



## Mass Communication

#6 Plan cycle - 6  
Plan cycle 2020/2021  
7/1/20 - 6/30/21



MCOM	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
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>13</b>

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	1	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
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>12</b>

2019-2020:

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	2	3	6	1	9	7	7	13	36	5	6	7	6	9	28	7
	NMED	1	3	1	0	5	0	8	7	8	4	27	1	5	5	9	6	25	2
	PUBR	1	1	1	6	9	0	12	14	12	14	52	5	6	15	13	18	52	7
	SLCM	0	1	0	3	4	0	2	2	1	4	9	1	3	1	1	4	9	2
	(blank)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>18</b>

2020-2021:

Major	Conc.	Summer						Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
MCOM	INDM	1	1	1	0	3	0	2	5	1	0	8	0	4	3	6	0	13	0
	JOUR	1	3	2	3	9	0	5	6	8	7	26	2	4	7	6	6	23	4
	NMED	0	0	1	2	3	0	1	6	7	9	23	4	0	3	5	8	16	4
	PUBR	0	1	4	7	12	2	11	10	15	15	51	4	6	8	18	13	45	6
	SCOM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	2
	SLCM	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	6	1	0	1	2	1	4	1
	(blank)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>17</b>

Percentage Change between 2017-2018:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change

MCOM	2017	97	8.247%
	2018	105	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>8.247%</b>
	<b>2018</b>	<b>105</b>	

Percentage Change between 2018-2019:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
MCOM	2018	105	18.095%
	2019	124	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>18.095%</b>
	<b>2019</b>	<b>124</b>	

Percentage Change between 2019-2020:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
MCOM	2019	124	-5.645%
	2020	117	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>-5.645%</b>
	<b>2020</b>	<b>117</b>	

### 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.

2019-2020:

To improve recruitment and retention efforts, the department head created a committee to discuss and decide on courses of action.

The first committee meeting was held March 11, 2020. The committee decided:

- To create 2+2 agreements with both Sowela and Lamar-Orange Community Colleges,
- To increase social media exposure for the department, and
- To create new promotional materials.

For complete details on decisions, please see the included recruiting and retention committee minutes. Shortly after this meeting, the university closed and all classes went online due to Covid-19. Some of these plans were unable to be acted on.

2020-2021:

Due to the hurricanes and the displacement of faculty members, the recruiting and retention committee was unable to meet during this academic year.

[3-11-20 Recruiting and Retention Committee meeting minutes \(2020\\_03\\_12 18\\_07\\_32 UTC\)](#) [DOCX 18 KB 8/20/21]

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	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.

2019-2020:

To improve recruitment and retention efforts, the department head created a committee to discuss and decide on courses of action.

The first committee meeting was held March 11, 2020. The decision was made to first look at the bachelor's degree and then to work on the PBC. Shortly after the meeting to look at the bachelor's degree, the university was shut down due to Covid-19, and the committee wasn't able to meet again to discuss the PBC.

2020-2021:

Due to the hurricanes and the displacement of faculty members, the committee was unable to meet during this academic year.

### 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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>87.5</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>59.4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>40.6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>46.9</b>

\*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	8	26.7	3	10.0	0	0.0
		Changed	3	10.0	6	20.0	10	33.3	6	20.0	2	6.7	1	3.3	0	0.0
		<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>96.7</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>80.0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>63.3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

\*3 students were previously undeclared before declaring MCOM.



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	20	Same	13	65.0	9	45.0										
		Changed	2	10.0	4	20.0										
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>75.0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>65.0</b>										

2020:

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	14	Same	14	100												
		Changed	0	0.0												
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>												

2021:

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														
		<b>Total</b>														

### 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.

2019-2020:

To improve recruitment and retention efforts, the department head created a committee to discuss and decide on courses of action.

The first committee meeting was held March 11, 2020. After the initial meeting, the university shut down for Covid-19, so the committee was unable to meet to discuss these numbers specifically and plan accordingly.

2020-2021:

Due to the hurricanes and the displacement of faculty members, the committee was unable to meet during this academic year.

## 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%
2019-2020	6/9	67%
2020-2021	6/8	75%

#### 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.

2019-2020:

We met our benchmark for this year. Of the nine full-time faculty members this year, two did not participate in any community or professional service due to health issues, and one did not participate because he was a visiting professor.

Examples of service for this year were:

High School Speech Rally host

The 705: Leadership Organization member

## FBLA Competition judge

2020-2021:

Despite faculty displacement due to the fall 2020 hurricanes, the faculty met the benchmark for the academic year. Of the eight full-time faculty, six participated in community or professional service.

