used to enhance course delivery?

> Donna Smith has retooled several modules and included additional analysis of the individual students group work in their off-campus location.

j) Is there any plan to offer this program on-line? If yes, what rationale is there to offer this program online?" (emerging market opportunity?, expand enrollment?, demand for niche program offering?, etc.)

> Currently, as part of a strategic planning effort on behalf of the department head, the faculty in Communication are debating the direction of the program and of its delivery format.

9. Accreditation
f) Is the program accredited or certified? NO
g) By whom?

172

h) When is the next review?
i) When is the self-study due?
j) How has the most recent accreditation review affected the program?

10. Student/Faculty Recognition
d) Have students within the program received any special recognition or achievement?
e) Have faculty within the program received any special recognition or achievement?
   No new recognitions have been documented since the previous report.

6. **Student Engagement**

V.   Academic Program Review Recommendations:
Please indicate the recommendations (enhancements or changes) made by APRC in the most recent review of the program by the APRC council. What actions have been taken in response to these recommendations?

From the November 27, 2001, APRC memorandum Applied Speech   Communication program recommendations:
   "The following steps need to be taken to maintain the program's quality.
   - Because a student can ladder into the B.S. program with an associate degree, the program should consider marketing the program to other two-year programs at FSU.
      ➢ Collaboration efforts are ongoing with other communication(s) programs at the University. Printing, TVP, Mass media, public relations and visual design are all programs in the dialogue.
      ➢ During the fall 2006 semester, Communication Program faculty, the Humanities Department Head, and members of the College of Business met on several occasions to share ideas regarding each group's programs. The COB solicited our input on new configurations of it Integrated Marketing program (and some COMM courses that are a part of that plan). The COB reciprocated when we shared some of our preliminary strategic planning ideas.
      ➢ With the addition of Dr. Matt Thatcher in Communication, we now have a Health Communication expert who is already helping our recruitment of students from Allied Health, especially students from the Dental Hygiene program.

a) Is volunteerism and student engagement a structured part of the program?
   In the fall semester, COMH 121 engagement was a structured part of the courses that support the Honors Program

b) Does the program utilize service learning in the curriculum?
   No
f) Does the program participate in the American Democracy Project?
   Yes, several of our Communication courses are active in the Political Engagement
   Project: COMM 385: Broadcast Writing; COMM 251: Argumentation and Debate; COMM

173

365: Intercultural Communication; COMM 121: Patten's Public Speaking; COMM 390: Political Communication. Additionally, the Communication Program hosted a campus-wide speech contest, the theme of which was political engagement.

Areas of Strength:
The program has a number of important strengths:
- It is central to Ferris' mission.
- The program utilizes already existing courses also included in many other degree programs and general education
- It provides a service to the state and nation by placement of its graduates.
- The faculty is experienced, well qualified, active in professional organizations, and involved in publishing scholarly works.

Areas of Concern (and proposed actions to address them)
- The increasing reliance on temporary faculty who are not expected advise, or take ownership of any part of the program. This issue will be resolved by a combination of effective scheduling and the hiring of additional tenure-track faculty.
- Low enrollment in courses: Several three-hundred level courses are seeing lower enrollment. It is hoped that by offering fewer of these courses in a given semester that students will be guided into the remaining course, thus increasing productivity there.
- There appears to be a lack of progress in assessing courses, general education, and the program. It is hoped that with the addition of the strategic planning project taking place department wide, with the creation of a Humanities Department Assessment Committee, and with the APR due this year, that strides will be made toward creating a more effective assessment/decision structure.

Future Goals:
- Establish clear, on-going assessment of the program, of the courses, and of General Education with the Communication Program
- Increased dialogue with programs in Allied Health and the College of Business.
- Work carefully to schedule the appropriate number of electives and core courses.

Other Recommendations:

- Create a smooth transition as Liz Wilson takes over the Program Coordinator role vacated by Sandy Alspach.
- Utilize the strategic planning process to rethink or refocus the various program requirements, perhaps by creating recommended concentrations or pathways.

Yearly Administrative Review: December 2006   Program: COMM AA

Purpose of Administrative Program Review

> 7. to facilitate a process led by the deans and department heads/chairs to assess and evaluate programs under their supervision
> 8. to facilitate long term planning and recommendations to the VPAA
> 9. to collect and analyze information that will be useful in the University's accreditation efforts; Academic Program Review deliberation; and assessment.

Instructions: Please prepare a report following the outline below.

