Mass Communication

Department of Mass Communication

Performance Objective 1 Increase enrollment, persistence, retention, and graduation rates for each program offered by the department.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Increase enrollment by 5% each year, overall and in each program offered by the department.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was track student enrollments at each level and in each concentration. Maintain or exceed 2014-2015 levels of declared majors:

- MCOM - BS Mass Communication
    - JOUR - Journalism
    - MEPR - Media Production (effective 201040; inactive effective 201540)
    - NMED - New Media (effective 201540)
    - PUBR - Public Relations
    - RDTV - Radio and Television (inactive effective 201040)
    - SLCM - Sales Communication (effective 201540)

1.1 Data

2013-2014:

Major	Conc.	Summer						Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
MCOM	JOUR	0	1	5	4	10	1	15	11	11	13	50	6	18	13	8	13	52	6
	MEPR	3	1	2	0	6	0	15	6	6	5	32	2	11	6	8	6	31	3
	PUBR	3	4	3	8	18	1	14	15	13	21	63	8	15	12	18	19	64	8
	RDTV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	1
Total		**6**	**6**	**10**	**12**	**34**	**2**	**44**	**33**	**30**	**42**	**149**	**17**	**44**	**31**	**34**	**40**	**149**	**18**

2014-2015:

Major	Conc.	Summer						Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
MCOM	JOUR	1	2	3	5	11	0	6	14	8	15	43	7	3	9	9	12	33	8
	MEPR	2	2	1	4	9	0	11	8	2	11	32	2	6	9	4	9	28	6
	PUBR	2	4	8	4	18	1	15	16	14	19	64	5	7	18	15	19	59	10
	RDTV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Total		**5**	**18**	**12**	**13**	**38**	**1**	**32**	**38**	**24**	**46**	**140**	**14**	**16**	**36**	**28**	**41**	**121**	**24**

2015-2016:

Major	Conc.	Summer						Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
MCOM	JOUR	1	0	2	2	5	0	11	5	10	6	32	3	12	5	10	6	33	4
	MEPR	1	1	2	1	5	0	1	6	5	5	17	3	0	4	5	2	11	1
	NMED	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	1	0	0	5	0	2	2	1	2	7	0
	PUBR	2	1	5	7	15	0	11	8	16	15	50	5	9	10	17	21	57	13
	SLCM	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	3	0
Total		**4**	**3**	**9**	**10**	**26**	**0**	**29**	**20**	**31**	**26**	**106**	**11**	**24**	**22**	**33**	**31**	**111**	**18**

2016-2017:

Major	Conc.	Summer						Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP

Major	Conc.	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
MCOM	JOUR	2	1	2	5	10	0	14	7	8	8	37	2	7	6	6	12	31	6
	MEPR	0	2	1	1	4	0	0	2	5	2	9	1	0	0	3	4	7	1
	NMED	1	0	1	0	2	0	8	0	0	2	10	0	5	3	2	3	13	2
	PUBR	1	1	5	10	17	0	15	7	13	18	53	8	10	16	10	18	54	10
	SLCM	1	1	1	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	5	1
	(blank)	2	0	1	4	7	0	3	1	1	4	9	0	2	1	0	2	5	0
Total		7	5	11	20	43	0	40	20	28	34	122	11	24	26	25	40	115	20

2017-2018:

Major	Conc.	Summer						Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
MCOM	JOUR	1	2	2	2	7	0	5	8	6	7	26	6	6	7	7	5	25	1
	MEPR	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	0	0	1	2	3	2
	NMED	0	0	0	2	2	0	5	3	2	2	12	0	2	6	2	4	14	2
	PUBR	0	0	3	5	9	0	7	17	9	12	45	6	4	12	14	12	42	6
	SLCM	1	1	1	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	5	1
	(blank)	1	1	0	1	3	0	2	0	1	3	6	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
Total		4	4	6	11	25	0	19	31	20	27	97	13	13	25	29	24	91	13

2018-2019:

