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I. Mission

(The mission statement was revised this year for students’ understanding and application of the mission statement. This statement as well as the learning objectives will be posted in the MVC Catalog.)

From: The Speech Communication Program supports Valley’s mission statement in that it provides students with the core communication skills necessary to succeed through examination of intrapersonal and interpersonal communication and the theories associated with that examination process.

To: The Speech Communication program’s mission is to provide students with an experiential environment dedicated to improving their communication skills. The program is dedicated to exploring the impact and value of communication for individuals, organizations, and societies. This program has wide applicability and prepares students to enter careers and graduate studies in such areas as public relations, business, law, and social media as well as any employment requiring communication skills.

II. Goals

A. Assist the students enrolled in the Speech Communication Program to increase their professional skills and marketability in a related field by
   a. Increasing students’ understanding on the use of the following communication theories (intrapersonal, interpersonal, public, nonverbal and group communication) evidenced through the Program Evaluation.
   b. Placing 98% of our eligible graduates in jobs and/or graduate studies within 6 months of graduation.

B. To grow our major by 10% to the program in five years by
   a. Remarketing the major with Public Relations and enlisting the assistance of the admissions office.
   b. Continue to work with admissions to recruit new students.

C. To enable students to participate in communication aspects of the college campus by
   a. Designing and conducting a communication event associated with a campus event during their capstone course in the program.

D. To extend our major by
   a. Researching and implementing other programs for Missouri Valley College which utilize the speech communication major.
   b. Researching and implementing or up-dating other courses strengthening communication skills.
III. Student Learning Outcomes

Likewise, Student Learning Outcomes for our speech major was revised for student publication in the MVC Catalog.

From:

1. Ability to think critically using good communication skills.
2. Analyze effective interpersonal communication skills in different settings.
3. Evaluate and demonstrate key components of management and leadership skills in business settings.
4. Understand the impact of social media and apply this knowledge to business settings.
5. Understand and create effective persuasive messages in media advertising and social media, using constructive presentational skills.

Student Learning Outcomes were revised this year to reflect a clearer articulation of the five areas of studies in speech communication: fundamental principles, presentation, interpretation, argumentation principles, and interpersonal/group communication.

IV. Course Map

New course map for 2013-14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>#1 Critical Thinking</th>
<th>#2 IPC Skills</th>
<th>#3 Management Leadership</th>
<th>#4 Social Media/Business</th>
<th>#5 Persuasive messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL 110</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 104</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP 100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP 221</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 325</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 385</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 405</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 415</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 420</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 485</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 212</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Assessment Tools

A. Knowledge Assessment Survey
   1. This assessment is given during SP485. This assessment is designed to evaluate the depth of the students’ comprehensive knowledge and understanding of all five of the student learning outcomes: Fundamentals of Communication, Presentation, Interpretation, Argumentation, and Interpersonal/group.

B. Major Program Portfolio
   1. To measure SLO #2, the SP485 students are expected to complete a research paper or a campus communication project to demonstrate skills and knowledge gained from program. Students must submit an outline of the project including an introduction, survey of literature, research questions, results and discussion, and summary, along with a portfolio demonstrating the learning outcomes. Student will be graded by a panel of their instructors and an outside adjudicator (if available) using a rubric supplied for this project.

C. Student Course Evaluations
   1. Many changes in the program are made as a result of student evaluations of the teacher and/or class structure. In my SP100 Public Speaking course, I will be developing learning pods to my course as a result of student comments during peer review. Students commented on other students’ strengths/weaknesses in certain areas resulting in peer assistance.

D. Career Evaluations
   1. E-mail contact has provided information regarding employment placement with our graduates within their focus areas. Within one year of graduations, students will evaluate all five of the program’s outcomes. This information revealed that our graduate from last year has been gainfully employed in the communication field, serving as an interpreter for a company.

VI. Summary of Findings

No changes due to no graduates for the 2013-14 academic year.

A. Knowledge Assessment Survey
   1. This assessment is given during SP485 and designed to evaluate the depth of the students’ comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the designated learning outcomes. This assessment tool has been in place since 2008 with some revisions.
i. Finding 1: With the average mean of 3.38 of the previous graduates on this assessment, our one 2013 graduate scored an average mean of 5.34. A gain of 1.96 over last graduates’ average.

ii. Finding 2: Comparisons of increased knowledge over last graduating class (this chart remains the same as last year as there were no graduates this year):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Last graduates mean scores</th>
<th>2013 graduate scores</th>
<th>+Gain, 0 Same, -Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1 Fund</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>+2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2 Pres</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>+1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3 OI</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>+1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Debate</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>+1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 IPC</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>+1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Major Program Portfolio
1. No graduates this year. The result of last year’s report: Our 2013 graduate chose to present a project this year was comparing and contrasting phonemes used in both the Japanese dialect and the Standard American dialect using representatives from both. The 2 professors evaluating this project indicated thorough research conducted according the main phonemes representing the dialect changes. Student was able to identify both changes, but with some work needed with the L’s and R’s. Average rubric scores of evaluators: 4.82 out of 5.00.

