SPEECH ASSESSMENT REPORT 2009

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. List the student learning outcomes (goals) for your unit. Include the specific website address where the learning outcomes can be accessed.

Students who earn the Bachelor of Arts in Speech Communication should:

> 1. Send and receive both verbal and nonverbal messages that meet critical standards;
> 2. Demonstrate facility in using major theories in message analysis;
> 3. Identify and resolve conflict issues in message construction and reception;
> 4. Demonstrate significant skill in adapting messages to any type of communication – i.e. intrapersonal through mediated;
> 5. Create formal messages using credible research methods and solid reasoning to draw conclusions.

2. Demonstrate how your unit's specific student learning outcomes (goals) are linked to the mission of UAM. Please use your enumerated list from Question 1 to complete the section to the right.

UAM MISSION STATEMENT	Unit Learning Outcomes
The mission the University of Arkansas at Monticello shares with all universities is the commitment to search for truth, understanding through scholastic endeavor. The University seeks to enhance and share knowledge, to preserve and promote the intellectual content of society, and to educate people for critical thought.	Goals 1 and 5
The University provides learning experiences that enable students to synthesize knowledge, communicate effectively, use knowledge and technology with intelligence and responsibility, and act creatively within their own and other cultures.	Goals 1,2, 3, 4 and 5
The University strives for excellence in all its endeavors. Educational opportunities encompass the liberal arts, basic and applied sciences, selected professions, and vocational/ technical preparation. These opportunities are founded in a strong program of general education and are fulfilled through contemporary disciplinary curricula, certification programs, and vocational/technical education or	Goals 2, 4 and 5

workforce training. The University assures opportunities in higher education for both traditional and non-traditional students and strives to provide an environment that fosters individual achievement and personal development.	

3. Provide specific evidence of the ways that your unit communicates student learning outcomes to prospective and current students (Examples: website, catalog, syllabi, brochures).

Student learning outcomes are stated in the university catalogue along with the Speech Communication curriculum, in the 8-semester plan literature, on all Speech course syllabi, and on the School of Arts and Humanities website.
The student handbook for Speech majors and minors contains specific material on the outcomes and their importance to the field. In addition, we provide tri-fold brochures, updated each semester, for an overview of the Speech Communication major and minor (these are designed to encourage students to choose the discipline and they also function as a handy guide to the academic requirements).

4. Provide specific evidence of how your unit assesses whether students have achieved your unit's student learning outcomes.

The Speech Communication faculty have advanced a two-pronged assessment plan that will allow for focused data collection for both the general education course offerings and the program as a whole. For the sake of clarity, the assessment plans for General Education offerings and for the Speech Communication program have been separated.

<u>General Education Course Offerings</u>

3 year Assessment Plan for General Education Course Offerings
In the spring of 2006 the speech faculty formulated a plan to assess the Speech Communication general education offerings. The following table identifies the planned stages of development and implementation for the assessment plan. As of the summer of 2009 this plan is on schedule.

Fall '06 Syllabi review of each SPCH course SPCH 1023 – Development and test pilot of the assessment plan	Spring '07 SPCH 1023 - administer assessment plan SPCH 2283 Develop an assessment plan
Fall '07 SPCH 1023 – process data collected in spring 07 SPCH 2283 – administer assessment plan	Spring '08 SPCH 1023 – process data collected in spring 07 SPCH 2283 – administer assessment plan SPCH 2203 – develop an assessment plan

Fall '08	Spring '09
SPCH 1023 – provide assessment results	SPCH 1023 – assessment of presentations
SPCH 2283 – process data collected	SPCH 2283 – process data collected
SPCH 2203 – administer assessment plan	SPCH 2203 – administer assessment plan
Fall '09 (Restart of Assessment Cycle) SPCH 1023 – pre/post tests; recording of presentations (additional development and revising of some methods of SPCH 1023 assessment anticipated)	

The assessment of each course is planned by the faculty who teach the course. The assessment plans for SPCH 1023 and SPCH 2283 can be found in **appendix A**. The results for SPCH 1023 can be found in **appendix B**. Results for SPCH 2283 can be found in Appendix C. Results for SPCH 2203 are currently being processed.

Pre-three-year assessment practices
Prior to the implementation of the three-year assessment plan developed in the spring of 2006, the Speech Communication faculty had conducted assessment for over 10 years. Different measurements were utilized depending on which of the courses was being evaluated and on the specific goals identified by the speech faculty. Both the instrument descriptions and the results can be found in **appendix D.**

Program Assessment Plan

In the fall of 2006, as part of the program assessment plan, the Speech Communication faculty adopted both the Intro to Communication Studies and the Senior Capstone as requirements for a Speech Communication degree:

> SPCH 2293 Introduction to Communication Studies
> Prepares students for upper level courses in the speech discipline by introducing them to the specialized areas of study, general theories, and critical thinking skills necessary for advanced work.

> SPCH 4633 Senior Capstone in Speech Communication
> Prerequisites: SPCH 2293, Senior Standing, Speech Major
> A semester-long assessment project where the senior speech communication student works with a mentor to prepare the graduation portfolio, work toward professional employment, and complete other activities, including service learning, during which a research paper/project is undertaken
> with the guidance of a faculty mentor leading to a presentation in a public forum with at least three (3) members of the speech faculty present.

Inherent in the design of these courses is an opportunity to collect pre- and post-major course work data and thus to measure the development of skills gained by a student progressing through the Speech Communication program.

Specific measurements taken or initiated in the SPCH 2293 course and followed up in SPCH 4633 include:

Portfolio project: Each communication major begins collecting information and compiling a personal portfolio. The project is collected in SPCH 4633. Thirteen portfolios have been collected from the years 2006-2008. They will be evaluated using a modified performance rubric by members of the speech faculty. For student guidelines for compiling the portfolio, see **appendix E**.

Video Recorded Speech: Each student enrolled in SPCH 2293 gives a brief in-class presentation (specifics vary by instructor). The speech is filmed and archived until the student completes SPCH 4633.   A group of trained raters view each presentation in its entirety, rating each speaker in unison. The evaluation forms are coded, and the coded material is sent to Meaningful Measurement for Rasch analysis and to a member of the Speech faculty for statistical analysis.

5. Provide evidence of the measures of student performance that your unit collects and analyzes regularly (Examples: retention rates/pass rate for classes, teacher made tests, research papers, recitals, field experiences, etc.). Give specific examples of how analyses of student performance have been used to improve unit decisions.