Major	Conc.	Summer						Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
MCOM	JOUR	1	1	2	4	8	0	8	7	11	9	35	4	8	8	8	10	34	2
	MEPR	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NMED	0	1	1	1	3	0	6	7	4	2	19	0	5	5	4	3	17	1
	PUBR	2	0	5	3	10	0	8	10	14	11	43	2	11	10	11	16	48	8
	SLCM	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	2	0	2	3	7	1
	(blank)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		3	2	9	10	24	0	26	24	31	24	105	7	26	23	25	32	106	12

Percentage Change between 2017-2018:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
MCOM	2017	97	8.247%
	2018	105	
Total	**2017**	**97**	**8.247%**
	2018	**105**	

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
In 2015-2016 NMED and SLCM concentrations were added. 2015-2016 Mass Communication enrollments have declined when compared to previous years.

2017-2018:

The Media Production concentration was converted to the New Media concentration in 2015-2016, so those numbers will be dropping to zero soon. The remaining concentrations are also declining, with the exception of the New Media concentration. Since we do not offer many summer classes, Mass Comm majors rarely attend summer school, so those numbers have little meaning to us.

In an attempt to increase numbers, the department has participated in both the fall and spring senior visits to campus. The department will be starting a self-study in the fall 2018 semester to determine the reasons for the decline in numbers and examine ways to adapt the program to increase enrollment.

2018-2019:
From 2017-18 to 2018-19, enrollment in Mass Communication has increased by 16.483%. Looking at the specific concentrations, the enrollment is up in each of these:
Journalism – 25 to 34, 36%
Public Relations – 42 to 48, 14.29%
New Media – 14 to 17, 21.43%
Sales Communication – 5 to 7, 40%

The Media Production concentration was discontinued in 2015 in favor of New Media and has seen its last graduate. This concentration should now be reflected as inactive.

From 2014-15 to 2017-18, the department saw a decrease in enrollment from 149 to 91, or 38.93%. The total completers had a corresponding drop from 39 to 25, or 35%. This decrease in enrollment and corresponding decrease in total completers was due primarily to the following factors:
- The current Mass Communication department is a combination of the original Mass Communication department and the former Speech department. Hence much of the existing faculty is more comfortable teaching speech rather than mass communication.
- The faculty for the Mass Communication department in 2017-18 was down two professors and two tenured /tenure track positions. Limited numbers of prerequisite classes were able to be offered because upper level classes also had to be offered for those students graduating.

Actions that have been taken to improve enrollment due to these reasons are:
- Offering training for those faculty members without degrees in Mass Communication to increase the number of faculty in the department able to teach Mass Communication courses.
- Requesting permission to hire at least one tenure track faculty member in the field.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Increase enrollment by 10% each year.

- SCCM - PBC Strategic Corporate Communication (effective 201840)

2.1 Data

Special Undergraduate Enrollment:

Major	Conc.	2018-2019			2019-2020			2020-2021			2021-2022			2022-2023		
		U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S
SCCM	(blank)	0	1	0												

Special Undergraduate Completers:

Major	Conc.	2018-2019			2019-2020			2020-2021			2021-2022			2022-2023		
		U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S
SCCM	(blank)	0	0	0												

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:
We did not meet this benchmark. The students we had interested or enrolled in this program were not able to obtain financial aid. We did not realize that financial aid was unavailable for students enrolled in a PBC.

To increase enrollment in the PBC, we are determining a new target audience for the program who does not have the same needs for financial aid.

3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmarks:
- A persistence rate (retained students from fall Y1 to spring Y1) of 85%.
- A retention rate of 70% from Y1 to Y2.
- A retention rate of 55% from Y1 to Y3.
- A retention rate of 45% from Y1 to Y4.
- A 4-year graduation rate of 35%.
- A 5-year graduation rate of 40%.
- A 6-year graduation rate of 45%.

