

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following summarizes the Speech Communication Department's 2009 program review.

There are three main categories of the department: English Speech as a Second Language (ESSL), forensics program, and general transfer and AA courses. All three have seen important changes. The ESSL had changed software since the last program review and with the implementation of this software, the nature of the speech lab and how students interact with the technology has changed. The most significant change to the department has been the success of the speech team. Winning the national championship in 2008 and taking second place in 2009, the forensics program has achieved great success in the past couple of years but will struggle to do well if staffing, funding and space needs are not met.

Like other departments our biggest concerns are financial. Lack of appropriate funding has affected our course allotment, ability to hire classified and full time faculty and negatively affected our ability to maintain lab equipment. We hope that departmental funding increases in the near future. Though, we are currently adapting to the limited resources, we hope this does not become the norm.

Although the last program review was completed in 2001, the course outlines did not require substantial updates, but two courses have been archived and a new one has been added. The ESSL course outlines were updated to make it clear that there was a hierarchy in the courses and that students should take ESSL courses in sequence. The most significant change to the program will happen in the next two years when the AA degree is updated and the changes actualized. We will be changing the required courses and adding a capstone course to assess the degree.

With Jim Marteney becoming the Distance Education Trainer, the department has embraced distance education. Distance education is becoming more prominent in our departmental choices and we wish to be able to offer a full AA degree that can be fulfilled mostly online. (Speech 101 and 130 will only be hybrids.) We feel that distance education meets the needs of our highly technologically culture and should be a substantial part of our curriculum.

Since the last program review the college has instituted Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Program SLOs (PSLO) for degrees and certificates. We assume that the implementation of SLOs will significantly alter the nature of our courses. For example, we have already assessed one class (speech 105) and this assessment has altered the structure of the course. Speech 101, our most popular course, is being standardized because of the difficulty of assessing a large number of sections taught by over ten instructors. We anticipate more changes as more classes are assessed.

The fulltime to part time ratio has altered significantly in favor of the part time. This ratio does not appear to be changing anytime soon. It is important to continue to argue for full time positions, but we need to face the reality of our seemingly consistent budget deficit and take into consideration the rights and importance of part time faculty members in the department.

The data collected from surveys handed out to students enrolled in speech courses reflected that in general, student's perception of speech instructors and courses was quite positive. However, all was not perfect and there were areas of concern that have already been brought to the attention of the department by the chair.

While the department is generally active in campus activities and has decent relationships with college programs and entities like the ASU, these relationships can be improved upon and made stronger.

INTRODUCTION

The Speech Communications Department has undergone considerable change since the last program review in 2001. The circumstances bringing about those changes, as well as the changes themselves must cause us to reevaluate our curriculum, our departmental goals and how we seek to achieve those goals, as well as our relationship to the college as a whole and the community with whom we relate as a Community College. The department has experienced many changes: a new department chair, administrative changes, scheduling changes, calendar changes, new faculty members, an ever increasing number of adjunct, changes in available educational technology, an increased demand for distance education, and an increased demand in meeting the needs of the diverse population. These changes have all brought to our attention the need to examine our program content and determine what, if any, adjustments must be made.

PHILOSOPHY, MISSION AND HISTORY

Department History:

Speech faculty were among the first to be added to the new college when it opened in 1949. For several years the first instructors worked and taught in the bungalows, until the Humanities Building was constructed. As Broadcasting was made a part of the department in 1950, studio space for radio was included in the construction. Before that, “broadcasting” consisted of using tape recorders and microphones in the bungalows for voice work, and for recording the active political/social campus involvements the speech teachers were supervising. Speech faculty sponsored student clubs in the ‘50’s, led political action expression among students in the 60’s and into the 70’s. By the mid ‘70s, when the LA system boasted 140,000 students, the Valley campus had 22,000 students, 16,000 of whom were part time, and 6,000 full time. The average age of students at Valley was 27 years, but the age range was between 16 and 83 years. Indeed, senior citizens as students made up a fair percentage of our classes. Speech and Broadcasting were attractive areas for retired folks to come and take a class or two at a time... until the governor began a tuition program for community colleges, which also put restrictions on students who already had a college degree!

In the eight semesters between 1972 and 1976 the speech transfers averaged 27 per semester. In the same period, Broadcasting averaged 91 occupational certificates per semester. Even though television had been around since the late ‘40’s, it took until mid ‘70’s to convert one classroom in Humanities to a television studio/classroom. At about that time, we also enabled the radio station, KVCN (K Valley College Monarchs) to use low power broadcast through the carrier wave system (Richard Burden, Associates - who installed the system at LAX), so anyone on campus could pick up the station by tuning in

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

to “AM -83” on their radios. In the ‘90’s, the daytime radio instructor, Gail Nastasia succeeded in getting the radio programming broadcast over cable. However, in 2001 Broadcasting split from Speech and formed Media Studies with Cinema.

The faculty leadership that had guided student participation in campus activities, and in public, active, politically expressive communication skills, developed courses around various roles communicators played. In the 80’s and 90’s more emphasis was placed on small group communication. Higher-level classes were created so that from basic platform performance public speaking one could move to interpersonal communication, studying the factors affecting the scope and purpose of human communications.