Speech Majors by Class:

	Fall 98	Fall 99	Fall 00	Fall 01	Fall 02	Fall 03	Fall 04	Fall 05	Fall 06	Fall 07	Fall 08
Freshman	9	8	10	4	12	14	6	3	2	5	2
Sophomore	3	5	6	14	5	12	7	9	5	2	6
Junior	5	6	7	9	16	9	9	8	8	6	5
Senior	4	3	7	7	10	13	9	6	7	6	8
Post-bachelors										1	0
Pre-Freshman	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	2
Total	**21**	**22**	**30**	**34**	**43**	**49**	**31**	**26**	**22**	**23**	**23**

The decline in majors has stopped, and we anticipate increasing numbers starting with data from Fall 2009. We averaged 5.33 graduates from 2006 to 2008. In 2009, we had 6. We anticipate an increased number of graduates in the coming years.

6. Provide specific evidence of how your unit utilizes information, other than student performance, to determine necessary unit decisions. Describe how your unit analyzes and selects a course of action. Attach documentation that supports your determination. (Examples: senior surveys, alumni surveys, professional meetings, minutes from faculty or committee meetings, etc.)

Faculty meetings: Regular meetings during 2007-2008 were deemed by the faculty to be unnecessary. Meetings held in the early part of the 2006-2007 academic year resulted in several curriculum changes regarding both the major and the minor, including the creation of a gateway course (Introduction to Communication Studies) and a capstone course. Decisions about assessment (for example, the taping of Public Speaking students) were made. See **appendix F**.

Additional meetings are currently scheduled to address the merge of journalism and speech communication. Initial discussions began in the April 2009 with no firm course of action yet determined.

Professional Meetings: The Speech Communication faculty regularly attend local, state, and national meetings to develop teaching and classroom coordination skills. National meetings, held by the National Communication Association (NCA), Pi Kappa Delta Honorary (PKD), and the International Public Debate Association (IPDA), offer a chance for the faculty to consult fellow educators from around the country. At the state level the Speech faculty members are involved in the Arkansas State Communication Association (ASCA). The UAM Speech Faculty sponsor the Arkansas Speech and Debate institute which includes a teacher workshop to share ideas and address concerns about communication education in the state.

All portfolio guidelines and performance speaking assessment have been developed in conjunction with materials, training, cooperative ventures, and partnerships with professional members of the National Communication Association (NCA), in particular the rating form for the Competent Speaker.

Strategic plan: Creating, implementing, and reviewing an annual Strategic Plan for the School of Arts and Humanities represent a culmination of discussion, observations, and analysis on the part of the faculty in regard to how SAH might better serve students. **See appendix G**.

7. Based on your answers to Questions 5 and 6 regarding student learning outcomes, prioritize your unit's future course of action. Include plans for what will be done, by whom, to what extent, and how often.

Revision of the Introduction and Capstone courses: Based on portfolios, recordings and pre and post-tests, Scott Kuttenkuler and Jim Evans believe it may be appropriate to revise course content and pedagogy.

Development of Concentrations within the Communication Degree
Initial review of the performance of speech majors has suggested the need for opportunities for advanced study in specific communication disciplines. This need and the timely merger between speech communication and journalism have provided momentum for the development of concentrations within the communication program. The specifics of the concentrations have yet to be determined, however, clear support for mass communication, organizational communication and rhetorical studies exist among the faculty. A review of the programs resources, faculty expertise, faculty teaching loads and enrollment numbers will be essential in the development of the concentrations.

Review of assessment data: Speech faculty will continue to review assessment data collected through the assessment rotation and appropriate adjustments will be made regarding pedagogical approaches, core assignments, and expectations. Information taken from a course will be made available as soon as the new information is processed and returned to the department.

8. Specifically describe how your unit is making student learning accessible, including, if applicable, alternative modes of instruction (CIV, WebCT, weekend, Early College High School, etc.). Address historical patterns and trends.

CIV Courses: The educational co-op plans to offer Public Speaking CIV in the Fall 2009 Semester. Until 2006-2007, a member of the Speech faculty taught one general education course in the CIV format, but with a low demand at the technical campuses and with the availability of online Public Speaking, the need for CIV in 2006-2007 did not exist. Typically, in the Fall Semester, Public Speaking was offered, and in the Spring Semester, Business and Professional Speech was offered. The medium seemed to produce results similar to those of traditional "face-to-face" classes.

Early College High School: In 2006-2007, UAM Public Speaking was offered at Monticello High School under the direction of Debbie Ashcraft.

Night Classes and Saturday Classes: Night sections are offered for a variety of both general education and major classes. Enrollments have been strong enough to justify continuation of these offerings.

Online Classes: Several Speech courses were available online during the 2007-2008 academic year. With the resignation of Dr. Linda Webster, there was an interruption in the offering of online Speech classes for Fall 2008 and Spring 2009, but online offerings resumed summer 2009 .

Alternative Methods of Instruction SPEECH (general education)					
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
CIV	SPCH 1023 SPCH 2283	SPCH 1023 SPCH 2283			
WebCT and Online			SPCH 1023	SPCH 1023	SPCH 1023 SPCH 2203 SPCH 4623
Southeast Arkansas Community Based Education Center					
Early College High School		SPCH 1023	SPCH 1023	SPCH 1023	SPCH 1023

9. Specifically describe how your unit involves students directly in the assessment process.

Student evaluations: At the end of a course, students receive an evaluative questionnaire and a request for written comments. The information is reviewed by the dean before being forwarded to individual instructors. The potential for course revision in response to student comments exists.

Presentation Coding: Students in SPCH 2293 and SPCH 4633 reviewed and coded presentations taken from SPCH 1023 during the 06-07 year.

10. Describe and provide evidence of the efforts your unit is making to retain students in your unit and/or at the university.

Involvement Opportunities
Specific Department Activities include membership on the UAM Speech and Debate Program, membership in Pi Kappa Delta (Speech and Debate Honorary) and membership in Pi Lambda Theta (Speech Honorary).

Speech Students are also strongly encouraged to participate in a variety of programs some of which recently involved in by students include; student government, The Voice (online student newspaper), Foliate Oak (UAM Sponsored Literary Journal), UAM Football team, ROTC, Alumni Relations, and band.

Financial Support

- Grants are provided through the Speech and Debate Program.
- Grants are provided from proceeds of the public speaking custom text.
- Placement in work study positions are offered both in and out of the department.
- Endowed Scholarships include
    o Barbara Murphy Babin Scholarship (speech)
    o Marty and Erma Brutscher Debate/Forensics Scholarship (debate)
    o Charlotte Cruce Hornaday Scholarship (debate)
    o R. David Ray Debate/Forensics Scholarship (debate)
    o Fred and Janice Taylor Scholarship (debate)

Commitment to the Student
 The speech faculty is committed to student success both in the classroom and away. Students visit with faculty and discuss career options and the simple "going ons" of life while in college. The faculty is responsive to and supportive of students and serve students as a personal connection to the campus.

Business and Professional Speaking
Assessment Proposal

Course Overview:

The Business and Professional Speaking (BNSP) course is designed to introduce the student to a wide cross-section of different communication activities.   These activities include public speaking, resume writing, interviewing (from both the interviewee and the interviewer perspective) and small group communication.