C. Student Course Evaluations
1. Changes in courses are made as a result of student evaluations of the teacher and/or class structure. Due to the student response during peer review of speech outlines, changes are being made to the public speaking course by adding learning pods.

2. Due to the fact that international students’ seem to be drawn to this area, I have developed several meetings with current faculty to pursue possibilities of developing other extensions of the major in speech communication to gain awareness of the program available. A program draft has been made to develop an intercultural communication degree. We will present that proposal to the curriculum committee for approval this fall.

D. Career Evaluations
1. Facebook contact has provided information regarding employment placement with our graduates within their focus areas. Developed for post graduate speech students to
get perspective of the major after graduation of Missouri Valley College. Have located four graduates: 1 has enrolled in graduate school to further study in communication; 2 are gainfully employed using their degrees in communication (both international students); 1 student is employed but not using the speech degree.

E. Indirect Methods
1. Students’ growth can be visible as a result of observation within courses as students’ progress through their studies.

2. Two years ago, a small group of faculty along with Joby Raines, Attorney at Law, were consulted regarding the possibilities of offering a pre-law degree. Mr. Raines felt this would be a positive move for Valley; however, some members of the group felt a pre-law degree was not necessary, so the possibility was tabled until further research could become more convincing. No further research has been conducted. Possibly, a new approach to this might be developing a pre-law program with the requirement that the major requires a double major. We will pursue this.

3. The admissions office is interested in the idea of developing a cultural communication major. We are exploring the feasibility of this, as I believe it is a field which could be very marketable on campus. A couple of possibilities:

i. "Interpreters work in spoken or sign language, while translators work in written language. The outlook for these type of jobs are: 42% (much faster than average)." [http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Media-and-Communication/Interpreters-and-translators.htm](http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Media-and-Communication/Interpreters-and-translators.htm)

ii. "The minimum educational requirement to enjoy a career in Intercultural Studies is a bachelor's degree; however, many of the professionals in this field hold a master's degree or above. Coursework in the field of Intercultural Studies may include the study of ancient civilizations, art and art appreciation, foreign language, literature and religion. Due to the fluid nature of this degree, some colleges allow the Intercultural Studies student to create their own course of studies within the school's academic guidelines." [http://education-portal.com/articles/Intercultural_Studies_Professional_Job_Outlook_and_Requirements_for_a_Career_in_Intercultural_Studies.html](http://education-portal.com/articles/Intercultural_Studies_Professional_Job_Outlook_and_Requirements_for_a_Career_in_Intercultural_Studies.html)

4. This major is currently being reviewed by the divisions and will be sent to curriculum in the fall.

F. Levels of Achievement of Student Learning Outcomes.
G. No graduate this year; so I am leaving in the findings from last year: Only one graduate …; however, an increase in all five SLO’s are evident over the past graduates. This was an overall gain of 1.35 from the last graduates; however, the knowledge rate continues to grow with a 3.21 since it was first administered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Knowledge Increase Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VII. Analysis/Interpretation**

Positive strides have been achieved. The overall assessment continues to produce better learning and has recruited additional majors to the program.

- **Learning Objective Assessment Survey**
  - Again no graduate this year. Last year’s report: Student was dedicated to education and was the only graduate in the program this year, making it difficult to assess why the dramatic increase. Solid reasons for the dramatic result cannot be determined. However in the past the assessment results were:
    a. **Overall Goal:** The goal to achieve an overall gain of a 2.0 was surpassed in the Knowledge Assessment Survey with a gain of 3.21. It is suspected the student’s abilities exceeded most students. Hopefully, the gain was attributed in part to the program and the assessments used and the changes made to the program.
    b. In comparison, in 2010, three graduates completed the assessment survey with an average gain of 1.11 over the 2006-7 assessment report.
    c. **Area of most gain:** Specific to Goal #2: Presentation—specific to the Rhetorical Strategies applied to message formation. Gain of a 3.1 over the 2006-7 assessment report.
    d. **Area of least gain:** Specific to Goal #3: Oral Interpretation—specific to the role of communication in creating meaning and influencing individuals and groups. Gain of a .3 over the 2006-7 assessment report.

- **Major Program Assessments**
  - **No** graduate this year. Last year’s report: … the program assessment was based on a rubric for the final paper or project (in this case, a project) chosen by the student. Japanese and Standard American Dialectal Phoneme Study was conducted with an average result 4.82/5.00 from two professors assessment. Which she is now employed as an Interpreter in Japan.

  e. **Overall Goal:** To achieve a successful portfolio deeming the merits of the senior’s committee consisting of an outside adjudicator (when available) within their specific field of study. Outside adjudicator will be supplied with a rubric.

