

Dean's Response to Internal Review of Program
Performance Review
Department of Human Communication Studies

The internal reviewer captures the department strengths, many of which have been discussed in my initial response to the report. The reviewer notes that department strengths include outstanding faculty, an excellent forensics program, innovative courses, collegiality, and a strong M.A. program.

On the other hand, the internal reviewer recognizes concerns and then offers solutions. I will address the concern and her solution. First, she indicates that the department "must" hire new faculty. She suggests that in order to strengthen the number of applicants, the department should reduce the teaching load and provide equitable salaries. First, it must be pointed out that the CSU teaching load is 4-4 unless creative scheduling and a few large classes provides salary savings that then can be given for course reduction. Unfortunately, the department has few large classes and does provide the majority of its faculty with three course loads, which causes budget strain. Also, salaries in this department are equal to salaries in the other departments. The department must try to live within its budget. Its SFR in fall of 2006 was 19.79. The SFR in Comm was 23.96 and in R-TV-F 29.01. In other words, the two sister departments are subsidizing budget shortfall in the Department of Human Communication Studies.

She recognizes a heavy teaching load with the 4-4 requirement. As noted above, about 1/3 of the faculty are teaching 4-4, the others have been given assigned time for various reasons. She is right, however, that large sections do produce opportunities for lighter loads across the faculty, but this requires large number of majors, and she points out that the CTP side of the department has only 147 majors.

The internal reviewer expresses concern about offering an adequate number of sections to accommodate student demand. If demand justifies increasing sections, then the chair is at liberty to do so if faculty are available. This is a department decision.

The internal reviewer discusses how the department might attract new majors. I suggest that the faculty review her recommendations and determine whether they have been tried or whether they have merit. She suggests that the name of the major be changed. This has been discussed at great length. Although I have full understanding as to why the name change is requested, I am not in total agreement that changing the department name to Communications Studies will cause an avalanche of new students. It is likely that students are interested in courses offered and whether they lead to job opportunities rather than the exact name of the department. It is true that a number of departments across the campus have experienced very slow growth while others have grown significantly. It seems to me that students find what they want, e.g., public relations students find the major within a very general department title of Communications.

I was pleased to read the many positive comments written by the internal reviewer. The reviewer's comments regarding strengths are appreciated and noted; at the same time,

recommendations for improvement and articulated concerns will be considered and are likely to become issues for discussion at various levels of the college and department.