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Executive Summary:

This Master of Science/Master of Arts (M.S./M.A.) in Communication provides a discipline-based, integrated study of communication and rhetoric structured around a core of fundamental theories, methodologies, and applications. While speech communication departments at some universities in the United States feature only rhetoric (such as public address, argumentation, persuasion, or media) or only communication (communication in personal contexts such as intercultural, small group, organizational, or family) in their graduate degrees, this program follows a more comprehensive model that combines both rhetoric and communication under the umbrella label of Communication. In keeping with the discipline of Speech Communication, this M.S./M.A. program addresses the means, functions, and goals of symbolic human interaction. The range of approaches to course offerings within this M.S./M.A. program includes theoretical, pragmatic, epistemological, and critical perspectives.

Students pursuing this degree will combine advanced study in a selection of topics including but not limited to persuasion and argumentation, conflict management and resolution, cultural (family, sex and gender, relational) and intercultural communication, and organizational and group issues, thus preparing students for doctoral study in communication and rhetoric or for careers as communication professionals. Students who do not continue to doctoral level study can pursue careers in law, training and development, advocacy, human resources, mediation and facilitation, group and organizational consulting, politics, community leadership and development, post-secondary college instruction, public relations, and other areas.

This graduate program drives Oregon State University’s (OSU’s) commitment to “sustain human well being and improve the quality of human life.” This program engages personal well being, the public life of Oregon, the critical issues of the nation, and the pressing concerns of the global society because communication and oral rhetoric comprise the heart of the “human system.” Producing experts in oral argument who excel in promoting effective interpersonal and small group processes provides a citizenry with the means and tools for grappling with complex, intractable, and fractious issues at all levels.

Program objectives in keeping with OSU’s Strategic Plan-Phase II:

i. To equip students with the practical and cognitive skills for critical thinking and information assessment so students may design solutions to problems in dynamic...
professional contexts influenced by political and social trends, including interpersonal and intercultural communication challenges as well as questions regarding persuasion and argument

ii. To produce creative problem solvers, students equipped with tools both for managing interpersonal human interaction in innovative ways and for creating and teaching others to create productive, oral arguments to inspire critical thinking through constructive debate

iii. To mentor students to grow leadership responsibilities so students serve as social resources for understanding, interpreting, analyzing and explaining communication processes in the increasingly “congested and troubled” local and global milieus

iv. To produce communication professionals who promote understanding and collaboration in human interactions within and across cultures, professionals who not only recognize human difference and embrace diversity but also teach effective interpersonal communication practices, model and provide vital argument strategies, and possess and present tools for achieving understanding among citizenry

v. To generate and increase students' commitments as dynamic agents of social change action able to manage communication consequences in personal, local, regional, national, and global contexts, including managing issues that resist simple technical or social solutions

vi. To offer students a comprehensive, in-depth grounding in communication and rhetorical scholarship, a well developed facility to conduct effective research, and a mentored experience in training and practice of effective communication techniques

vii. To prepare this generation of communication professionals to cope with the social, cultural and organizational challenges posed by new technologies

viii. To attract the best students in communication and oral rhetoric to Oregon State University by providing a program focused on information and skills vital to human processes at local and global levels: interpersonal communication, small group work, social influence, and oral rhetoric

ix. To produce leaders who value respect, integrity, and social responsibility, leaders able to achieve accountability through an understanding of guiding theory in the field and who also excel at communication and oral rhetoric to engage present and future inquiry into such areas as high-impact, public policy issues as well as other significant questions regarding human interaction in multiple contexts

x. To enhance Communication (COMM) faculty experience through teaching and advising high-quality graduate students
xi. To provide course work that serves as a resource for graduate and undergraduate students across Oregon State University

b. This program advances OSU's commitment as a public university to engage the public life of Oregon; universities not only train professionals, they educate citizens. Likewise, the fields of rhetoric and communication adhere to traditional commitments to enhance public life and generate coherence among citizens. These commitments increase the potential for this M.S./M.A. to produce more effective civic participants in interpersonal relationships, in social forums, and for society in general, in addition to shaping future leaders for the state of Oregon.