With various international pressures driving up immigration numbers (and political asylum!) numbers in this country, again Speech led the way, by beginning a Speech Lab to provide the necessary education for foreigners to acquire American /English speech sounds, to help them with their survival skills in a new country. From the mid ‘70’s through the present, the demographics have shown the English Speech as a Second Language program is increasingly more vital. The lab moved into the basement of the Camps Center in the late 90s and this has been its home ever since. From 2001 to 2006 block grants increased the number of computers in the lab and facilitated the introduction of a new software program, called Sony Soloist, which has since formed the core of the lab instruction. While the lab used to be based on audio tapes, Sony Soloist delivers the program designed and produced by Pat Calder and Adrienne Zahler.

Since the last program review, the department had undergone significant staffing changes. First off, we have lost four long-term faculty members: Bill Edler, Adrienne Zahler, Jack Sterk, and George Potsic. Bill Edler fully retired in spring 2003. Jack Sterk transferred to Pierce College in spring 2006. He still retains his seniority rights and will be teaching hourly classes in fall 2010. George Potsic retired in spring 2008 and continues to teach hourly in the speech lab.

In fall 2001, Duane Smith was hired full time to coach the speech and debate team. In fall 2002 Josh Miller was hired as another coach for the team. While the beginning was rocky for these two and initially the team saw limited success, in 2008 the speech team won the national championship in Chicago. In 2009 the team was second place overall. The speech team is the only team in the history of Valley College to win a national championship.

Due to the diverse nature of our population, a new course was added to the department curriculum: Communication Across Cultures. Currently this course is offered only online, but promises to play a more prominent role in our department as we make it a part of the AA degree.

In the summer of 2008, the first major renovation the Humanities building was completed. Classrooms were painted, new audio-visual technology was installed, the floors had new linoleum installed and the locks were changed. When the fall 2008 semester began this was a nightmare as there weren’t even doors on the renovated rooms. Locks were not officially installed until spring 2009 and they were fully changed in summer 2009.

Spring 2009 saw the beginning of significant budgetary issues. Some faculty and administrators who have been at Valley a long time have said that this is the worst budget crisis they have ever seen. Ten percent of the spring classes were cut and one entire summer session was cut with the second one only offering two classes. Fall 2009 had a ten percent cut over the previous fall. Winter 2010 is less than half of 2009, and spring 2010

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

has been cut another ten percent on top of spring 2009's cuts. The cuts to our program, while not having as dramatic an effect as it has on other programs, has significantly affected the work load of the adjunct. Adjuncts who were getting two or three classes, now only get one. This has increased the stress load for the faculty whose lifestyles are being altered by our budget. In addition, the cuts are affecting student's choices. There are fewer classes available for students to take.

The Speech Department's goals are to:

1. Improve the general education of students.
2. Prepare students for transfer to 4-year schools.
3. Improve the quality of communication for students for whom English is a Second Language
4. Prepare students for competition in forensics (speech and debate competition).

The philosophy and goals of the Speech Communications Department could not relate more directly to the College's mission and goals than if they (the College's) were taken from our own course outlines: i.e. inherent in the nature of Speech Communication classes (and English Speech as a Second Language classes), are "critical thinking, cultural awareness, intellectual development, self-direction, and social responsibility."

The speech communication program exists to improve communication. ESSL courses are designed to help non-native speakers overcome language barriers to more effectively communicate. General courses are designed to help students increase communication effectiveness and critical thinking in the specific course area. For example, we will all most likely have to work in groups. The goal of Speech 151: Small group communication is to create awareness of group communication in theory and practice so that when students enter into group communication situations in their future, they will be more effective communicators.

As detailed in later sections, the speech department feels that we are doing well in terms of enrollment numbers, student perception and course content. We do need to create a greater emphasis on the degree.

Right now the program hopes to accomplish SLO assessment of the all courses within the designated time frame. We also wish to create more publicity about our courses, ESSL classes and AA degree. We have about talked creating a web presence and having better fliers to offer students.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Speech Communication is the study of how human beings communicate. People who study Speech Communication are interested in learning how the communication process works and desire to improve and adapt their communication for intended recipients. Courses in the Associates degree examine the importance of effective communication in public, groups, cultures, interpersonal settings, and literature. In addition, we explore the nature of argumentation and the ability to critically evaluate messages as both the sender and receiver. The Speech Communication Associate's degree can lead to careers in broadcasting, teaching, business, marketing, law, journalism, public relations, and consulting.

CURRICULUM ANALYSIS

The Speech Communications Department offers courses leading to an Associate of Arts Degree, and provides eight courses (Speech 101, 102, 104, 105, 121, 122, 130, 151) which help fulfill the Communication and Critical Thinking, and the Humanities categories for transfer or certification. Generally, all courses are taught each semester throughout the year. In fall 2009 speech 121 and 130 were not offered due to budget cuts. This was an anomaly and, despite this, our department goal is to offer all classes each semester so students can easily attain their educational goals.

The coursework within the department falls into the areas of: General Speech and Critical Thinking, Forensics, and English Speech as a Second Language (ESSL). Of the 18 courses offered in the department, 14 transfer to either the UC system, or the CSU system, or to both. Only the ESSL classes: 61, 62, 63, 64, are Not Degree Applicable.

Since the last program review two courses have been archived and one has been added. With the constant pressure to have courses with a high enrollment it as determined by the department that Storytelling and Business Communication needed to be archived. Business Communication has not been offered in over ten years. George Potsic was the primary professor for Storytelling and the few times that Storytelling has been offered, the enrollment has been very low. After George Potsic retired, no department faculty were desirous of teaching it and there seemed to be no student demand.

