Specific Requests by the Reviewers

#1 Student and Faculty Statistical Summary:

Most of these data were already provided in the original report (see page 235). The only missing elements were the Instructional Costs per FTE, and the Instructional Costs per SCH. They are reproduced here in the format requested, along with some additional data: enrollment in the program since the data of the program review, and the number of communication majors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment in program for review Pd *</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment in program since review Pd **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>1145**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment/Attrition</td>
<td>+242</td>
<td>+259</td>
<td>-313</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>+974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Communication Majors***</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Costs per FTE</td>
<td>$2,049</td>
<td>$1,684</td>
<td>$2,035</td>
<td>$2,419</td>
<td>$2,630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Costs per SCH</td>
<td>$136.60</td>
<td>$112.27</td>
<td>$135.67</td>
<td>$161.27</td>
<td>$175.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data provided by Institutional Research when report was originally filed (Fall 2007). See pg. 235 of the report.

** Data for years 2007-2008 and 2008-09 (YTD) are provided FYI only, not as part of the program review, and 2008-09 data is for summer and fall only—not for the entire year.

*** Number of majors was not requested as part of this response, but is provided as important additional data.

It should be noted that the years 2003-05 and 2007-09 show significantly increased enrollment numbers. This is primarily because of the addition of B.S. programs in those years. The CNM degree in the first instance, and the new Communication degree and emphases in the latter.

#2 Program Strengths Identified by Reviewers

The strengths identified by the reviewers are nearly identical to those provided by the department in the program review (see pages 224-230). While we agree with their conclusions, we find it disappointing that they rated the program’s achievements as only “acceptable.” We are left to wonder what was missing in a program that they describe as having “a quality, solid core curriculum,” a “wide array of specializations with corresponding practical experience,” a “strong focus on student development and growth,” and a “good reputation with graduates of the program and with the community.”

#3 Areas for Improvement Identified by the Reviewer:

Here again, the areas for improvement listed by the reviewers are nearly identical to the ones provided by the department in the program review (p. 243). And none of these are in the control of the department or its faculty; they are external situations that can only be resolved by institution through additional budget allocation.
1. Find a facility that can comfortably house all faculty and staff... As noted in the program review (pp. 214-215), this is already being done with the remodeling of the Jennings Building.

2. Hire at least one additional full-time faculty member who can expand course offerings in theory, mass comm, and criticism... As noted in the program review (pp. 3-11), the course offerings have already been significantly expanded by the addition of 24 new lower- and upper-division courses in comm theory and practice (see page 224).

We have asked for but not received additional faculty (pp. 207, 237), so we sought to cover the need by hiring a non-tenure track faculty member through our Degree-Completion Program. Since all tracks have complete curricular integrity, adding further courses would be only electives unless another emphasis were added, and it is not likely under current budget conditions that the college will provide more faculty.

3. Develop outreach programs to attract potential students... We believe that we are already doing more than most departments in this area. During the final year of the review period we assigned three faculty to work on recruiting as part of their load, and they did a superb job. We have since added two lecturer/advisors who actively recruit majors through all available means. We actively promote our Degree Completion Program in the community and have recruited two cohorts through that effort. The excellent community relations mentioned on page 241 (bottom paragraph) have not diminished.

4. Specific ideas for converging and idea sharing... We are not sure what is being suggested here, since we hold monthly departmental meetings where this kind of interchange takes place. We also hold retreats in the Fall and at Christmas-time to build faculty solidarity. Another review mentioned avoiding creating demoralized faculty and we believe that the comments on page 225, final three paragraphs, demonstrate that we have no significant problem in this area. Our espirit d’courage has been very good.

5. Increase support staff... Amen (see page 231). We are still functioning with one part-time secretary even though our program has nearly tripled in size over the past two years.

6. Continue to seek funding... The department has acknowledged the needs (p. 237, 232-236) and has (and is) actively seeking funding from a variety of donors (in cooperation with Institutional Development) and through innovative entrepreneurial programs like the Dick Nourse Center for Media Innovation and the Degree Completion program, both of which are self-funding.

7. Encourage faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees... See page 239, paragraph 6, and page 207.
8. *Monitor and refine assessment*… See page 165 and more than 50 pages of assessment reports that follow. One reviewer called our procedure “weak” and we decidedly disagree. We monitor every class, every semester and adjust curriculum accordingly.

**#4 Response to Specific Recommendations of Prior Program review.** See pages 239-241, 243.

**#5 Specific Commendations:** See #1 above for our comments on what the reviewers found were our strengths.

**#6 Program Action Plan and Goals in Response to Review:** See the summary on page 243, along with the comments throughout this response document.