c. This program meets the needs of the state of Oregon by producing students capable of helping people adapt to changes in the Oregonian way of life, including changes in the personal lifestyles as the economy moves toward a focus on high-tech and service industries. Families and individuals will need to cope with increasing effects of social and institutional demands. Citizens of Oregon also will be facing an increasingly difficult set of social and political challenges, including decisions about natural resources, taxes, health care, education, etc. In a state where the value of citizen involvement remains high, this M.S./M.A. will help meet Oregon’s need for active, interpersonal interchange within personal relationships where functional and generative communication is critical as is the need for skilled citizen leaders who can facilitate high quality public discussion and argument.
Proposal for the Initiation of a New Instructional Program Leading to the Master of Science/ Master of Arts Degree in Communication

Oregon State University
College of Liberal Arts
Department of Speech Communication

Description of Proposed Program

1. Program Overview

a. CIP number

b. This Master of Science/Master of Arts (M.S./M.A.) in Communication provides a discipline-based, integrated study of communication and rhetoric structured around a core of fundamental theories, methodologies, and applications. While speech communication departments at some universities in the United States feature only rhetoric (such as public address, argumentation, persuasion, or media) or only communication (communication in personal contexts such as intercultural, small group, organizational, or family) in their graduate degrees, this program follows a more comprehensive model that combines both rhetoric and communication under the umbrella label of Communication. In keeping with the discipline of Speech Communication, this M.S./M.A. program addresses the means, functions, and goals of symbolic human interaction. The range of approaches to course offerings within this M.S./M.A. program includes theoretical, pragmatic, epistemological, and critical perspectives.

Students pursuing this degree will combine advanced study in a selection of topics including but not limited to persuasion and argumentation, conflict management and resolution, cultural (family, sex and gender, relational) and intercultural communication, and organizational and group issues, thus preparing students for doctoral study in communication and rhetoric or for careers as communication professionals. Students who do not continue to doctoral level study can pursue careers in law, training and development, advocacy, human resources, mediation and facilitation, group and organizational consulting, politics, community leadership and development, post-secondary college instruction, public relations, and other areas.

The Speech Communication faculty delayed this M.S./M.A. proposal until faculty numbers and breadth reached appropriate levels. With the hiring of a new faculty member in intercultural communication in Fall 2008, key faculty now are in place and sufficient faculty resources exist to implement the program. Courses in this department presently used for the M.A.I.S constitute a substantial basis for an M.A. program; only moderate alterations in requirements and the addition of a limited number of new graduate courses are necessary to support an M.S./M.A.

c. This M.S./M.A. program will be operational Winter 2013.
2. Purpose and Relationship of Proposed Program to Oregon State University’s Mission and Strategic Plan

a. This graduate program drives Oregon State University’s (OSU’s) commitment to “sustain human well being and improve the quality of human life.” This program engages personal well being, the public life of Oregon, the critical issues of the nation, and the pressing concerns of the global society because communication and oral rhetoric comprise the heart of the “human system.” Producing experts in oral argument who excel in promoting effective interpersonal and small group processes provides a citizenry with the means and tools for grappling with complex, intractable, and fractious issues at all levels.

Program objectives in keeping with OSU’s Strategic Plan-Phase II:

i. To equip students with the practical and cognitive skills for critical thinking and information assessment so students may design solutions to problems in dynamic professional contexts influenced by political and social trends, including interpersonal and intercultural communication challenges as well as questions regarding persuasion and argument

ii. To produce creative problem solvers, students equipped with tools both for managing interpersonal human interaction in innovative ways and for creating and teaching others to create productive, oral arguments to inspire critical thinking through constructive debate

iii. To mentor students to grow leadership responsibilities so students serve as social resources for understanding, interpreting, analyzing and explaining communication processes in the increasingly “congested and troubled” local and global milieus