The course is performance driven with 475 of the total 725 points directly related to speaking and group interaction. Students are evaluated through a combination of teacher created rubrics (presented to the student prior to each project) and the completion of a comprehensive multiple choice final and the occasional quiz.

The specific projects include
- personal presentation
    - 7-8 min persuasive speech
    - followed by question and answer session
    - formal outline is submitted

- Resume / Cover letter
    - Students locate an employment advertisement for a potential job that they are currently qualified
    - For this advertisement he/she will design a resume and cover letter suited for the position

- Mock Interview
    - The student (using the employment advertisement) will participate in a mock interview.
    - The interview is conducted within the "course group" identified early in the semester.
    - Students are expected to participate as both the interviewer and the interviewee

- Group presentation
    - The group (same as identified for the mock interview) prepares a proposal for one of the following options

        - Identify a problem and provide a solution for a significant issues facing the UAM Campus (parking is not allowed)

        - Develop and design a training program that will increase at least one specific skill set.

Proposed Assessment Measures

1. <u>Cognitive Learning Measure</u>:
   Pre / Post test covering elements related to the 4 main themes of the course (public speaking, resume writing, interviewing and small group interaction). The post test will also serve as the final for the course

2. <u>Self Perceived Attitudinal Review</u>:

   NOTE: The two instruments selected are consistent with current public speaking measurements

   Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC)

   Source: McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1988). Self-report as an approach to measuring communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 5,* 108-113.

   The self-perceived communication competence scale was developed to obtain information concerning how competent people feel they are in a variety of communication contexts and with a variety of types of receivers. Early self-report measures of competence were structured to represent what the creators of the measures felt were the components of communication competence. This scale is intended to let the respondent define communication competence. Since people make decisions with regard to communication (for example, whether they will even do it), it is their perception that is important, not that of an outside observer. It is important that users of this measure recognize that this is NOT a measure of actual communication competence; it is a measure of PERCEIVED competence. While these two different types of measures may be substantially correlated, they are not the same thing. This measure has generated good alpha reliability estimates (above .85) and had strong face validity. It also has been found to have substantial predictive validity.

   Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24)

   Source: McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical communi*cation (4th Ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

   The PRCA-24 is the instrument which is most widely used to measure communication apprehension. It is preferable above all earlier versions of the instrument (PRCA, PRCA10, PRCA-24B, etc.). It is highly reliable (alpha regularly >.90) and has very high predictive validity. It permits one to obtain sub-scores on the contexts of public speaking, dyadic interaction, small groups, and large groups. However, these scores are substantially less reliable than the total PRCA-24 scores-because of the reduced number of items. People interested only in public speaking anxiety should consider using the PRPSA rather than the public speaking sub-score drawn from the PRCA-24. It is much more reliable for this purpose.

3. <u>Peer Course Objective Review</u>:
   Traditionally this course has only been taught by one member of the faculty. The peer course objective review is both a syllabus and activity review for the fellow members of the faculty. The end goal of this effort is to ensure consistency with department, university and state general education course expectations.

Public Speaking Assessment
Assessment Proposal

Cognitive Learning Measure:
The Public Speaking Core Competency Test was developed in Fall Semester 2006 by the Speech Communication faculty. This test consisted of 60 multiple choice questions related to basic communication directives related to speech writing, nonverbal communication, interpersonal relationships, and listening. All students in each class were tested at the beginning and end of Spring Semester 2007 to measure competence in the various aspects of the public speaking course. The data is currently being processed.

Self Perceived Attitudinal Review:
Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC)

Source: McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1988). Self-report as an approach to measuring communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 5,* 108-113.

The self-perceived communication competence scale was developed to obtain information concerning how competent people feel they are in a variety of communication contexts and with a variety of types of receivers. Early self-report measures of competence were structured to represent what the creators of the measures felt were the components of communication competence. This scale is intended to let the respondent define communication competence. Since people make decisions with regard to communication (for example, whether they will even do it), it is their perception that is important, not that of an outside observer. It is important that users of this measure recognize that this is NOT a measure of actual communication competence; it is a measure of PERCEIVED competence. While these two different types of measures may be substantially correlated, they are not the same thing. This measure has generated good alpha reliability estimates (above .85) and had strong face validity. It also has been found to have substantial predictive validity.

Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24)

Source: McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical commun*ication (4th Ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

The PRCA-24 is the instrument which is most widely used to measure communication apprehension. It is preferable above all earlier versions of the instrument (PRCA, PRCA10, PRCA-24B, etc.). It is highly reliable (alpha regularly >.90) and has very high predictive validity. It permits one to obtain sub-scores on the contexts of public speaking, dyadic interaction, small groups, and large groups. However, these scores are substantially less reliable than the total PRCA-24 scores-because of the reduced number of items. People interested only in public speaking anxiety should consider using the PRPSA rather than the public speaking sub-score drawn from the PRCA-24. It is much more reliable for this purpose.

Willingness to Communicate (WTC)

Sources:

McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly, 40,* 16-25.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 119-131). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Willingness to communicate is the most basic orientation toward communication. Almost anyone is likely to respond to a direct question, but many will not continue or initiate interaction. This instrument measures a person's willingness to *initiate* communication. The face validity of the instrument is strong, and results of extensive research indicate the predictive validity of the instrument. Alpha reliability estimates for this instrument have ranged from .85 to well above .90. Of the 20 items on the instrument, 8 are used to distract attention from the scored items. The twelve remain items generate a total score, 4 context-type scores, and 3 receiver-type scores. The sub-scores generate lower reliability estimates, but generally high enough to be used in research studies.

Public Speaking Speech Review:

Each presentation given by each student enrolled in the spring 2007 semester of public speaking were coded and review by a panel of trained reviewers. The information was then subjected to the following statical process

The computer program FACETS provides the basis for this analysis. It uses an extension of Rasch's original separability theorem. John Michael Linacre of the MESA Psychometric Laboratory at the University of Chicago generated the model for many-faceted conjoint measurement. Once raw scores are conditioned into measures, traditional statistical analyses may be performed.

The Rasch Model for Conjoint Measurement

This method allows one to examine the various elements in an assessment situation. In this case, they are speakers, judges, and the items on the evaluation form. All of the facets are calibrated in common units of measure within a common frame of reference. An objective measurement analysis performs the following functions:

        1) provides a calibration of evaluation items
        2) produces objective measures of speakers' competency
        3) measures the severity of the judges
        4) discovers rater inconsistency
        5) detects rating scale step structure

When raw scores are conditioned using this technique, something wondrously useful occurs. The strands in the analysis are disentangled from each other, and smoothed out into straight lines. They are calibrated into common units, providing context-free rulers that are able to measure at any time and any place. The results are precise reproducible measurement instead of the fuzzy idiosyncratic descriptions of statistics. Investigation is now possible in a manner that conforms to scientific principles. Instruments are constructed and calibrated with the ability to produce generalizable results. Each element can be examined separately, allowing the researcher to delve into the data in a far deeper way than has been possible with traditional methods. We discover information heretofore unavailable.