Major:
- MCOM - Bachelor of Science in Mass Communication

3.1 Data

2012:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MCOM	32*	Same	25	78.1	16	50.0	12	37.5	9	28.1	7	21.9	7	21.9	8	25.0
		Changed	3	9.4	6	18.8	10	31.3	10	31.3	3	9.4	6	18.8	7	21.9
		Total	**28**	**87.5**	**22**	**68.8**	**22**	**68.8**	**19**	**59.4**	**10**	**31.3**	**13**	**40.6**	**15**	**46.9**

*3 students were previously undeclared before declaring MCOM.

2013:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MCOM	30*	Same	26	86.7	18	60.0	12	40.0	13	43.3						
		Changed	3	10.0	6	20.0	10	33.3	6	20.0						
		Total	**29**	**96.7**	**24**	**80.0**	**22**	**73.3**	**19**	**63.3**						

*3 students were previously undeclared before declaring MCOM.

2014:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MCOM	13	Same	8	61.5	6	46.2	3	23.1	2	15.4						
		Changed	3	23.1	4	30.8	7	53.8	8	61.5						
		Total	**11**	**84.6**	**10**	**76.9**	**10**	**76.9**	**10**	**76.9**						

2015:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MCOM	20	Same	11	55.0	8	40.0	8	40.0	5	25.0						
		Changed	3	15.0	2	10.0	1	5.0	2	10.0						

			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%						
		Total	14	70.0	10	50.0	9	45.0	7	35.0						

2016:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MCOM	24	Same	17	70.8	11	45.8	9	37.5								
		Changed	1	4.2	3	12.5	4	16.7								
		Total	**18**	**75.0**	**14**	**58.3**	**13**	**54.2**								

2017:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MCOM	12	Same	12	100	9	75.0										
		Changed	0	0.0	2	16.7										
		Total	**12**	**100**	**11**	**91.7**										

2018:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MCOM	21	Same	19	90.5												
		Changed	0	0.0												
		Total	**19**	**90.5**												

2019:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MCOM		Same														
		Changed														
		Total														

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:
In examining the historical data, the total percentages have hovered around the benchmark, with the exception of 2015. 2015 seems to have been a particularly bad year for retention, but we have no data to explain why there was a sudden drop in that year.

Since we have not had this data in the past, we do not know what is impacting the persistence and retention rate. For our next reporting period, we will conduct research to see what impacts these rates.

Performance Objective 2 **Engage in collaborative ventures and campus and community activities which enhance economic development, cultural and artistic growth, and/or educational experiences for the SWLA region and beyond.**

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 50% of the full-time faculty serve in a voluntary capacity to community or state agencies and/or organizations.

1.1 Data

Academic Year	Faculty participating	
	#	%
2013-2014	—	50%
2014-2015	—	80%
2015-2016	—	70%
2016-2017	9/10	90%
2017-2018	5/10	50%
2018-2019	5/8	62.5%

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
We have met our level of achievement; however, two of the faculty members were new this year and needed more time for developing classes. We will continue to encourage community outreach activities.

2017-2018:
Two full-time faculty left during the year, so we have no data from them. In addition, two full-time faculty did not submit APR documentation to establish their participation, and one full-time faculty did not submit complete information that included this data. Part of the APR documentation for each faculty member includes a form that provides the information for this assessment.

We are currently undergoing a change of department head. The new department head will seek information on how to best gain compliance with APR requirements.

2018-2019:
62.5% of full-time faculty participated in some form of community service or professional service. We have met our benchmark of 50%. However, we continue to have a problem with faculty participating in the APR process. The three faculty members that did not participate in some form of service are also the three faculty members that did not participate in the APR process. It is entirely possible that these faculty have participated in service, but since they did not complete their APR documentation, there is no way to know.

During department meetings for Fall 2019, the department head has encouraged and explained the importance of participation in the APR process.

Performance Objective 3 **Demonstrate excellence in teaching in order to enhance student recruitment, retention, and graduation.**

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 70% of departmental faculty will meet or exceed the University SEI average.