iv. To produce communication professionals who promote understanding and collaboration in human interactions within and across cultures, professionals who not only recognize human difference and embrace diversity but also teach effective interpersonal communication practices, model and provide vital argument strategies, and possess and present tools for achieving understanding among citizenry

v. To generate and increase students' commitments as dynamic agents of social change action able to manage communication consequences in personal, local, regional, national, and global contexts, including managing issues that resist simple technical or social solutions

vi. To offer students a comprehensive, in-depth grounding in communication and rhetorical scholarship, a well developed facility to conduct effective research, and a mentored experience in training and practice of effective communication techniques

vii. To prepare this generation of communication professionals to cope with the social, cultural and organizational challenges posed by new technologies

viii. To attract the best students in communication and oral rhetoric to Oregon State University by providing a program focused on information and skills vital to human
processes at local and global levels: interpersonal communication, small group work, social influence, and oral rhetoric

ix. To produce leaders who value respect, integrity, and social responsibility, leaders able to achieve accountability through an understanding of guiding theory in the field and who also excel at communication and oral rhetoric to engage present and future inquiry into such areas as high-impact, public policy issues as well as other significant questions regarding human interaction in multiple contexts

x. To enhance Communication (COMM) faculty experience through teaching and advising high-quality graduate students

xi. To provide course work that serves as a resource for graduate and undergraduate students across Oregon State University

b. This program advances OSU's commitment as a public university to engage the public life of Oregon; universities not only train professionals, they educate citizens. Likewise, the fields of rhetoric and communication adhere to traditional commitments to enhance public life and generate coherence among citizens. These commitments increase the potential for this M.S./M.A. to produce more effective civic participants in interpersonal relationships, in social forums, and for society in general, in addition to shaping future leaders for the state of Oregon.

c. This program meets the needs of the state of Oregon by producing students capable of helping people adapt to changes in the Oregonian way of life, including changes in the personal lifestyles as the economy moves toward a focus on high-tech and service industries. Families and individuals will need to cope with increasing effects of social and institutional demands. Citizens of Oregon also will be facing an increasingly difficult set of social and political challenges, including decisions about natural resources, taxes, health care, education, etc. In a state where the value of citizen involvement remains high, this M.S./M.A. will help meet Oregon's need for active, interpersonal interchange within personal relationships where functional and generative communication is critical as is the need for skilled citizen leaders who can facilitate high quality public discussion and argument.

3. Course of Study

a. The proposed curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMM 520 Introduction to Graduate Study in Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMM 588 Survey of Rhetorical Theory and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMM 589 Survey of Communication Theory and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMM 517 Research Methods in Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 credits  COMM 565 Research Methods in Rhetoric
3 credits  COMM 590 Graduate Seminar in Rhetoric
3 credits  COMM 591 Graduate Seminar in Communication
3 credits  COMM 515 Research Methods in Communication
3 credits  COMM 565 Research Methods in Rhetoric
12-15 credits  COMM electives (additional courses, including practica and an internship option)
6-9 credits  Thesis
12 credits  Minor area of study (as approved)
Total  =  50-55 credits

Students wishing to pursue a non-thesis degree will be encouraged to enroll in the M.A.I.S. program where both thesis and project options are available.

b. Course descriptions and explanations:

COMM 520 Introduction to Graduate Study in Communication already exists. The course description reads, “Introductory graduate seminar in the field of communication. Emphasis on the breadth and depth of the discipline, graduate study, and research directions.”

COMM 588 Survey of Rhetorical Theory and Research: A survey of Western rhetorical oral traditions from 500 B.C. to the present, this course examines theories of argument and persuasion in public contexts. Some developments in rhetorical theory are investigated by tracing the relationships between rhetoric and historical events or social movements.

COMM 589 Survey of Communication Theory and Research: A survey of Western communication theories deriving from quantitative, qualitative and critical perspectives. Course will include contexts such as conflict management, cultural and intercultural communication, organizational communication, and relational communication.