APPENDIX B
Results for Speech 1023
The Public Speaking assessment instruments were distributed to 160 Public Speaking students in the Spring 2007 semester. The data entry is in progress, and the initial results are anticipated in the fall 2007 semester.

The Public Speaking Core Competency Test was developed in Fall Semester 2006 by the Speech Communication faculty. This test consisted of 60 multiple choice questions related to basic communication directives related to speech writing, nonverbal communication, interpersonal relationships, and listening. All students in each class were tested at the beginning and end of Spring Semester 2007 to measure competence in the various aspects of the public speaking course. The data is currently being processed.

Fall Results

This study revolved around three survey instruments distributed to students in Public Speaking Classes (SPCH 1023) in the fall of 2006. The survey instruments were distributed in classes during the first and last weeks of the semester. The student sample included 71 respondents who took both pre and post surveys. 78.9% (56) of the respondents were between the ages of 18 through 20. 37 respondents were male and 34 were female.
 The survey instruments were, seemingly, designed to measure the communication apprehension and self-evaluation of communication competence. The first survey was self-evaluation of communication competence. The questions in this survey were set up on a 0 to 100 scale with 0 being incompetent and 100 being competent. Second was communication apprehension. The questions in this survey were set up on a 0 to 100 scale with 0 being never and 100 always. Next was another communication apprehension survey. The series of questions within this were set up on a 5 point Likert scale.
In conjunction with means, we conducted matched-pair t-tests on each of the 56 questions to assess if there was a significant difference between the pre and post surveys.
Self-Evaluation of Communication Competence
This survey consisted of 12 questions, the answers indicating how competent the respondent felt in the given situation. All the answers moved in a positive direction from the pre to the post survey. The questions dealing with presenting speeches all moved in a significant manner. The question of presenting a talk to a group of strangers moved from a mean of 49.18 on the pre survey to a mean of 61.69 on the post test, a difference of 12.51. The t-test result of 3..409 showed this to be a significant difference. The question of presenting a talk to a group of friends moved from 84.52 on the pre survey to 90.86 on the post test, a difference of 6.34. The t-test result of 3.037 showed this to be a significant difference. The question of presenting a talk to a group of acquaintances moved from 68.11 to a mean of 79.04 on the post test, a difference of 10.93. The t-test result of 3.298 showed this to be a significant difference.
Communication Apprehension 1
This survey consisted of 20 questions, the answers indicating how often the respondent would participate in the behavior. All the answers moved in a positive direction from the pre to the post survey. The questions dealing with talking in large meetings all moved in a significant manner. The question of talking in a large meeting of friends moved from a mean of 83.21 on the pre survey to a mean of 88.25 on the post test, a difference of 5.04. The t-test result of 2.194 showed this to be a significant difference. The question of

talking in a large meeting of acquaintances moved from 63.93 on the pre survey to 76.92 on the post test, a difference of 12.99. The t-test result of 3.465 showed this to be a significant difference. The question of talking in a large group of strangers moved from 35.47 to a mean of 49.49 on the post test, a difference of 14.02. The t-test result of 3.746 showed this to be a significant difference.

Communication Apprehension II

This survey consisted of 24 questions, the answers indicating if the respondent strongly disagreed (1) to strongly agreed (5) with the statement. All the answers moved in a positive direction from the pre to the post survey. The statements dealing with apprehension while giving a speech moved in a significant manner. The statement of I have no fear of giving a speech moved from a mean of 2.41 on the pre survey to a mean of 2.78 on the post test, a difference of .37. The t-test result of 2.440 showed this to be a significant difference. The statement of I feel relaxed while giving a speech moved from 2.32 on the pre survey to 2.63 on the post test, a difference of .31. The t-test result of 2.150 showed this to be a significant difference.

Spring Results

This study revolved around four survey instruments distributed to students in Public Speaking Classes (SPCH 1023) in the Spring of 2007. The survey instruments were distributed in classes during the first and last weeks of the semester. The student sample included 70 respondents who took both pre and post surveys. 81.4% (57) of the respondents were between the ages of 18 through 20. 25 respondents were male and 45 were female.

 The survey instruments were, seemingly, designed to measure the communication apprehension, self-evaluation of communication competence, and basic communication knowledge. The first survey was self-evaluation of communication competence. The questions in this survey were set up on a 0 to 100 scale with 0 being incompetent and 100 being competent. Second was communication apprehension. The questions in this survey were set up on a 0 to 100 scale with 0 being never and 100 always. Next was another communication apprehension survey. The series of questions within this were set up on a 5 point Likert scale. Finally, was a multiple choice test of basic communication knowledge.

In conjunction with means, we conducted matched-pair t-tests on each of the 117 questions to assess if there was a significant difference between the pre and post surveys.

Self-Evaluation of Communication Competence

This survey consisted of 12 questions, the answers indicating how competent the respondent felt in the given situation. All the answers moved in a positive direction from the pre to the post survey. The questions dealing with presenting speeches all moved in a significant manner. The question of presenting a talk to a group of strangers moved from a mean of 50.67 on the pre survey to a mean of 74.39 on the post test, a difference of 23.72. The t-test result of 6.303 showed this to be a significant difference. The question of presenting a talk to a group of friends moved from 84.97 on the pre survey to 91.21 on the post test, a difference of 6.24. The t-test result of 2.925 showed this to be a significant difference. The question of presenting a talk to a group of acquaintances moved from 69.34 to a mean of 83.30 on the post test, a difference of 13.96. The t-test result of 3.731 showed this to be a significant difference.

Communication Apprehension 1

This survey consisted of 20 questions, the answers indicating how often the respondent

would participate in the behavior. All the answers moved in a positive direction from the pre to the post survey. The questions dealing with talking in large meetings all moved in a significant manner. The question of talking in a large meeting of friends moved from a mean of 81.30 on the pre survey to a mean of 90.17 on the post test, a difference of 8.87. The t-test result of 2.547 showed this to be a significant difference. The question of talking in a large meeting of acquaintances moved from 61.70 on the pre survey to 77.96 on the post test, a difference of 16.26. The t-test result of 4.152 showed this to be a significant difference. The question of talking in a large group of strangers moved from 35.04 to a mean of 57.29 on the post test, a difference of 22.25. The t-test result of 5.790 showed this to be a significant difference.