There have been course changes since the last program review. Speech 122: Communication Across Cultures was added in 2004. This course is crucial as we live in a multi-cultural society. It is important to learn to how to communicate with myriad cultures. We have archived Business Communication and Storytelling as these classes have not been offered in a number of years. We submitted a change for speech 106 from six hours to seven hours, due to the extensive time commitment on the part of both the students and the forensics coaches.

We need to push more for awareness of the AA in speech and to get more student to major in Speech Communications. One issue is that the degree is still "Speech." This may create the impression that the degree is based on public speaking. This is not in line with all the local transfer universities (CSUN, USC, UCLA), all of whom call the degree Communication. The speech departments should consult with other departments in the district to change the name of the program to communications. This could have the effect of creating more majors and will be in line with transfer universities. In addition, there is no departmental connection to the AA degree. A student can earn an AA without having any direct communication about this degree with any faculty member.

This is our current AA degree:

Speech 101 Oral Communication I

Speech 102 Oral Communication II

OR

Speech 385 Directed Study-Speech. Comm.

Speech 104 Argumentation

OR

Speech 105 Critical Thinking

Speech 121 The Process of Interpersonal Communication

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

Speech 130 Intro. to Oral Interpretation of Literature

OR

Speech 135 Storytelling

Speech 151 Small Group Communication

Total: 18 units

This is the new AA degree submitted to curriculum spring 2010. As of the writing of this narrative, it has not been officially approved:

Speech Communication Associate Degree Major Requirements

Plan A

Speech 101	Oral Communication I	3
Speech 102	Oral Communication II	3
Speech 104	Argumentation	
OR		3
Speech 105	Critical Thinking	
Speech 121	Interpersonal Communication	
OR		3
Speech 130	Oral Interpretation of Literature	
Speech 122	Communication Across Cultures	3
Speech 151	Small Group Communication	3

TOTAL: 18 units

English Speech as a Second Language (ESSL):

The Speech department's ESSL program is essential to the diverse population we serve at Valley College.

The goals of the ESSL program are as follows:

1. To facilitate the ability of students to make themselves understood by others in their environment.
2. To improve their potential to be gainfully employed.
3. To reduce their accents and improve articulation.

The Demography of California, hence that of Los Angeles Valley College, includes various ethnic groups, among them, many immigrants from foreign countries. The students served by this program come from (Fall of 2006 sampling) 48 different countries and speak 28 different languages. In order to become productive members of our society and to maximize their personal well-being, it is urgent that they be able to communicate in our common language with prospective employers, with doctors responsible for their health needs, with the teachers of their children, and others involved in their welfare. In order to provide them with the opportunity to accomplish this goal, the Speech Communications Department conducts continuing assessment of the ESSL Program, and the way it is delivered to the students.

The program began almost thirty five years ago, served a minimal number of students using tape recorded materials from various sources on 6 comparative audio recorders, and was served by two faculty members. Since that time, there have been massive changes, not only in the number of faculty involved in the program, but also in the

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

number of students served and in the materials used. At the time of the college's peak enrollments, the ESSL classrooms and the Speech Lab served over 600 students per semester. As budgetary, space and equipment limitations grew, enrollment in the Lab dropped to the 500's per semester and current enrollments vary from 250 to 400. The materials used in the Lab are designed by members of the Speech faculty who are speech pathologists, educated in acquisition of language skills and articulation. Those materials are then recorded professionally by a department member trained and qualified in speech performance and broadcasting techniques. The current media used are digitally recorded lessons which have been completely revamped and expanded from the earlier Lab contents, and have been used most successfully for five years now. They are delivered at approximately 60 computer stations. Specialized text/workbooks/scripts to accompany the lessons – have been written by faculty members to address the specific needs of the students utilizing the Lab to help them achieve success not only in our ESSL classes, but in their ability to enter and succeed in mainstream academic classes.

The program itself consists of five tiers: (Sp. 63) Beginning Conversational Speech Skills, repeatable once; (Sp. 64) Basic Speech Skills, repeatable once; (Sp. 66) Advanced Speech Skills, repeatable once; (Sp. 111) Voice and Articulation; and (Sp. 113) English Speech as a Second Language, repeatable once. Students are strongly advised to take Speech Lab (Speech 61) concurrently with these classes, and move on to the more advanced Speech 62 (Speech Lab Techniques) as they achieve success in correcting sounds in Speech 61. Each of the tiers should recommend concurrent enrollment in one of the Lab courses for practice in acquiring intelligible American/English speech sounds.

In accordance with the mission of the college, this program is designed to become the focus of immigrants and other non-English speakers to achieve success in their lives in our community; in many cases, to enable them to continue their education by transferring to the four-year universities. (A number of our ESL students were professionals in their own countries, and often need to improve their English speech in order to be licensed to practice here in their fields.)

Southern California has become the home of many different ethnic groups arriving from other countries in ever increasing numbers. Because there is usually an ethnic group already living here, other members of families and friends migrate to this area. All are in need of communication skills that will make them independent members of our society, able to earn their living in this country. It is the goal of this program to provide them with what they need to succeed

At the Basic Skill level are students who barely understand, let alone speak English, and at the Speech 113 level, we may find those who need only minor help in articulation to be completely comprehensible and capable of success in meeting the oral speech requirement for AA and the nursing program.

Forensics team:

A second major part of the department is the Forensics Program, in which students research, develop, train and perform in competitive events such as Parliamentary debate, public speaking and oral interpretation of literature. There are three team awards categories at Phi Rho Pi: debate, individual event and over all. In addition there are three divisions of competition: small, medium and large school. The divisions are not based on the overall school size, but the size of the entry. The most competitive division

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

is the large school division as this is the one that the top schools enter into. We compete in the large school division.