COMM 517 Research Methods in Communication: This course is designed to train students how to evaluate and also perform qualitative communication research. In order to accomplish this, the assumptions and theoretical traditions of qualitative research will first be established, along with highlighting the role of the researcher in qualitative inquiry. Students will then be introduced to a variety of research methods, including interviews, focus groups, case studies, and participant observation. In order to demonstrate understanding of different data collection techniques, students will engage in practice
assignments to personally experience the challenge inherent in qualitative research. Different approaches to qualitative data analysis will be covered, and finally, ethical issues with regard to conducting qualitative communication research will be discussed.

**COMM 565: Research Methods in Rhetoric:** This course will explore different approaches to rhetorical criticism practiced in the Twentieth- and Twenty-first Century. Focusing on the preeminent methods that have generated a substantial corpus of criticism, the course will examine how, in each method, rhetorical texts are selected, what contexts are deemed relevant, what aspects of the text warrant attention, and what ends the critic aims to accomplish. This will be accomplished by reading a selection of works exemplary of each mode of criticism and applying our understanding to a substantial work of rhetorical criticism.

**COMM 590 Graduate Seminar in Rhetoric:** Offers an in-depth exploration into a narrowly focused topic in speech and rhetoric. The seminar will consist of interactive discussion and investigative research regarding the topic. The topic for this Speech Communication seminar will rotate among rhetorical theory; rhetoric in specific, historical eras; and rhetorical criticism.

**COMM 591 Graduate Seminar in Communication:** Offers an in-depth exploration into a narrowly focused topic in communication. The seminar will consist of interactive discussion and investigative research regarding the topic. The topic for the seminar will rotate among conflict management, organizational and small group communication, intercultural communication, and relational communication.

Each faculty member in the Speech Communication Department will provide one, targeted seminar to be offered in rotation for **COMM 590** and **COMM 591**. Each faculty member will focus their seminar on their general area of expertise and may change the specific topic within that area to reflect current trends in the field. (See Appendix A for examples.) Students and major advisors may take advantage of the interrelationships among topics available during that student's two-year program (for example, conflict management and environmental rhetoric or intercultural communication and rhetorical criticism in speech) to negotiate a coherent program of study for each individual student.

These six basic courses (**COMM 515, 565, 588, 589, 590, and 591**) provide graduate students two important perspectives on the communication discipline—one a broad, wide-ranging discussion of the discipline and one a narrow, closely-focused examination of a single area. The two survey courses each extend students' breadth and depth of knowledge about the discipline as a theoretical and historical whole and provide students with a range of ideas for areas of study to use in their individual programs. The two methods courses provide students with the opportunity to develop research skills appropriate to graduate level extended research. Each targeted seminar, on the other hand, offers a model of in-depth study into a single area of rhetoric and a single area of communication.

Combined with these six basic courses, **COMM 520** introduces students to the rigors and structures of graduate study. Students learn requirements of graduate study—such as the construction of a comprehensive literature review—and review epistemological differences that dictate methodological choices. Students can select areas of study and methodologies to serve
those ends from information they gather 1) in this course in conjunction with experiences students have investigating narrow topics, 2) in the two targeted seminars, and 3) in consultation with their major advisors. Students then can select electives that help inform their particular foci.

At a minimum, three of these five courses will be offered each fall term: COMM 520, one of the survey courses, and the complementary topics course. Each fall, the survey/topics pair will rotate; the rhetorical pair will be offered one fall and the communication pair the next. Each winter, the opposite survey course will be offered and each spring its complementary topics course will be offered. Additionally, the methods courses will alternate one Winter and one Spring. With this rotation, graduate students in the program will have access to seven, graduate-only courses in this department in their first years and a sixth course in the fall of their second years, bringing their graduate-only course total to 7 courses (3 credits each), or 21 credits. Together with 9 thesis credits, students would therefore accumulate 30 credits of graduate-only course work. If students include no other graduate-only courses in their programs, they will still meet the 50/50 requirement of the Graduate School. If students enroll in other graduate-only seminars in our department or in their minor areas, they will further exceed the number of courses listed in that requirement.