Communication Apprehension II

This survey consisted of 24 questions, the answers indicating if the respondent strongly disagreed (1) to strongly agreed (5) with the statement. All the answers moved in a positive direction from the pre to the post survey. The statements dealing with apprehension while giving a speech all moved in a significant manner. The statement of I have no fear of giving a speech moved from a mean of 2.56 on the pre survey to a mean of 2.87 on the post test, a difference of .31. The t-test result of 2.054 showed this to be a significant difference. The statement of I feel relaxed while giving a speech moved from 2.30 on the pre survey to 2.74 on the post test, a difference of .44. The t-test result of 3.121 showed this to be a significant difference. The statement of I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence moved from 3.20 to a mean of 3.49 on the post test, a difference of .29. The t-test result of 2.335 showed this to be a significant difference.

Communication Knowledge

This test consisted of 61 multiple choice questions, the answers indicating the general communication knowledge of the respondent. The mean score on the pre-test was 30.23 out of 61 and the mean score on the post test was 38.09, a difference of 7.86. The matched pair t-test result of 8.557 showed this difference to be significant.

Public Speaking Review

Overall, all students make great strides between speech #1 and speech #2, and those who finish the course are doing significantly better by speech #5 than they were at the beginning. The competency numbers go way down with the most recent classes which may be a measure of having only upper-level students plus one faculty member rating the speeches. We're projecting higher consistent numbers for the speakers when faculty make up the bulk of the raters

APPENDIX C
Results for SPCH 2283

The following analysis took place during the 2008-2009 academic year in keeping with the three-year Speech assessment cycle.

The initial SPCH 2283 Business and Professional Speaking assessment was pilot tested in the fall of 2007 and first formal collection done in the spring of 2008. The cognitive learning measure consisted of a 47 question pre / post test covering elements related to the 4 main themes of the course (public speaking, resume writing, interviewing and small group interaction). The post test also served as the final for the course.

Fall 2007 Results

The pre-test for the cognitive measure was distributed in the first session of the course prior to any instructor student interaction. The post test was distributed as the final for the course. The total student enrollment for the course was 59 students of those only 37 took both the pre and post test. Due to an error in the data processing the direct link on the individual level for the pre and post test could not be determined. The gross scores presented a marked improvement with a composite pre-test average of 61.54% average compared to a post-test average of 84.78%.

Three specific questions (not content areas) seem to be regularly missed in the post-test. They include:

Question 45	According to class lecture how much of our day is spent listening…
Question 28	An unexpected, off-the-cuff talk is…
Question 26	Which of the following is not a way to make your speech sound normal and pleasing…

Spring 2008 Results

The pre-test for the cognitive measure was distributed in the first session of the course prior to any instructor student interaction. The post test was distributed as the final for the course. The total enrollment for the course was 55 students of those only 23 took both the pre and posted. Due to an error in the data processing the direct link on the individual level for the pre and post test could not be determined. The gross scores presented improvement with a composite pre-test average of 58.64% and a post-test average of a 91.31%.

The 3 specific questions identified in the fall 2007 data collection maintain an above average rate of incorrect answers. In addition one additional question would be added to this list.

Question 47 A resume that organizes experience based time and job title is

Assessment Limitations: In review of the pilot and first round of data collection for SPCH 2283 Business and Professional Speaking multiple limitations were identified.

1. Due to an error in the data processing the pre and post test were not able to be connected.

a. Solution Step. In the data processing significant attention needs to be placed on how data is entered to ensure that pre and post test can be connected.

2. Not all sections of the course were given the pretest (specifically refer to the small sample size in the spring 2008)
    a. Solution Step 1. Keep better records for test administration to ensure all sections have received pre-test.
    b. Solution Step 2. In the event that the pre-test is not administered during the first session of class, allow pre-test to be given within the first 3 class meetings. The extended deadline for pre-test collection will allow greater inclusion opportunities.

3. Volume of data for processing. Though not as significant as the first 2 concerns the overall volume of the assessment data and the current collection method has made data processing excessively time consuming.
    a. Solution Step 1. Incorporate technology for data collection
        i. Online test submission
        ii. Scan-tron system

Overall Assessment review for SPCH 2283 Business and Professional Speaking
Though limitations exist for this round of data collection and those limitation could impact the validity of the information collected two specific bit of information can be deduced.
1. Students make a marked improvement from the pre-test to the post-test
2. 4 questions seem to have a significant incorrect answer rate. Those questions and the specific content they are referencing need to be reviewed by each of the following
    a. Correctness of the questions / Clear formatting or wording errors
    b. Review of the lecture associated to the information.

APPENDIX D
Pre 3 year cycle assessment descriptions and results

Pre-tests and post-tests: Pre-tests and post-tests have been used in all general education courses for over 10 years. Different measurements are utilized depending on which of the courses is being evaluated and the specific goals that have been identified by the Speech faculty.

Business and Professional Speaking utilizes the Communication Anxiety Instrument published by Booth-Butterfield and Gould in 1986. This instrument consists of a 20-item scale identifying specific statements that suggest variable self-perceived responses to a speech and other related communication activity (i.e. listening). For example, two sample items include: "I feel that I have nothing worthy to say," and "When speaking, I maintain eye contact when I want to." Responses are made on a 5-point scale ranging from "Almost Never" to "Almost Always." Reliability of this scale, as published by the authors, is a Cronbach's a = .91. **See Attachment A.**

Interpersonal Communication utilizes the Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale (ICCS) published by Rubin and Martin in 1994. This instrument is a 36 item scale specifically designed to measure communication exchanges that are interactive in nature. Specific items include "I feel relaxed in small group gatherings" and "I enjoy talking with someone that I have just met." Responses are made on a 5-point scale ranging from "Almost Never" to "Almost Always." Reliability of this scale, as published by the authors, is a Cronbach's a = .86. **See Attachment A.**

Public Speaking utilizes several instruments to measure issues related to communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate:

Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC) Source: McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1988). Self-report as an approach to measuring communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 5,* 108-113. The self-perceived communication competence scale was developed to obtain information concerning how competent people feel they are in a variety of communication contexts and with a variety of types of receivers. Early self-report measures of competence were structured to represent what the creators of the measures felt were the components of communication competence. This scale is intended to let the respondent define communication competence. Since people make decisions with regard to communication (for example, whether they will even do it), it is their perception that is important, not that of an outside observer. It is important that users of this measure recognize that this is NOT a measure of actual communication competence; it is a measure of PERCEIVED competence. While these two different types of measures may be substantially correlated, they are not the same thing. This measure has generated good alpha reliability estimates (above .85) and has strong face validity. It also has been found to have substantial predictive validity.

Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) Source: McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An Introduction to Rhetorical Communi*cation (4th Ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

The PRCA-24 is the instrument most widely used to measure communication apprehension. It is preferable above all earlier versions of the instrument (PRCA, PRCA-10, PRCA-24B, etc.). It is highly reliable (alpha regularly >.90) and has very high predictive validity. It permits one to obtain sub-scores on the contexts of public speaking, dyadic interaction, small groups, and large groups. However, these scores are substantially less reliable than the total PRCA-24 scores because of the reduced number of items. People interested only in public speaking anxiety should consider using the PRPSA because of its greater reliability rather than the public speaking sub-score drawn from the PRCA-24.