The goals of the speech team are as follows:

1. To fully understand how to properly research, structure, compose and perform a speech, debate or interpretation event.
2. To analyze an audience and adapt presentations for them.
3. To fully understand the competitive demands of all of the different genres of performance celebrated within the forensics community: platform speaking, limited preparation, debate, and oral interpretation of literature.

The forensics program is one of the most successful programs on the campus, winning the overall national community college forensics championship in 2008 and taking second place in 2009. Competitions take place locally and throughout the state, where students acquire sufficient distinction to represent the school at State and at National Competitions. LAVC has long been a leader in the number and type of accomplishments in Forensics. The two coaches, Josh Miller and Duane Smith were themselves competitors at Valley College as students, and had won national trophies in their days as student competitors. It is important to note that the success of the team would not have been possible without Robyn Jackson and Paul Davis, both former competitors who helped coach the speech team during the 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 seasons.

Distance education:

With Jim Marteney being the distance education coordinator, and the recognition that a majority of our students operate in a digital world, the department has embraced distance education. We currently offer six fully online courses (104, 105, 121, 122, 151, 1/2/385) and one hybrid only (101). As indicated in the timeline, Speech 130 is in the works to be offered as a hybrid. The department recognizes the importance of distance education and hopes to be able to soon offer an AA degree that students can earn, with the exception of the 101 hybrid, fully online.

Course timeline:

All classes are offered each semester so there is no need to construct a class offering timeline.

SPEECH DEPARTMENT DATA ANALYSIS

The Speech department was provided with two collections of data: the analysis of the Speech program review surveys, which were distributed in spring 2009, and analyzed in fall 2009; and the Speech Program Review Data Profile provided to us by Michelle Fowles in winter 2010.

Speech Program Review Survey:

A total of 879 surveys were handed out to students enrolled in speech courses in spring 2009. The surveys were handed out to day and evening courses and to both full time and adjunct instructors. All students were given the general survey and students enrolled in the speech lab were given an additional set of questions to complete. The

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

number of surveys collected from students enrolled in the speech lab was 181. Many of the questions were used solely for informational purposes only and will not be factored into this program reviews. For example, knowing the student's living situation could be interesting, but this knowledge does not impact the nature of the program.

A majority of the respondents provided us with results that indicate that the department is doing quite well.

*Ninety percent said speech instructors made it clear that student could ask questions and an additional eight said it was somewhat clear. Only one percent said that this was not clear.

*Sixty-two percent said that they would take another speech class. Twenty one percent said possibly.

*Sixty-nine percent strongly agreed that speech instructors are easy to understand and twenty eight percent agree.

*Sixty-six strongly agree that speech instructors are prepared and up to date and thirty two percent agree.

*Sixty-three percent strongly agree that speech faculty are interested in their progress. Thirty-two percent agree.

*Sixty-eight percent strongly agree that speech instructors present material in an interesting manner and twenty-eight percent agree.

*Fifty eight percent strongly agree that speech instructors are available outside class and thirty-three percent agree.

*Sixty three percent strongly agree that courses were scheduled when they needed them and thirty two percent agree.

*Seventy-nine percent strongly agree that they would recommend someone else to take a speech class and eighteen percent agree.

What this data tells the department is that we are doing quite well with how students perceive us. The above data also tell us that we are addressing important issues in education: making material interesting, letting students know that it is okay to ask questions, being prepared and up to date, etc. What stood out the most for us is that ninety five percent of students agree or strongly agree that speech instructors are interested in their progress. The speech instructors in general seem to be very students oriented and genuinely concerned about the educational success of their students. The fact that students recognized this shows that that instructor's perception of their relationships with the students seems to match the student's.

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

But while the surveys were quite positive, there are two areas of concern. Nine percent of the respondents said that they never received a syllabus from their instructor. The department was very concerned about this, as all professors should be providing syllabi for their classes. This issue has been presented to all the instructors by the department chair. The chair has let all instructors know that providing syllabi is not optional and not providing a syllabus for a course may result in a negative review.

The second area of concern is that seventy three percent said that the instructor explained something they didn't understand during the first few meetings. The first few meetings really set the tone for the rest of the course and can be crucial to the student's success. There is no way to know if this lack of understanding was addressed in later classes or through student questions, but it needs to be communicated to the instructors that this is an issue that may need to be addressed in the early classes.

The speech lab, in general, also received positive results, but there are also areas of concern.

*Fifty-nine percent said that lab is available all the time and thirty five percent said most of the time.

This is to be expected, as the lab is open during the times the college is most populated: morning, early afternoon, and evening, but is not open all day long.

*Forty nine percent said that the lab is in good condition all of the time and fifty four percent said most of the time.

While this data may contradict our claim later in this narrative that we need a classified position, it does not. We were fortunate to get a student worker in spring 2009 that knew a great deal about computers and was able to keep the computers functioning well. The equipment has been suffering a great deal since he left. Currently about thirty percent of the computers are not functioning at full capacity.

* Fifty percent of students reported that there is enough equipment all the time, and thirty nine percent said most of the time.

This should be close to one hundred percent for all of the time, but the constant computer issues make many of them unavailable. We hope that computer problems, discussed in greater detail later in this narrative, will be addressed soon.

* Seventy seven percent reported that someone was there to help them out all of the time, and fifteen percent said most of the time.