IX. Summary of Modifications since last report:

Please provide a brief summary of the changes that have taken place in the program since the last report. There have been no significant changes in the AA communication program since the last report.

X. Program Assessment/Assessment of Student Learning

e) What are the program's learning outcomes?

Graduates from the COMM AA program should be able to:

1. Demonstrate understanding of the human communication process; including message construction, dissemination, and interpretation
2. Demonstrate understanding of how messages construct personal identity
3. Demonstrate the ability to interact appropriately and effectively with another person, both verbally and nonverbally (COMM 105: Interpersonal Communication)
4. Demonstrate the ability to construct appropriately and deliver effectively a public speech (COMM 121: Public Speaking)
5. Demonstrate the ability to participate appropriately and effectively in performing a group problem solving activity (COMM 221: Small Group Decision Making)
6. Demonstrate understanding of how communication theories inform research and build knowledge in the field (COMM 299: Theories of Human Communication)
7. These courses help create the foundation of skills required for work in the B.A. and B.S. in Communication.

b) What assessment measures are used, both direct and indirect?
    Outcomes have been developed for the three primary communication skill sets of public speaking, small group communication and interpersonal communication. Some initial data has been collected but not yet reviewed.

i) What is the assessment cycle for the program?
    Communication students will be assessed relative to the basic skills covered in COMM 105, 121, and 221 in their assignments in COMM 299 (this course provides a midpoint between the freshmen orientation class (COMM 101) and the senior capstone class

(COMM 499). While students completing the associates degree and students enrolled in one of the bachelor degrees both take this one course, the course itself provides an opportunity to view the skills assumed to be covered in the three foundation courses (105, 121, and 221) . This fall COMM 299 was cancelled due to low enrollment; however, there are 30 students already enrolled for the course in spring 2007. Assessment of these courses also falls under the General Education assessment cycle, and the Humanities Department will be conducting during 2007 a wide ranging assessment of all of its General Education offerings.

j) What assessment data were collected in the past year?
    Some data from some sections of COMM 105, 121, or 221 was collected near the end of the fall term, but the analysis of the data will have to wait until next semester.

k) How have assessment data been used for programmatic or curricular change?
    Assessment of the data is forthcoming.

XI.   Course Outcomes Assessment

e) Do all multi-sectioned courses have common outcomes?
            COMM 105, COMM 121, COMM 221 contain the outcomes required for General Education courses. All syllabi have been reviewed to insure the presence of outcomes.

If not, how do you plan to address discrepancies?

f) How do individual course outcomes meet programmatic goals?
            One of the interesting features of the three foundation courses is that they will be assessed in the future from two points of view. On the one hand, these courses will be reviewed for the effectiveness in meeting the General Education outcomes. On the other hand, these courses will be assessed for their ability to provide the foundation for study in the upper-level Communication Program courses. Thus, the general education outcomes do represent in some way the foundational skills required for the more specialized study in the higher electives and required courses in the Communication Program

XII.   Program Features

11. Advisory Board
g) Does the program have a board/committee? When did it last meet? When were new members last appointed? What is the composition of the committee (how many alumni, workplace representatives, academic representatives, etc.)

        The Communication Program does maintain an active advisory board. The board met this October, and a new member was introduced at that meeting. The current configuration of the Board is three Ferris State University alumni (not all in COMM), six members of the professional work force, and one faculty member (the Program Coordinator). The meeting this fall provided an opportunity for the new Department Head to meet the board, a variety of faculty to interact with the members, and for University administrators to share their visions with the Board.

The Board was also introduced to the strategic planning process for the Department of Humanities and the upcoming APRC Report that would involve their contributions and insights.
  h) If no advisory board exists, please explain by what means faculty receive advice from employers and outside professionals to inform decisions within the program.
  i) Has feedback from the Advisory Board affected programmatic or curricular change?
    Historically, the ideas of the Advisory Board have been incorporated in program modifications, and the Program looks forward to seeing the results of the survey that the Board members are in the process of completing.

12. Internships/Cooperative or Experiential Learning
  e) Is an internship required or recommended?
    Associate degree to ladder into the BS degree (No internship for AA)
  f) If the internship is only recommended, what percentage of majors elect the internship option? It is not required nor recommended.

  g) What challenges does the program face in regard to internships? What is being done to address these concerns?

  h) Do you seek feedback from internship supervisors?
    If so, does that feedback affect pedagogical or curricular change?