Example of service for this year were:

Society of Professional Journalists Louisiana Professional Chapter board member

Webster University Speech and Debate Tournament tab room

Hurricane relief work

### **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%
2019-2020	7/11	64%
2020-2021	6/9	67%

##### **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.

2019-2020:

The department did not meet our expected level of achievement for this measure. In part, this may be because faculty members that have no knowledge of online teaching were forced to move classes online due to Covid-19. Since the faculty has always previously met this level of achievement, we believe that this may be an occurrence due to the change for Covid.

2020-2021:

The department did not meet our expected level of achievement for this measure. SEIs this year only included the spring 2021 semester, and response rates were extremely low. Many faculty and students were displaced by the hurricanes in the fall 2020 semester. We think that this is a contributing factor to both low response rates and poor performance. We will continue to monitor for the 2021-2022 academic year in hopes of a more normal academic 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%
2019-2020	8/11	73%
2020-2021	7/9	78%

#### 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.

2019-2020:

The department did not meet our expected level of achievement for this measure. In part, this may be because faculty members that have no knowledge of online teaching were forced to move classes online due to Covid-19. Since the faculty has always previously met this level of achievement, we believe that this may be an occurrence due to the change for Covid.

2020-2021:

The department did not meet our expected level of achievement for this measure. SEIs this year only included the spring 2021 semester, and response rates were extremely low. Many faculty and students were displaced by the hurricanes in the fall 2020 semester. We think that this is a contributing factor to both low response rates and poor performance. We will continue to monitor for the 2021-2022 academic year in hopes of a more normal academic year.

## **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
2019-2020	40
2020-2021	27

#### **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.

2019-2020:

The department met out goal for the year, but due to the sudden university closure because of the Covid-19 pandemic, the faculty were unable to meet and clarify the method of reporting.

The most significant of the items completed was a rewrite of the Speak Easy book for COMM 201 Public Speaking. Seven members of the department collaborated on the rough draft splitting 17 chapters for a rewrite.

2020-2021:

The department met our goal for the year, but due to the two hurricanes, the faculty were unable to meet and clarify the method of reporting.

During the fall semester, the faculty completed revising and editing the COMM 201 Public Speaking textbook, Speak Easy.

[Master Plan Form](#) [PDF 38 KB 2/18/20]

## **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.

2019-2020:

The curriculum committee met once during the 2019-2020 academic year. The minutes are attached. The remaining two meetings were scheduled for the spring 2020 semester, which was interrupted due to Covid-19. Since all classes went online suddenly, most of that semester was spent in adapting classes to online and dealing with the problems from Covid.

2020-2021:

Due to the hurricanes and the displacement of many faculty members because of hurricane damage, the curriculum committee was unable to meet during the 2020-2021 academic year.

[3-8-19 Curriculum Committee Meeting minutes](#) [DOCX 20 KB 2/18/20]

[9-25-19 Curriculum Committee meeting minutes \(2019\\_11\\_14 19\\_09\\_41 UTC\)](#) [DOCX 17 KB 8/20/21]

[Curriculum Committee meeting 2-6-19](#) [DOCX 22 KB 2/18/20]

### **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.

2019-2020:

The curriculum committee decided, in keeping with the current direction in the field, to change the names of two concentrations. The "New Media" concentration was renamed "Integrated Digital Media" to clarify what the concentration emphasized. "Sales Communication" was renamed "Strategic Communication" to more precisely identify the theoretical side of the concentration.

In addition, from research in the field and interviews with recent graduates, the curriculum committee decided that the students needed an introductory technology course to familiarize themselves with the computer and software, so that students would be better able to advance in the upper level courses. MCOM 231, which was a video production course, was reformatted to include additional basic technology and reduce the emphasis on video production. Other technology classes were reformatted to take into consideration the new knowledge students would be bringing into the classes.

2020-2021:

Due to the hurricanes that hit in fall 2020, the curriculum committee was unable to meet. No changes were made.

**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%
2019-2020	31/31	100%
2020-2021	30/30	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.

[Interns\\_S21\\_U21](#) [DOCX 14 KB 8/20/21]

[Internships - Summer 2019 - Summer 2020](#) [DOCX 14 KB 8/20/21]

[MCOM Internships](#) [XLSX 42 KB 2/18/20]

**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.

2019-2020:

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

2020-2021:

All graduating seniors have completed at least one internship. We have met our benchmark. We will continue to require every student to take an internship.