While this seems generally positive, it also addresses our current need for a classified position. In spring 2009, in addition to two workers from financial aid, we had a student worker that was paid for by our department. Due to budget cuts, we had to let the departmental student worker go. Student worker's available employment time does not always fit the hours that the lab is open. This means that there are lab times when only an instructor is present. It can be very difficult for one instructor to help students with checking in and out, computer issues and conversation labs. A classified position

would alleviate the burden placed on the instructor and would better meet student's needs.

Speech Program Review Data Profile:

A review of the program review data profile did not turn up anything significant in end-of-term enrollments, credit census counts, gender, age, ethnicity, privacy language, citizenship, prior education, and educational goals. Other than the increased number of Armenians enrolled in speech courses, which can be explained by Armenian enrollment in the speech lab, the data was not significantly different from the LAVC in general.

However, there was one interesting bit of data because it allows for a direct comparison from one instructor to another. Speech 105 is a course that had been taught by only one speech faculty member for many years. This instructor left and another took over, and, with the exception of one section, taught all of the 105 sections. The retention rate of 105 in fall 2005 was seventy-seven percent with a success rate was sixty-three percent. The retention in fall 2008 (with the new instructor) was ninety-five percent, with a success rate of eighty one percent. There is no way to quantify why the numbers have changed, but we felt it was important to note how one instructor can dramatically alter the numbers in a course.

PSLO AND SLO

Program:

The PSLOs will be assessed using the campus wide rubric. This rubric assesses the general education and transfer programs at Valley College. There are four goals outlined on the rubric and the following will demonstrate how the courses in the Speech Communicate department help achieve those goals:

Communication skills:

This goal is the one that most directly relates to our department. Communication is, after all, in our name. Our courses emphasize the expression, transmission and interpretation of knowledge. Speech 101 focuses solely on speaking and a majority of our other courses teach writing, listening and reading.

Reasoning Skills:

We have two courses that specifically emphasize reasoning skills: Speech 104 and 105. Both courses focus on the importance of reasoning logically and coming to reliable solutions. On a broader level, almost all of our courses teach audience analysis and the ability to adapt messages to the recipients of communication.

Social responsibility/ personal development:

A majority of our courses teach an understanding of the nature of one's own communication and the effect that communication may have on one's environment.

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

Global awareness:

An assessment of Speech Communication 122: Communication Across cultures will best help determine if this goal is being met. This course focuses on the nature of how the world's cultures shape, and are shaped, by communication.

Achievement: AA or transfer:

Our department offers an Associates degree and fourteen courses that are transferable.

The Speech Communication Department will meet the requirements of the PSLO by examining the course level SLOs. Our plan once we get them all is to meet as a department and review all of our courses to see, as a whole, how they meet the General Education/Transfer Program PSLO.

Course level:

All course level SLOs have been written. As of the writing of this narrative, speech 105 has been assessed. This means that there are 17 courses left to assess. The time line for the assessment is as follows: six completed during the 2009-2010 academic year, six completed during the 2010-2011 academic year and five completed during the 2011-2012 academic year.

SLOs (student learning objectives) have also started to enter in the educational mix. The creating and implementation of the SLO will soon affect how our courses are structured and taught. We are meeting in the winter of 2010 to standardize the speech 101 courses. Right now there is no clear standard for speech 101 and the majority of 101 classes are taught by adjunct. This means that the adjunct will need to adapt their courses to the standard agreed upon by the department. The effect of this standardization remains to be seen.

FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

Offices:

Currently, a majority of the speech department have their offices in Humanities 108. Pat Calder and Helen Fountaine are in 108A, Jim Marteney is in 108B, Josh Miller uses 108C for chair duties and 108D is the adjunct office. Betty Ballew's office is in Humanities 116 and Josh Miller and Duane Smith have their offices in bungalow 24. The office space is currently adequate for our needs. Most of us have working computers. Jim Marteney and Betty Ballew do not have computers right now but orders have been place and we anticipate they will receive new computers soon.

Meeting space:

Humanities 106 is the meeting and storage space for the speech department. This space meets our departmental needs.

Dedicated classroom facilities:

Currently we have no classrooms designated solely for the speech department. There was a time that bungalows 71 and 72 were designated primarily for the speech classes, but we no longer get priority usage of those classrooms. We do have a number of classes in Humanities 110, but we do not have sole usage of this room. We will push for a dedicated classroom especially for the full time faculty members who can adapt the classroom to their academic needs.

Speech lab:

The speech lab is in the basement of the Campus Center. The space consists of a large space for computer usage, rooms for group discussion, a control room, a kitchen, and a few small rooms used primarily for storage. The speech lab's space is adequate to the needs of the program.

The main problem with the lab seems to be the computers. There are currently 54 computers in the lab for students to practice their language skills. At any given time, over a quarter of the computers have issues that prevented them from functioning properly. The issues range from headphones not working properly to memory issues. Having working computers is essential and Al Amory has been instrumental to keeping the computers and the lab working smoothly. The speech department would like to extend a heartfelt thanks to Al for his dedication to the lab.

Forensics:

The biggest issue facing the forensics program is the potential future lack of a designated meeting space. Currently the team uses bungalow 24. Bungalow 24 has three offices, a workroom with a refrigerator, and a gathering spot. Bungalow 24 does a great job of being a space that students feel comfortable in and can make their home. Space is crucial to the success of our program,

Once the bungalows are demolished, we have been told that we can move into Humanities 114. While this space is adequate, there is a concern that this space may not fulfill all of the needs of our program.