1.1 Data

Academic Year	Faculty that met or exceeded SEI average	
	#	%
2013-2014	10/12	75.0%
2014-2015	9/12	92.3%
2015-2016	12/13	75.0%
2016-2017	9/12	83.3%
2017-2018	8/10	80.0%
2018-2019	7/8	87.5%

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
We have met our expected level of achievement and will continue monitoring.

2017-2018:
We have met our expected level of achievement for the benchmark. We would like to change this benchmark to include a qualitative analysis of areas that each individual faculty member should work on. The current person assigned to completing the master plan does not have access to the individual question scores for the faculty. However, this new benchmark will be able to be added for the 2018-2019 year, since that person will now have access to all SEI scores and comments.

2018-2019:
We have met our expected level of achievement for this benchmark. In a qualitative examination of items on which the faculty do not perform well, it was found that there was little difference between questions. If a faculty member does well on one question, that person also does well on all of the questions. If a faculty member does poorly on one question, that person does poorly on all questions.

Although most of the faculty did very well and all the questions scored highly, the one question that seemed to be the most problematic for the majority of the department was providing pertinent feedback on tests and assignments. This problem has been discussed with the faculty as a whole. We will see if this measure improves next year.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 90% of departmental faculty will meet or exceed 85% on additional SEI questions that are specific to the mass communication department.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 70% of departmental faculty will meet or exceed 85%.

2.1 Data

Academic Year	Faculty that met or exceeded 85%	
	#	%
2013-2014	—	93.3%
2014-2015	—	91.6%
2015-2016	—	100%
2016-2017	12/12	100%
2017-2018	9/10	90.0%
2018-2019	7/8	87.5%

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Faculty members do well on these departmental SEI questions, and we will raise the benchmark in 2017-2018 to 90% of faculty will meet or exceed 85% on those questions.

2017-2018:
The benchmark was raised to 90% of faculty will meet or exceed 85% on those questions. We have met our expected level of achievement for the benchmark.

We would like to change this benchmark to include a qualitative analysis of areas that each individual faculty member should work on. The current person assigned to completing the master plan does not have access to the individual question scores for the faculty. However, this new benchmark will be able to be added for the 2018-2019 year, since that person will now have access to all SEI scores and comments.

2018-2019:
We have not met our expected level of achievement for this benchmark. With our current number of full-time faculty members (eight), we would have to score 100% to meet this benchmark.

In a qualitative examination of items in which the faculty do not perform well, it was found that there was little difference between questions. If a faculty member does well on one question, that person also does well on all of the questions. If a faculty member does poorly on one question, that person does poorly on all questions.

Nearly all faculty scored high on these questions. The one question that could be improved on was the professor available for additional help. However, that really was only a consistent problem with one faculty member.

Performance Objective 4   Demonstrate commitment to research and creative and scholarly activity.

1   Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: A minimum of 25 items from the following list will be completed by faculty:
- Publish book, article, book chapter, or other similar professional writing.
- Present article, panel, or speech at convention.
- Chair or respond to a panel at a professional conference.
- Review of book, chapter, article, speech for a professional medium.
- Demonstrate progress in a stated research program or activity.
- Produce creative project, such as approved video production, web production, speech presentations and other similar projects.

1.1   Data

Academic Year	# of items completed
2013-2014	12
2014-2015	14
2015-2016	60
2016-2017	27
2017-2018	40
2018-2019	55

1.1.1   Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
We are continuing to examine better methods of reporting for this category. We are also re-examining what items are included in this list vs. what items are excluded. This number reflects an improvement from last year.
We believe that the early low numbers stemmed from a problem with the reporting of the data for Master Plan purposes, rather than a problem with the productivity of the department.

Clarification of 2016-2017 data: We believe that the numbers lower than our benchmark data in 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 was a problem with reporting. We met our benchmark for 2016-2017.