Willingness To Communicate (WTC) Sources: McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly, 40,* 16-25. McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 119-131). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Willingness to communicate is the most basic orientation toward communication. Almost anyone is likely to respond to a direct question, but many will not continue or initiate interaction. This instrument measures a person's willingness to *initiate* communication. The face validity of the instrument is strong, and results of extensive research indicate the predictive validity of the instrument. Alpha reliability estimates for this instrument have ranged from .85 to well above .90. Of the 20 items on the instrument, 8 are used to distract attention from the scored items. The twelve remaining items generate a total score, 4 context-type scores, and 3 receiver-type scores. Although the sub-scores generate lower reliability estimates, they are generally high enough to be used in research studies.

Results

To: Dean Mark Spencer, School of Arts and Humanities

From: James Roiger, Statistical Technician and Consultant

Date: June 27, 2007

Subject: Report on Assessment of General Education Speech Courses
Reporting Period: 2006 Fall Semester and 2007 Spring Semester

Assessment Method

All courses were assessed using a pretest-posttest methodology and tested with a 1-tailed matched-pairs t-test, $p < .05$. The reliability of the instruments was measured using Cronbach's *a*.

Assessment Instruments

Course	Name	Authors
Speech 2203	Communication Competence Scale	(Rubin & Martin, 1994)
Speech 2283	Communication Anxiety Instrument	(Booth-Butterfield & Gould, 1986)

Current Year Results

Courses Assessed

<u>Fall 2006 Semester</u>

Course	Name	No. of Sections	No of Students
Speech 2203	Interpersonal Communication	5	90
Speech 2283	Business & Professional Speech	3	54

<u>Spring 2007 Semester</u>

Course	Name	No. of Sections	No of Students
Speech 2203	Interpersonal Communication	3	56
Speech 2283	Business & Professional Speech	2	48

Instrument Reliability

<u>Fall 2006 Semester</u>

Course	Name	Cronbach's a		No. of Items
		Pretest	Posttest	
Speech 2203	Communication Competence Scale			
	Competence Scale	.7943	.7854	30
	Anxiety Scale	.7231	.5345	6
Speech 2283	Communication Anxiety Instrument	.9269	No cases	20
	Context Anxiety Scale	.8837	No cases	14
	Trait Anxiety Scale	.8537	No cases	6

<u>Spring 2007 Semester</u>

Course	Name	Cronbach's a		No. of Items
		Pretest	Posttest	
Speech 2203	Communication Competence Scale			
	Competence Scale	.7412	.7482	30
	Anxiety Scale	.5279	.5327	6
Speech 2283	Communication Anxiety Instrument	.9008	.7894	20
	Context Anxiety Scale	.7092	.7183	14
	Trait Anxiety Scale	.6154	.8600	6

Assessment Results

<u>Fall 2006 Semester</u>

Course	T Value	D. F.	Prob.	Pretest	Posttest
Speech 2203					
Competence	1.474	26	.076	101.96	104.19
Trait Anxiety	1.013	26	.160	17.00	16.33
Speech 2283					

Context Anxiety   No valid cases to test
Trait Anxiety   No valid cases to test

Spring 2007 Semester

CourseT Value	D. F.	Prob.	Pretest	Posttest
Speech 2203				
Competence	2.737	41	.004	102.76	106.10
Trait Anxiety	2.634	41	.006	17.57	16.40

Speech 2283
Context Anxiety   No valid cases to test
Trait Anxiety   No valid cases to test

Cumulative Assessment Results 1995 - 2006

CourseT Value	D. F.	Prob.	Pretest	Posttest
Speech 2203 (1995 - 2006)				
Competence	8.01	657	.0001	104.69	107.30
Trait Anxiety	3.18	657	.001	16.44	16.04
Speech 2283 (1995 - 2005)				
Context Anxiety	8.01	605	.0001	41.15	38.50
Trait Anxiety	7.48	605	.0001	16.67	15.45

Discussion

The Speech 2283 course could not be assessed. There were no cases where the respondents completed both the pretest instrument and the posttest instrument so a matched-pairs t-test to measure student change could not be conducted.

The Speech 2203 paired t-tests did not record significant results for student interpersonal competence during the Fall 2006 semester. However the means were in the predicted direction. The small sample (n = 26) probably contributed to the non-significant results.

The Speech 2203 paired t-tests were both significant for the Spring 2007 semester. There are two unique features with these results. The trait anxiety scale result is not normally significant but had strong significance this semester. Previous research indicates that an interpersonal communication course does not change interpersonal trait anxiety. The faculty should investigate to determine if something has been changed in the course curriculum or in the teaching approach. The second unique feature is that for the first time since the faculty have been assessing the course the analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicates a significant gender difference for the competence scale, $F(25,1) = 6.43$, $p < .02$. This could be a one-time occurrence or it could be an indication of changing characteristics in the target audience for the course.

The cumulative results of the assessment of the Speech 2283 course from 1995 through 2005 indicate that the course continues to make a significant difference in the

communication skills of the students completing the course, but no new data effected the cumulative file this year.

The cumulative results of the assessment of the Speech 2203 course from 1995 through 2006 using the competence scale indicate that the course continues to make a significant difference in the communication skills of the students completing the course. With the Spring 2007 results excepted, the results of the Speech 2203 trait anxiety analysis for individual years affirms that this form of anxiety is not successfully addressed by the Interpersonal Communication course, although the cumulative results would suggest otherwise. While the results of the twelve year cumulative analysis are statistically significant for the trait anxiety scale, they are probably not substantively significant, given the low t-test value in relation to the other scales. The law of large numbers more likely accounts for the significant results.

<div align="center">References</div>

Booth-Butterfield, S., & Gould, M. (1986). The communication anxiety inventory: Validation of state- and context-communication apprehension, <u>Communication Quarterly</u>, <u>34</u>, 194-205.

Rubin, R. B., & Martin, M. M. (1994). Development of a measure of interpersonal communication competence. <u>Communication Research Reports</u>, <u>11</u>, 33-44.