This what we need and a justification for that need:

1. A student gathering spot: We need a space that students can practice, relax and hang out in. The more time they spend in the office the more connected they become to the team.
2. A work and computer room: Computers are essential to our research.
3. Faculty offices close to the team: A key part of our success is our immediacy to the students. Any future team space should include offices that are close to the student gathering spot.
4. A practice space: One benefit of being in the bungalows is that we have a bunch of rooms to use for practice. Practice space is crucial to the team.

The department has identified Campus Center 3 and 4 as potential space for the team. This space is ideal for the team as it has all of the above issues addressed. In addition, is it right across from the speech lab and this will allow Josh Miller, who is both department chair and forensics coach, greater access to the lab. This space is currently

being used by the Media Arts department, but it is assumed that they will vacate this space once the Media Arts building is completed in about five years. We have already talked to the architects and Dennis Reed about taking over the space.

In terms of technology the needs of the speech team are simple: a few computers for printing and research. We were given four computers through a block grant in 2003. The concern is that as the technology ages, the computers will not longer meet our needs and we will not have the financial assistance to get new technology.

FACULTY AND STAFFING

Full time staff (in order of hiring date):

Jim Marteney: (1977) B.A., Speech & Economics, and M.A., Speech Communication, University of California, Santa Barbara
Former speech & debate coach having twice led our teams to National Championships as well as coaching the two top speakers in the country. Currently teaches critical thinking, creative problem solving, public speaking, group dynamics and argumentation. Co-authored Critical Thinking text; authored Debate text; authored Group Communication text. Presents seminars and consults in speech and staff development. Is a former State Board member, Calif. Community College Council for Staff Development. Currently is the Distance Learning Trainer working with faculty in developing online learning opportunities for students.

Pat Calder: (1980) A.A., LAVC; BA, & MA, CSU, Northridge: Communicative Disorders,
CCC (Certificate of Clinical Competency) Speech, Language & Hearing Association, L.A. Unified District teaching in the special education (Aphasia classroom). Over twenty years teaching ESSL and Speech Communication at Valley. Author of text/workbook/ for Beginning Conversational Speech Skills, Basic Speech Skills, Advanced Speech Skills, Voice and Articulation text/workbook, Speech Lab text/workbook/scripts, coauthor of text/workbook for English Speech as a Second Language.

Betty Ballew: (1989) BA, & MA, California State University, Los Angeles, Speech Communications
Theatre and Broadcasting background and professional experience in both fields as both talent and technician, as well as president of an independent production company. Teaching experience includes general speech courses, coaching forensics, and over 12 years teaching ESSL at LAVC.

Helen Fountaine: (1996) A.A., LAVC; BA, MA, CSU, Northridge; Communicative Disorders.
CCC (Certificate of Clinical Competency) degree. Was a certified speech pathologist for the LA Unified District for twenty-two years, serving severely handicapped students and supervising the delivery of speech therapy to preschool children throughout the district.

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

Was president of an organization of Public School Speech Specialists. Had taught part-time at Valley in ESSL for 10 year before becoming full-time for the past thirteen years.

Duane Smith: (2001) A.A., Los Angeles Valley College, Speech; B.S., Northern Arizona University, Speech; M.A., California State University Los Angeles, Speech Communication.

From 1991-1993 was a student at valley college and a speech team member and in 1993, was awarded a forensics scholarship to NAU. In 1996, was awarded a forensics TA position at CSLA. In 2000 was hired to direct the LAVC forensics program. In 2008 the LAVC speech team won the over all national championship title. In 2009 the LAVC speech team and placed first for individual events - making the 08-09 team the most successful team in Valley College history, and one of the most successful programs in the country. From 2006-2008 hosted the PSCFA Spring Championship Forensics Tournament at Valley College. From 2001-2009 served on the graduation speaker committee.

Joshua Miller (2002). AA Speech Los Angeles Valley College; BA and MA, CSU, Los Angeles

Former competitor for the Valley College speech team, moved on to compete and then coach the CSLA speech team. Was assistant editor for text and performance quarterly, an NCA journal. Was a lecturer and Director of Parliamentary Debate at the University of Southern California from 1998-2002. Currently coaches the Valley College forensics program, which won the national title in 2008. Is also currently department chair, but hopes to get out of this position soon.

Many adjuncts have come and gone since the last program review, so I will only list the ones who are teaching fall 2009. All instructors in the department are screened for their abilities to teach general speech courses, with the ESSL courses or coach the speech team.

The following are the part time instructors (those without degrees listed have either not responded to the requests for degrees or did not want this information documented):

Robert Allen (2001) California State University, Los Angeles
Master of Arts, Communication Studies
Specialties: Persuasion, Mass Mediated and Intercultural Communication

Jason A. Baumwirt (2005)California State University, Northridge
Masters of Arts, Communication Studies
Specialties: Rhetoric, Public Speaking, Argumentation, Organizational, and Interpersonal Communication

Bonnie Bizoza (1972) University of Pittsburgh
Master of Science, Speech and Language Pathology
Specialties: Speech and Language assessment, remediation, accent reduction, ESSL

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

Yancy Duncan (1995) California State University, Los Angeles
Master of Arts, Speech Communication
Specialties: Rhetoric, public discourse and forensics.

Ann Geller

Virginia Green

Michael H. Goodwyn (2001) Eastern Michigan University
M of Arts, Communication
Specialties: Public Speaking, Interpersonal, Small Group, Oral Interp, Reader's Theater

Michael Kalustian (2005) California State University, Los Angeles
Master of Arts, Communication Studies
Specialties: Rhetorical Criticism/ Critical Performative Studies
Thom Karlsen

Jessica Kelpine (1991) California State University, Northridge
Master of Arts, Speech Communication
Specialties: Public Speaking, Interpersonal Communication, Group Communication, Voice and Diction, certified to teach online.