2017-2018:
The Department of Mass Communication consists of eight full-time faculty members. Of these faculty members, two are tenured and six are instructors. Of the two tenured faculty members, one has significant administrative duties. We have met our benchmark for this year.

Our plan for the future is to determine a reasonable amount of research and what should and should not constitute research for instructors, since this is what our faculty primarily consists of.

2018-2019:
As previously stated, the department consists of six instructors. The research requirements for instructors needs to be clarified University-wide. Our interpretation of acceptable research is not necessarily the same as the above benchmark. In the faculty's self-reported numbers, the benchmark was met.

In attempting to compile a list of the pertinent items for this report, it was discovered that there are some inconsistencies in how individuals are reporting information. The information from this report is taken from a separate list that individuals respond to for their APR. This form is attached. It has become apparent that not everyone in the department is defining "scholarly or creative work" the same way. This will be clarified for next year's reporting.

Master Plan form   [PDF 38 KB 9/17/19]

Performance Objective 5 Curriculum Development

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Program Curriculum Committee faculty meet three times per academic year to review student progress, curricular offerings, and appropriate professional contacts and opportunities.

1.1 Data

2016-2017:
This is a new assessment. We did not track this information last year. The Curriculum Committee met twice last year, but no formal minutes were taken. In the future, minutes will be kept in the departmental office.

2017-2018
The committee met twice formally, but discussions were held informally via email with members of the committee. The curriculum committee met to examine the curriculum. With decreases in enrollment, the faculty decided that the department needed to meet an additional market. It was decided that their was an underserved market of post-baccalaureate students that would benefit from additional skills in communication.

The department recently moved from offices. Unfortunately, some of the department's paperwork, including the minutes to these meetings, was lost in the move.

2018-2019:
The curriculum committee met three times during the 2018-19 academic year. The minutes for the last two meetings are attached. The first meeting was a brainstorming session in which no minutes were kept.

3-8-19 Curriculum Committee Meeting minutes   [DOCX 20 KB 9/17/19]

Curriculum Committee meeting 2-6-19   [DOCX 22 KB 9/17/19]

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
The curriculum committee made major revisions to the mass communication curriculum and decided to meet again to make changes to the three concentrations for next years catalog.

2017-2018
The curriculum committee added a Post Baccalaureate Certificate in Strategic Corporate Communication to reach an additional market. Specifics on the certificate are attached. The committee also made revisions to the four concentrations under the BS in Mass Communication to make the concentrations more consistent with each other.

The committee met twice formally, but discussions were held informally via email with members of the committee. The department recently moved from offices. Unfortunately, some of the department's paperwork, including the minutes to these meetings, was lost in the move.

2018-2019:
The curriculum committee discussed the future of the field and the necessary student learning outcomes related to this. We also discussed the current standards of accreditation in the field. The committee decided to add an assessment to the BS in Mass Communication program master plan examining career preparation. The wording and benchmark for this are still being determined.

Curriculum Changes   [PDF 426 KB 1/28/19]

Performance Objective 6 Students will connect learning with professional experiences through learning experiences outside of the classroom.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 90% of graduating seniors will complete at least three credit hours of internship experience.

1.1 Data

Academic Year	Students that completed at least three hours of internship	
	#	%
2014-2015	42/42	100%
2015-2016	30/30	100%
2016-2017	32/32	100%
2017-2018	29/29	100%
2018-2019	19/19	100%

Reported data is the number of graduating students for the academic year that have completed an internship. The internship is not necessarily completed during their senior year.

MCOM Internships [XLSX 42 KB 9/17/19]

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Benchmark met. Continue current efforts to provide students with internship opportunities.

2017-2018:
At the request of IRE, we will track information to add to the report about the types and locations of internships in which students participate.

2018-2019:
Since we are reporting how many of the students graduating had an internship in this measure, rather than how many students completed an internship in this year, we do not have complete records to report where these students worked for their internships. This is a flaw in our record keeping that will be corrected.

Since all of our graduating seniors have completed at least one internship, we have met our benchmark.