APPENDIX E
Portfolio guidelines

Portfolio: Minimum Contents

Resume

Three (3) professional letters of recommendation

Two (2) job interviews

One (1) interview with people in fields related to your field

Service-Learning Project

Research Project: Portfolio Assessment

Two (2) presentations for filming

Preparation of a multi-media presentation for the public forum

Portfolio Organization:

Cover page
Table of Contents
  I.   Brief Note of Introduction
        Resume
        Letters of Recommendation

  II.   Materials Supporting Your Resume
  III.   Materials Supporting Your Communication Skills

APPENDIX F
Minutes of Speech program meetings

Communication Department Meeting Minutes
4/22/2009
Faculty Present: Ron Sitton, Gary Marshall, Scott Kuttenkuler, Jim Evans
Purpose of meeting:
   To discuss curriculum changes that will move the program from separate speech
   communication and journalism programs to a single communication program
Topics Discussed
   - Reorganization for merging to a single department
   - Creation of core classes
   - Creation of emphasis within the communication degree
      o Possible suggested emphasis include

         - Speech Communication

         - Journalism

         - Rhetoric

         - Organizational Communication

         - Performance
   - Responsibilities of the department specifically related to general education
      offerings.

Overview of the meeting
   This meeting was an initial roundtable conversation about the future of the
   communication program. At this time no specific courses of action were
   determined. Additional meetings are planned for the fall 2009 semester.

APPENDIX G: Strategic Planning

REVIEW OF
THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT MONTICELLO
July 2008 – June 2009

Mission, Role, and Scope

The mission of the School of Arts and Humanities is to offer significant exposure to language, literature, communication, and artistic expression, providing students with the knowledge, appreciation, and experience necessary to develop personal and professional skills in these areas. The School's dual function is to provide courses for its own baccalaureate programs and for the general education program in the fields of writing, speaking, and art.

The School of Arts and Humanities offers Bachelor of Arts degree programs in Art, English, Journalism, and Speech Communication, as well as minors in Art, English, French, Journalism, Spanish, and Speech Communication. The School of Arts and Humanities program offerings are available to all campus disciplines through service courses.

Support goals from Enhancement of Resources focus:

Recruit, develop, and retain a quality faculty and staff.
Build partnerships through networking and collaboration.
Enhance the University's image, visibility, and influence.
Enhance the research environment for faculty and students.
Improve internal and external communication.
Improve employment opportunities.
Develop internal and external resources.
Recruit, retain, and graduate students.

Short-Range Objectives

1.   To continue to generate funds for Speech scholarships from a custom-published Public Speaking text. **Accomplished. New funds are now available for the awarding of one or more scholarships in Speech.**

2.   To continue to generate funds from custom-published Composition and World Literature texts. **Accomplished. This year royalties for UAM have totaled $14,626, half of which has come to Arts and Humanities allowing for the purchase of classroom furniture and Smart Room equipment.**

3.   To employ two Spanish Fulbright International Teaching Assistants and one French Fulbright International Teaching Assistant. **Accomplished in part. The two Spanish Fulbrights have been hosted but not the French.**

4.   To continue to host events that attract high-school students to campus, such as

debate tournaments, foreign-language festivals, and art exhibitions.
Accomplished. Events have included the annual Foreign Language Festival, art exhibitions, and the Shakespeare Festival.

5. To continue to improve communication and collaboration with secondary schools in the region with the purpose of recruiting and of enhancing the preparation of high-school students for college. **Accomplished. Activities have included university faculty visiting public schools and the UAM English faculty hosting a professional development workshop for area high-school English teachers.**

6. To continue to expand the size of the debate team. **Accomplished. The team had 11 members who did not return after spring 2008 but recruited 12 new members for 2008-2009 for a net gain of 1 member.**

7. To have "SMART" classrooms in Sorrells Hall and Wells. **Accomplished. The number of Smart Rooms has increased by four.**

8. To expand the size of the summer debate institute. **Accomplished. Camp grew from 18 in 2007 to 49 in 2008.**

9. To convert MCB 115 and 121 into Smart Rooms. **Accomplished in part. MCB 115 has been enhanced with Smart Room technology, but 121 has not because of electrical limitations of the building.**

10. To hire a Speech faculty member. **Not accomplished.**

Intermediate-Range Objectives

1. To employ four Fulbright International Teaching Assistants--two Spanish, one French, and one Italian. **Accomplished in part. Two FLTAs are currently employed.**

2. To make all classrooms on the first floor of MCB Smart Rooms. **In progress.**

Long-Range Objectives

1. To convert MCB 114 into a seminar room. **Accomplished.**

2. To publish a once-a-semester, hard-copy campus news magazine. **No progress.**

3. To identify donors for an endowed scholarship in creative writing. **No progress.**

4. To add a kiln yard with kilns adjoining the Art Complex. **No progress.**

Support goals from Enhancement of Academics focus:

Improve academic quality standards.
Share academic opportunities across units.
Increase opportunities for faculty/student research and creative activities

and increase experimental and service learning opportunities.
Improve internal and external communications.
Provide the latest technology to our students and faculty.
Accommodate the diverse needs of students.
Enhance UAM's image.

Short-Range Objectives

1.   To continue to implement and execute academic-program and general-education assessment in all disciplines and revise curriculum in response to valid data. **Accomplished. This year's changes have focused on the Art program and the implementation of three distinct concentrations.**

2.   To continue to develop articulation agreements with off-campus sites for placement of Speech and Journalism interns. **Accomplished. Speech interns have been placed with local television stations (KATV 7 and KARK 4) and at the local AM radio station (1220 AM KVSA). Journalism students have interned at the *Pine Bluff Commercial.***

3.   To continue to offer classes in Japanese language and culture. **Accomplished.**

4.   To continue to offer Latin classes and to make part of the permanent curriculum. **Accomplished.**

5.   To continue to increase the number of French classes offered. **Accomplished.**

6.   To create a "reading" series for students and faculty who wish to give presentations of scholarly or creative work, especially in preparation for giving presentations at regional or national conferences. **Discussion of goal has continued. Advanced Composition students did give presentations in Fall Semester.**

7.   To continue to revitalize the English program by placing greater emphasis on close readings, theory, grammar, and writing. **Accomplished. A critical and on-going goal.**

8.   To offer Speech theatre courses in order to provide students with greater opportunities in the area of performance. **No progress.**

9.   To enhance uniformity in all SAH general-education courses. **We are making progress. We held approximately ten workshops this year for Fundamentals of English instructors so that they could share pedagogical approaches and expectations and receive guidance from the Director of Composition.**

10.   To offer several sections of eight-week Fundamentals of English and Composition I to better serve the needs of developmental students. **Accomplished.**

11.   To offer Special Topics Art courses related to regional internship

opportunities.   **Accomplished. Several students interned with a local artist who received a major grant from the State pertaining to the evocation and preservation of various aspects of Arkansas history.**

Intermediate-Range Objectives

1.   To implement a major in Romance Languages (Spanish, French, Italian, Latin). **In progress. A "Modern Languages" major should be available to students Fall 2009.**

2.   To create a film-studies concentration within the English major. **In progress. A curriculum is being designed, as well as a History of Film course. We will probably seek Curriculum and Standards approval in fall 2009.**

Long-Range Objectives

1.   To start a summer program of visiting artists who will teach a 3-credit course called Blossom Painting, Blossom Drawing, Blossom Ceramics. **No progress.**

2.   To implement a minor in German. **In progress. German courses will be offered in 2009-2010.**

3.   To implement a photography class for the enhancement of the Journalism and Art programs. **No progress.**

Support goals from Enhancement of Quality of Life focus:

Accommodate the diverse needs of students.
Develop and implement a comprehensive student retention plan.
Promote healthy lifestyles for students, employees, and communities.