Elective courses qualifying for the M.S./M.A. requirement include (but are not limited to)

COMM 518 Interpersonal Communication Theory and Research
COMM 522 Small Group Communication Theory and Research
COMM 526 Intercultural Communication: Theories and Issues
COMM 527 Cultural Codes in Communication
COMM 530 Theoretical Issues in Communication Inquiry
COMM 532 Gender and Communication
COMM 540 Theories of Conflict and Conflict Management
COMM 542 Bargaining and Negotiation Processes
COMM 544 Third Parties in Dispute Resolution Mediation
COMM 546 Communication in International Conflict and Disputes
COMM 554 Advanced Argumentation
COMM 556 Rhetoric: 500BC to 500 AD
COMM 558 Rhetoric: 500AD to 1900
COMM 559 Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric
COMM 560 Rhetoric of Revolutionaries and Reactionaries 1750-1900
COMM 562 Rhetoric of Revolutionaries and Reactionaries 1900-Present
COMM 566 Ethics of Rhetoric
COMM 572 The Rhetoric of Popular Culture
COMM 576 Issues in the Freedom of Speech
COMM 578 Political Campaign Rhetoric
COMM 580 History of Media Communication
COMM 582 Media in Culture and Society
COMM 584 Media Criticism
COMM 586 Media Aesthetics
COMM 512 Special Topics
COMM 524 Communication in Organizations: Theories and Issues will be eliminated from the regular curriculum and will become one of the rotating graduate seminars (COMM 591) in Communication.

Sample courses of study are provided in Appendix B.

c. Non-traditional learning modes: Internships and practica are standard components of most communication curricula. In addition, some courses will be available via interactive video from Bend, OR.

d. As specific learning outcomes, students will:

i. Exhibit an appropriate level of knowledge of core areas in communication and rhetorical theory, research, and practice as well as an appropriate level of knowledge for specialty course topics as applicable.

ii. Manage and solve communication problems in professional and civic contexts by selecting expedient means from communication and rhetorical theory and research.

iii. Maximize the dynamic, cross-disciplinary character of rhetoric and communication through an innovative thesis design that integrates the minor area.

iv. Synthesize and apply the personal, professional, and civic responsibilities of communication specialists in courses, practica, internships, and departmental interactions.

v. Employ ethical practices for communication specialists and promote ethical use of rhetoric and communication in all contexts.

4. Recruitment and Admission Requirements

a. The program will attract students already interested in OSU, but also a much larger pool of applicants who seek concentrated graduate study in Communication will find this M.S./M.A. attractive. The Department of Speech Communication regularly receives inquiries from potential students who want to do graduate study in Communication but who seek a discipline-based degree rather than an interdisciplinary degree. The number of graduate programs in communication is insufficient and inadequate in the state of Oregon. A standard M. A. program at OSU would draw to this state numerous students whose needs are not met by the M.A.I.S.

b. In addition to meeting the admission requirements of the Graduate School at OSU, students seeking admission will need to meet the following criteria:

i. Show significant preparation in communication studies, typically a B.A./B.S. in Speech Communication or a closely related field

ii. Demonstrate a 3.0 or better G.P.A. in their communication course work

iii. Submit a Graduate Record Exam
iv. Provide a writing sample  
c. The total number of graduate students will be limited by the capacity of faculty to administer reasonable advising and mentoring through a student’s program including a thesis process. Since the faculty size may change, graduate students will be admitted at a ratio of 4:1 to the number of current faculty. Although that formula would allow about 32 students in the start-up year, trends suggest that this target number of students would not be reached for several years.