13. On-Line Courses
  k) Please list the web-based courses, both partial internet and fully online, offered last year.
    A variety of COMM courses make use of WebCT technology. This summer COMM 221 was delivered successfully on-line for the second summer

  l) What challenges and/or opportunities has web-based instruction created?
    Human communication and personal interaction make on-line delivery difficult, especially in performance courses, and there is a debate among faculty regarding the appropriateness of on-line delivery for some of these courses.

  m) What faculty development opportunities have been encouraged/required in order to enhance web-based learning within the program?
    No current initiatives are in place at the Program or Department level that directly impact these courses.

  n) How has student feed-back been used to enhance course delivery?
    Donna Smith has retooled several modules and included additional analysis of the individual students group work in their off-campus location.
  o) Is there any plan to offer this program on-line? If yes, what rationale is there to offer this program online?" (emerging market opportunity?, expand enrollment?, demand for niche program offering?, etc.)
    Currently, as part of a strategic planning effort on behalf of the department head, the faculty in Communication are debating the direction of the program and of its delivery format.

14. Accreditation
  k) Is the program accredited or certified? NO
  l) By whom?
  m) When is the next review?
  n) When is the self-study due?
  o) How has the most recent accreditation review affected the program?

15. Student/Faculty Recognition
  g) Have students within the program received any special recognition or achievement?
  h) Have faculty within the program received any special recognition or achievement?
        No new recognitions have been documented since the previous report.

6. **Student Engagement**

V. Academic Program Review Recommendations:
Please indicate the recommendations (enhancements or changes) made by APRC in the most recent review of the program by the APRC council. What actions have been taken in response to these recommendations?

From the November 27, 2001, APRC memorandum Applied Speech   Communication program recommendations:

> "The following steps need to be taken to maintain the program's quality.
> - Because a student can ladder into the B.S. program with an associate degree, the program should consider marketing the program to other two-year programs at FSU.
>   - ➤ Collaboration efforts are ongoing with other communication(s) programs at the University. Printing, TVP, Mass media, public relations and visual design are all programs in the dialogue.
>   - ➤ During the fall 2006 semester, Communication Program faculty, the Humanities Department Head, and members of the College of Business met on several occasions to share ideas regarding each group's programs. The COB solicited our input on new configurations of it Integrated Marketing program (and some COMM courses that are a part of that plan). The COB reciprocated when we shared some of our preliminary strategic planning ideas.
>   - ➤ With the addition of Dr. Matt Thatcher in Communication, we now have a Health Communication expert who is already helping our recruitment of students from Allied Health, especially students from the Dental Hygiene program.

a) Is volunteerism and student engagement a structured part of the program?
    In the fall semester, COMH 121 engagement was a structured part of the courses that support the Honors Program

b) Does the program utilize service learning in the curriculum?
    No
i)   Does the program participate in the American Democracy Project?

Yes, several of our Communication courses are active in the Political Engagement Project: COMM 385: Broadcast Writing; COMM 251: Argumentation and Debate; COMM 365: Intercultural Communication; COMM 121: Patten's Public Speaking; COMM 390: Political Communication.

Areas of Strength:

The program has a number of important strengths:

- It is central to Ferris' mission.
- The program utilizes already existing courses also included in many other degree programs and general education
- It provides a service to the state and nation by placement of its graduates.
- The faculty is experienced, well qualified, active in professional organizations, and involved in publishing scholarly works.

Areas of Concern (and proposed actions to address them)

- The increasing reliance on temporary faculty who are not expected advise, or take ownership of any part of the program. This issue will be resolved by a combination of effective scheduling and the hiring of additional tenure-track faculty.
- Low enrollment in courses: Several three-hundred level courses are seeing lower enrollment. It is hoped that by offering fewer of these courses in a given semester that students will be guided into the remaining course, thus increasing productivity there.
- There appears to be a lack of progress in assessing courses, general education, and the program. It is hoped that with the addition of the strategic planning project taking place department wide, with the creation of a Humanities Department Assessment Committee, and with the APR due this year, that strides will be made toward creating a more effective assessment/decision structure.

Future Goals:

- Establish clear, on-going assessment of the program, of the courses, and of General Education with the Communication Program
- Increased dialogue with programs in Allied Health and the College of Business.
- Work carefully to schedule the appropriate number of electives and core courses.

Other Recommendations:

- Create a smooth transition as Liz Wilson takes over the Program Coordinator role vacated by Sandy Alspach.
- Utilize the strategic planning process to rethink or refocus the various program requirements, perhaps by creating recommended concentrations or pathways.