Denise Lerette (2006) California State University, Northridge
Master of Arts, Speech Communication
Specialties: rhetoric, gender studies, and interpersonal communication.

Cal Liedtke (1991) University of Iowa
Master of Arts, Communication Studies.
Specialties: Public speaking, forensics, Performance, directing, script analysis.

Linda Luger

Suzanne Marteney (1986) California State University, Northridge
Master of Arts, Mass Communication
Specialties: Public Speaking, Group Dynamics, Broadcast writing and performance, journalism.

George Potsic (1961) Northwestern University
Master of Arts.

Jack Sterk (1971) California State University, Northridge
Master of Arts, Speech Communication

Marion Taras (1974) California State University, Northridge
Master of Arts, Mass Communication
(1961) California State University, Los Angeles

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

Master of Arts, Theater

Specialties: forensics, mass communication, public speaking, directing.

Roana Thornock (1999)

Master of Arts, Applied Communication

Specialties: small group communication, interpersonal communication, computer mediated communication, and public speaking for ESSL students.

Linda Toth

Andres Torres

Adrienne Zahler

Staffing issues:

All of the above teach combined programs of ESSL classes and Speech Communication (and, for some, Broadcasting) classes, as well as function as supervisors in the Speech Lab at various times. Some hourly rate faculty are needed to teach ESSL classes at least until we successfully complete a probationary ESSL hire, and probably even beyond that. We have been able to retain the expertise of George Potsic and Adrienne Zahler, (retired and currently adjunct).

However, in spite of all of the above, our staffing requirements for ESSL have not been met. We must still provide sufficient numbers of qualified Speech/ ESL teachers (with sufficient voice, diction articulation, and phonetics qualifications) for enlarging on the numbers of classes offered, since, once again, students must be turned away as we cannot take all who come to enroll.

Additionally, student workers, and especially a Program Assistant are needed to distribute materials in the Speech Lab and to assist with record-keeping, as the lab has now committed to a longer schedule to meet student needs.

There is also a need for not only a classified person in the Speech Lab, but also certificated personnel to help maintain the lab at all the hours it has been necessary to operate; through the day and into the evening. Lab hours are currently restricted to the time that ESSL faculty can give to supervise and conduct conversation groups while also teaching their regular classes.

There has never been any classified staff in the department. It is quite essential at this point that we continue to pursue having at least one fulltime technician/electronics person to maintain all the equipment needed in the Speech lab and the department as a whole. We need to have someone either exclusively for the Speech Lab, or someone even "shared" with Media Arts, which would be located in the same vicinity as the lab (in the basement of Campus Center). Maintaining the computer system alone would necessitate having someone on or near the premises having the job skills to keep us (and perhaps Media Arts with its similar equipment?) up and running without losing too much student study time. These computers need constant maintenance and upgrading and have been maintained as well as possible so far; headphone wires break; microphones blank out, and there is a crying need to even do preventive cleaning etc. to prevent such damage from

happening. Student workers cannot do all that, and their own jobs. And our equipment usage will be expanding in the future. In spring 2009 a significant amount of the maintenance was done by a temporary student worker. We cannot rely on this as we get new student workers each year.

A staffing plan for the next five years will be difficult to create due to class cuts. Ideally we would like to have more full-time, but with limited resources this may not be possible. While more full time professors create a better connection to students, this may not be possible. In lieu of necessary full time faculty members, a better relationship needs to be created with part time faculty members. The department needs to start discussing ways to make the adjunct feel like they are a part of the department and not just freeway fliers that hop from campus to campus, but never feel like they are a significant part of the department. Department meetings generally have few adjunct, so more must be done to encourage them to attend. Other possibilities are informal get-togethers and creating greater awareness of campus activities through via email.

Admittedly, the adjunct professors for the most part do not do a good job of fulfilling their professional development obligations. This has been going on from some time, and while the current department chair did not create this institutional mindset, he needs to take responsibility for making sure that professional development obligations are met. This needs to come in form of reminders, creating awareness of opportunities for the obligation and documenting on evaluations when these obligations are met or not met.

CAMPUS PARTNERS AND RESOURCES

The department has begun to realize that we need to partner better with on campus resources. We recognize the value of such entities as the library and writing center, but we do not make it a departmental priority to work with them directly. Any contact with these entities is through individual instructors such as Duane Smith who takes his 101 classes to the library for research education and Josh Miller who offers extra credit to go to the writing center. The department had agreed to standardize speech 101 and perhaps with this standardization, a better relationship with the writing center and library can be developed to ensure that students leave with clearer ideas of how to write and research. With the library being under construction the ability to procure workshops from library staff has been strained, but we hope that once the new library is up we can partner with library staff to better educate our students in research.

We have enhanced our department offerings through a connection with the Transfer Alliance Program (TAP), Advanced College Enrollment (ACE) and Valley College Accelerated Program (VCAP). TAP is the honors program, and through it we offer academically enriched courses. Our relationship with TAP, while strong, has a need to improve. The department currently offers two courses for TAP: speech 101 and 105. The chair of the speech department regularly teaches the 105 tap sections, but does not adequately maintain a relationship with the TAP program. ACE is comprised of classes offered at local high schools and PACE is primarily comprised of short-term weekend courses designed for working professionals. We adequately meet the needs of the ACE and PACE programs.