5. Accreditation of the program  
a. N/A  
b. N/A  
c. N/A

6. Evidence of Need  
a. Evidence of student interest

i. Lack of Alternatives in the State: This program is essential because no such program exists in Oregon; the only other graduate program available is offered at Portland State University, but that program does not contain a significant rhetoric component. A discipline-based program similar to this one was abandoned in 1991 at the University of Oregon when that institution eliminated its Department of Speech, thereby abolishing not only the M.S./M.A. program but also the only Ph.D. program in the state. At present, no graduate program in Communication is available outside of the Portland area.

ii. Evidence from Previous Enrollment (See Appendix C): Most of the M.A.I.S. graduate students we have served have been from the state of Oregon. We would continue to attract these students, but also we would attract others who have gone out of state for standard (i.e., non-M.A.I.S.) programs. The desire for an M.S./M.A. program is evident in M.A.I.S. students; over the past 3 years 86%, 87% and 83% respectively named Speech Communication areas for two of their three major areas of study. These students earn approximately 36 of their 48 credits from this department. That percentage indicates the department already serves graduate students in a capacity approaching the M. A. level, but it also indicates the students’ intent to design a program for themselves that more closely aligns with a traditional M.S./M.A. program.

While some students find that the M.A.I.S. meets their needs, many express disappointment about their inability to access an M.S./M.A. at OSU. This department also has had students who have applied to Ph.D. programs only to discover, with regret, that some of those programs do not recognize the M.A.I.S. degree and require the graduate to complete additional courses before entering that program.

iii. Mutual Need for Funding: The department needs disciplined-based graduate students to fill graduate teaching assistantships for Baccalaureate Core courses that
serve both Speech Communication majors and departments across the campus; graduate students need the funding available to them through GTA positions. An M.S./M.A. will provide a mutually beneficial opportunity for graduate students, for the department, and for numerous other university programs that depend on those basic courses.

b. Needs for Employment: The career paths graduates would follow include numerous areas of the job market, including human resource and human resource management, organizational development, training and development, public and community leadership and development, health communication, advocacy, mediation/facilitation/conflict resolution, public service, public participation processes, politics, post-secondary college instruction, public relations, and others. The demand is high regionally, nationally, and globally for individuals trained to lead groups and also to work effectively in groups; to provide conflict and interpersonal communication training within communities and organizations; to advocate successfully in various venues and contexts; to argue persuasively and ethically as leaders in groups and organizations; and to design, implement, and lead development plans in national and international venues.

c. Number and Characteristics of Students to be Served: Using the past six year period as an indicator, the department will serve 18 to 29 graduate students annually in the next few years. That number will increase as funding levels increase based on past indicators. For example, at the highest funding levels, the department served the highest number of graduate students who named two areas of Speech Communication in their M.A.I.S. programs; that correlation indicates that as funding levels rise, more students will be interested in the M.S./M.A. program.

The composition of the graduates in the program can be projected from the history of students in the M.A.I.S. program who have named Speech Communication as one or more of the three areas of study. Of those graduate students, typically, $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ will be female, $\frac{1}{5}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ will be non-residents, up to $\frac{1}{10}$ will be international scholars, and between $\frac{1}{10}$ and $\frac{1}{8}$ will be minority.

d. Other Compelling Reasons for Offering the Program:

i. The recent economic plunge in the United States demonstrates the key role communication plays in civic life and social behaviors. Many economists have explained that economic theory did not effectively predict the severity of the downturn in large part because those theories did not account for the “real-life” functions and consequences of human interaction that play such key roles in economic investment. This M.S./M.A. integrates both rhetoric and interpersonal communication, thus graduating individuals well prepared to address exactly those issues of interpersonal communication and public discourse.

ii. OSU has more graduate, Communication faculty than any other Communication program in Oregon and therefore can take the lead in this discipline in the state.

iii. Current and ongoing developments in technology create significant social changes rapidly; social organizations in Oregon will accrue critical benefits from expertise and training offered by communication experts.
iv. This program complements emerging graduate offerings in the College of Liberal Arts.