Short-Range Objectives

1.   To continue to offer—and, where appropriate, to expand offerings of—online Art Appreciation, Fundamentals of English, Composition I, Composition II, World Literature I, World Literature II, and Public Speaking. **Accomplished. On-line Technical Writing and Art History have been added as regular offerings.**

2.   To continue to offer night sections of all general-education required courses. **Accomplished in part. All General Education courses with the exception of Public Speaking and Art Appreciation have been available at night the past year.**

3.   To offer one or two Drawing I classes each semester and two or three Ceramics I classes each semester in addition to offering as many Drawing II/III and Ceramics II/III as Stage I can generate. **Accomplished.**

Intermediate-Range Objectives

1. To explore the feasibility of offering upper-level courses online. **In progress. Technical Writing and Art History have been added to the online offerings.**

Long-Range Objectives

1. To establish a resource center providing career information for English, Speech, Art, Journalism, and Romance Language majors. **No progress.**

**STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT MONTICELLO
July 2009 – June 2010**

Mission, Role, and Scope

The mission of the School of Arts and Humanities is to offer significant exposure to language, literature, communication, and artistic expression, providing students with the knowledge, appreciation, and experience necessary to develop personal and professional skills in these areas. The School's dual function is to provide courses for its own baccalaureate programs and for the general education program in the fields of writing, speaking, and art.

The School of Arts and Humanities offers Bachelor of Arts degree programs in Art, English, Journalism, and Speech Communication, as well as minors in Art, English, French, Journalism, Spanish, and Speech Communication. The School of Arts and Humanities program offerings are available to all campus disciplines through service courses.

Support goals from Enhancement of Resources focus:

Recruit, develop, and retain a quality faculty and staff.
Build partnerships through networking and collaboration.
Enhance the University's image, visibility, and influence.
Enhance the research environment for faculty and students.
Improve internal and external communication.
Improve employment opportunities.
Develop internal and external resources.
Recruit, retain, and graduate students.

Short-Range Objectives

7. To implement Modern Languages major.

8. To have 20 Modern Languages majors by May 2010.

9. To graduate 6 Speech majors, 4 Art majors, and 10 English majors in 2009-10.

10. To increase the number of Speech majors to 30, the number of Art majors to 25,

the number of English majors to 75.

11.   To revise and update the custom-published Public Speaking text.

12.   To revise the custom-published Fundamentals of English text to give it a college-life, study-skills theme.

13.   To continue to generate funds from custom-published Composition and World Literature texts with the purpose of using funds in ways that will benefit significant numbers of students and faculty.

14.   To employ two Fulbright International Teaching Assistants.

15.   To host events that attract high-school students to campus, such as debate tournaments, foreign-language festivals, Shakespeare Festival, the documentary film festival, and art exhibitions.

16.   To further enhance communication and collaboration with secondary schools in the region with the purpose of recruiting and of enhancing the preparation of high-school students for college.

11.   To add one more "SMART" classroom in Wells Hall.

17.   To expand the size of the summer debate institute.

18.   To employ two Arts and Humanities Graduate Assistants.

19.   To begin implementation of a coherent rotation of Philosophy courses.

20.   To expand the size of the debate team.

Intermediate-Range Objectives

1   To have 30 Modern Languages majors, 40 Speech majors, 30 Art majors, and 80 English majors by Fall 2011.

2.   To have 8 Speech graduates, 6 Art graduates, and 12 English graduates in 2011-12.

3.   To enhance MCB 114 and MCB 121 with Smart Room Technology.

4.   To custom publish Spanish texts for Elementary Spanish I and Elementary Spanish II, thereby saving students approximately $100 on texts. Royalties will go toward foreign-language scholarships.

Long-Range Objectives

5.   To publish a once-a-semester, hard-copy campus news magazine.

6.　　　To add a kiln yard with kilns adjoining the Art Complex.

7.　　　To graduate 5 Modern Languages majors.

8.　　　To employ four Fulbright International Teaching Assistants.

Support goals from Enhancement of Academics focus:

Improve academic quality standards.
Share academic opportunities across units.
Increase opportunities for faculty/student research and creative activities
　　　and increase experimental and service learning opportunities.
Improve internal and external communications.
Provide the latest technology to our students and faculty.
Accommodate the diverse needs of students.
Enhance UAM's image.

Short-Range Objectives

12.　　To revise curriculum in response to valid assessment data.

13.　　To develop additional articulation agreements with off-campus sites for placement of Speech and Journalism interns.

14.　　To maintain offerings in Japanese language and culture.

15.　　To maintain offerings in Latin classes.

16.　　To increase the number of French classes offered.

17.　　To support faculty professional growth through support of faculty travel and through recognition (publicity, annual evaluations, merit pay) of scholarly and creative achievements.

18.　　To create a "reading" series for students and faculty who wish to give presentations of scholarly or creative work, especially in preparation for giving presentations at regional or national conferences.

19.　　To further revitalize the English program by placing emphasis on close readings, theory, grammar, and writing.

20.　　To enhance uniformity in all SAH general-education courses.

21.　　To maintain offerings of multiple sections of eight-week Fundamentals of English and Composition I to serve the needs of developmental students.

22.　　To offer German classes.

11.	To offer Special Topics Art courses related to regional internship opportunities.

Intermediate-Range Objectives

3.	To create and implement an interdisciplinary film-studies concentration within the English major.

Long-Range Objectives

4.	To start a summer program of visiting artists who will teach a 3-credit course called Blossom Painting, Blossom Drawing, Blossom Ceramics.

5.	To implement a photography class for the enhancement of the Journalism and Art programs.

Support goals from Enhancement of Quality of Life focus:

Accommodate the diverse needs of students.
Develop and implement a comprehensive student retention plan.
Promote healthy lifestyles for students, employees, and communities.

Short-Range Objectives

4.	To maintain—and, where appropriate, to expand offerings of—online classes.

5.	To maintain offerings of night sections of general-education required courses.

6.	To offer one or two Drawing I classes each semester and two or three Ceramics I classes each semester in addition to offering as many Drawing II/III and Ceramics II/III as Stage I can generate.

7.	To support The Creative Society in its sponsorship of Mocha Madness, an evening of music, poetry, fiction, and humor held once each semester.

Intermediate-Range Objectives

2.	To explore the feasibility of offering additional upper-level courses online.

Long-Range Objectives

1.	To establish an online resource center providing career information for English, Speech, Art, and Modern Languages majors.