Over the past few years, the Speech team and the Associated Student Union have forged a strong relationship due primarily to the success of the team and the ASU's desire

to continue that success. As the college has cut our funding the ASU has increased their support. This year the ASU had given us the most funding that they have ever given us. While their help does not even get us close to our previous 28,000 dollar budget, it does ameliorate some of the financial burden placed on us by the budget cuts.

Jim Marteney's relationship with Professional Development is strong. He offers a number of workshops through them. Last month Josh Miller offered a workshop on increasing communication between faculty and students. He received positive feedback from that workshop and has been asked to do more. What we lack is departmental encouragement to participate in these workshops. More must be done to communicate the value of these workshops and how they contribute to professional development obligations. In addition to Professional Development, Jim Marteney is the Distance Learning Trainer

Duane Smith and Josh Miller have been active for the last five years with the graduation committee selecting the student speakers for graduation. Once a year they meet to audition candidates for the graduation speech. Once the speakers have been selected, they continue to work with them to perfect their speeches and delivery.

Other than what has been mentioned above, the speech department does not have any overt relationship with programs like EOPS, DSPS, etc. other than the obvious need to accommodate students with special needs or sign EOPS cards.

NEEDS ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Dedicated classrooms:

The Speech Communication department needs a classroom or two dedicated solely to the department. This will make the standardization of courses like speech 101 easier to achieve.

Faculty Computers:

We need to continually push for upgraded technology, including new computers and printers. As the students become more technologically astute, the faculty should be too.

Forensics team:

The budget needs to be increased to ensure the continued success of the forensics program. Four years ago our budget was over 28,000 dollars. The schools that challenge us for the national championship have budgets over 30,000 dollars while ours has been cut to less than 17,000 and seems destined to be cut lower. As airplane and hotel costs go up, we need to have a budget to be able to cover those costs. Without increased staffing and money the program success will most likely not continue. The main schools we compete against: Moorpark, Orange Coast and Mount San Antonio College all have budgets of over 30,000 dollars. Orange Coast's budget was over 40,000 dollars last year, and this year they received a substantial increase. As of the writing of this narrative the team has an excellent group of recruits, but the concern is that all the people who earn the right to go to nationals will not be allowed to go due to the lack of finances.

We also need to have at least four full time coaches to stay competitive with the other top schools in the country. The three colleges mentioned in the previous paragraph

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

all have at least four coaches. We have been successful with two, but this is only because we were able to bring in people to help us. We were lucky the past two years, but we are not as lucky this year. It's like having a football team but needing to bring in a new offensive coordinator each year. Sometimes a quality person might come in, but the team success is left up to chance.

We will soon need new computers for our program. We were successful in obtaining a block grant four years ago, but as we all know technology ages quickly and we will soon need to upgrade our equipment.

Additional compensation for the coaches is also needed. Many coaches from other schools get additional compensation for the substantial time commitment made to forensics. There have been pushes made by the union for compensation in the form of a stipend, additional paid hours, or load banking. We support this push and fully believe that the immense time commitment from forensics needs to be better recognized and compensated for.

The final and most important need is future space. Without an appropriate meeting and work space, the team will not be successful.

Speech lab:

As stated above, we desperately need a classified person to work in the lab. Last year we lost a student worker due to budget cuts, and this year we are again hampered by cuts. A classified employee needs to be a department priority. A case needs to be made to administration for this position and pressed until the position is filled. We also need to upgrade our lab equipment immediately. This includes computers, microphones and headsets. Without a classified employee and upgraded equipment, the quality of the instruction in the lab will suffer.

Replacements of the faculty:

The last program review listed 11 adjunct professors. This semester we have 21. We would have had more if so many classes had not been cut. While the need for full time is obvious, the reality is that it may be awhile before the full time/adjunct ratio is up to the state mandate, so there is a need to better incorporate the adjunct into the department. We will continue to push for full time faculty members, but at the same time, work hard to make the adjunct feel more like part of the department.

ACTION TIMELINE

The department has discussed an action timeline and has determined that a specific action timeline is difficult considering the budget situation. We have numerous needs (see above section) and these needs are not beholden to a specific timeline; rather, they will be discussed and argued for each year until they are met. With that said, here are some issues that can be addressed in a specific time frame:

2009-2010

Fall 2009:

Finish program review.

Spring 2010:

Speech Communication 2009 Program Review

Department advertising: The speech department needs to have a web page and have flyers for the Humanities hallway.
Assess six courses for the SLOs.

2010-2011

Fall 2010:

Review and interpret the SLO data collected.

Submit AA changes to curriculum for offer in fall 2011. These changes include the AA changes and a course proposal for the capstone.

Review and revise department webpage

Spring 2011:

Assess six courses for the SLOs.

Meet to discuss the implementation and evaluation of the AA.

2011-2012

Fall 2011:

Review and interpret the SLO data collected.

The new AA will begin fall 2011.

Spring 2012:

Assess six courses for the SLOs.

2012-2013 (This assumes of course, that we survive 2012.)

Fall 2012:

Review and interpret the SLO data collected.

The goal is to begin the online AA degree this term.

Spring 2013:

Currently there are no goals for this term.

2013-2014

Fall 2013

Spring 2014:

Currently there are no goals for this academic year.

The speech program was one of Valley's first and continues to flourish. While there are a lot of positives in the department, there are a number of things that need to be worked on to make the department even better. This program review has helped the department analyze its strengths, weaknesses and needs and will provide a framework for the program's growth.