- **Dean/Chair and Teacher Evaluations**

- 6) **Overall Goal:** To continue to improve teaching methods through written evaluations. Method tends to be an adequate form of assessing teaching methods and directions for courses.
- **CAO Course Evaluation:** Scoring remains high in the evaluation process. My teaching evaluation was at a 5.0.
- Students respond to the written administrative evaluations with an average score of a 1.11. In addition, administration requests written feedback online. Responding percentages through the system, ratio a couple of students responded. Responses were overall positive with one comment indicating I can be confusing at times.
- Student evaluations average = 1.11
- Student response for excellent faculty: “We had to give a variety of speeches throughout the semester and received feedback for all of them. I like the way she teaches and how we do the speeches. I feel like this class has helped me a lot with my public speaking”.

  o **Career Evaluations**
    - Last year’s graduating senior is attending graduate studies in International Communications in the fall and is now employed as an interpreter.
      a. Overall Goal: 100% of graduating seniors will find placement within six months of graduation.
      b. 100% of prior seniors have landed gainful employment or successfully enrolled in graduate studies within 6 months of graduation.
    - Using social media tools we developed a survey rubric for our alumni was developed to determine employment and educational levels achieved. All students are employed by the same companies; however, one student just successfully completed her master’s degree in communication.

  o **Indirect Methods**
    - Attending the STAM conference where many good workshops are provided for improving teaching methods and updating teaching methods to the program. Every year opportunities exist to incorporate new ideas into the program. Using a variety of applications for course work was addressed in the conference. I have incorporated some of these applications to my classroom setting.

- **VIII. Action Plan**

  A. Since our division has been actively working with the admissions department, 1 new incoming student is intending to major in speech communication was recruited last year. Even though, this is just one student, we have never recruited a new freshman for this major. This is encouraging. We will continue to work with our admissions staff to attract more students to this program.

  B. The communications division evaluated the possibility of joining the Public Relations major with the Speech Communication major and forming two concentrations under one major. This again, did not pass within the division.

  C. We did however, examine the addition of a new major, Intercultural Communication. A committee developed a core set of requirements. This will go to curriculum this fall.

Actions for growing program:
a. To grow the major or extend the major by 10 students by 2016.
   1. Program will accomplish this by:
      a. Working with admissions.
   b. To improve the growth of the Knowledge Assessment Survey from a 1.7 in Knowledge to a 2.0. (Last year it increased to a 3.21. This exceeded the plan for growth of 2.0. Another positive movement in the programs improvements.)
      1. Program will accomplish this by:
         a. Through examining the new SLO rubric and implementing and aligning more assignments specific to each SLO.
   c. To continue to get other majors to adopt communication courses within their core curriculum
      1. Program will accomplish this by:
         a. Promoting new areas of study within the communications field.
         b. Promoting the new program if passed
   d. To increase awareness of the major on campus.
      1. Program will accomplish this by:
         a. Continue to assist in recruitment strategies.

IX.) Faculty/Course/Student Information

Table 1. Program Faculty and Loads
Program faculty are those who taught at least one course in the program in the past year.

*The definition of ‘full-time’ for this table coincides with our standard MVC definition. Include all full-time faculty who taught in the program regardless of their division affiliation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th># credit hours taught in program in past year</th>
<th># of advisees</th>
<th>Years of teaching and/or professional experience</th>
<th>Highest degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Dittmer</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15  15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADJUNCT

Include all adjunct faculty who taught at least one course in the program in the past year.

Speech 100 Adjunct not used to cover any course required for this major. However, those adjunct who assisted in teaching for the general education requirement were:

Wendy Leslie (cross-divisional English faculty)
Christine Carnes (adjunct faculty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th># credit hours taught in program in past year</th>
<th># of advisees</th>
<th>Years of teaching and/or professional experience</th>
<th>Highest degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Leslie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Carnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total credit hours

% of credit hours taught by adjuncts

Table 2. Course offerings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 100-200 level</th>
<th>Fall 300-400 level</th>
<th>Spring 100-200 level</th>
<th>Spring 300-400 level</th>
<th>Inter- sessions fall/spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face sections</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio sections*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships/practicums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab (face-to-face) sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education classes offered**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A studio class is defined as one that emphasizes skills and practical application, not lecture/discussion. Examples include studio art, performance theatre, and dance.

**Include all general education classes offered in your program area even if they are not part of the major requirements.

**Table 3. Student Profile**

Supply the numbers for each category in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall Male</th>
<th>Fall Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Spring Male</th>
<th>Spring Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating seniors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Two of the new majors were recruited through the SP 100 course this year.)

**X. Individuals Assisting with Plan**

Below: Please list all individuals who assisted in the completion of this report.
Susan Dittmer.