v. Students have only one practical alternative in the state of Oregon and none outside of the Portland area.

vi. Students seeking graduate work in rhetorical theory and practice within the Speech Communication field must go out of state; no Oregon option exists.

vii. This program will attract strong graduates in communication, helping to grow OSU traditions in the liberal arts areas.

viii. A comprehensive masters degree program in Communication serves the university overall. In addition to attracting top graduate students, it will provide graduate teaching assistants of a quality and quantity appropriate to serve undergraduate students in Baccalaureate Core Communication classes.

e. Special Interest Groups: American Society for Training and Development, Public Relations Association, Association for Conflict Resolution, Toastmasters International

f. Program Availability: The Communication Area of the Speech Communication Department intends to maintain its continuing commitment to offering a significant number of evening courses at the graduate level. Opportunities also exist at OSU Cascades Campus in Bend, OR where students could obtain a limited number of graduate courses offered as “slash” courses offered by one faculty member there. Several graduate-level courses also are offered regularly at the OSU campus during summer school, including courses that can be taken during the zero-week offering where students attend one-week courses consisting of eight-hour sessions for 5 days. In addition, the department historically has occasionally offered a 400/500 level course online.

**Outcomes**

7. **Program Evaluation**

a. Evidence that program objectives have been met:

i. Faculty will meet annually to review the performances of all graduate students with regard to their course work and progress in their programs. A letter reflecting this assessment will be sent to each student.

ii. Faculty will conduct exit interviews with all graduate students at the end of every two years. In addition, faculty will conduct exit interviews with graduates who complete their programs.

iii. Theses will be reviewed by a faculty committee on a bi-annual basis.
iv. Records of alumni activity, in particular employment history, will be charted.

b. Biennial review: Based on the information from 7a, the faculty will conduct a biennial review of program requirements and procedures. The program will be modified as needed to insure it meets its goals and provides a compelling learning experience.

8. **Assessment of Student Learning**

   **Graduate Assessment Plan (Master’s programs)**

1. **Program Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>M.A./M.S. in Speech Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/School</td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Submitted by</td>
<td>Trischa Goodnow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Program Outcomes**

   **Provide the Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes for your Master’s program.**

   **Outcome 1:** Students will be able to identify important problems, pose relevant questions, and conduct original research that extends knowledge of Speech Communication. This requires developing novel and original arguments based on empirical evidence and theoretical justification. This will be demonstrated through discrete research as found in a thesis.

   **Outcome 2:** Students will achieve mastery of substantive knowledge in Speech Communication demonstrated through proficiency in relevant methodological and theoretical perspectives.

   **Outcome 3:** Students will develop a strong background in scholarship from the area’s two related perspectives, interpersonal and small group communication and rhetorical and social influence.

   **Outcome 4:** Students will be able to identify ways that Speech Communication can inform discussions of pressing social, environmental, ethical, and/or public issues and be able to communicate these perspectives to relevant audiences.

   **Outcome 5:** Students will learn to conduct activities in an ethical manner.

3. **Measurement** – Provide a detailed narrative or schematic to articulate how all the outcomes will be measured for all outcomes.

   **a) Describe the methods you will use to assess each outcome.**

   Students conduct independent research with oversight by a major professor. This is accomplished in research seminars and as a thesis project. The research product is evaluated so that faculty can assess the qualifications of the student as an independent scholar. Documentation of deficiencies that delay or inhibit successful completion of the degree are noted and reviewed on an annual basis by the Director of Graduate Studies and the student’s major professor.

   Students in the program must maintain a high level of achievement in all coursework. This includes not only the core curriculum but also courses outside of the program. If performance in
course work proves unsatisfactory, the student will meet with the major professor and Director of Graduate Studies to develop an educational plan for addressing difficulties. Each student must enroll in the required core curriculum which is designed to provide reading breadth in the field but also to provide ongoing opportunities to refine skills in research, writing, and in formulating original scholarship. The Director of Graduate Studies will track information about the program including the number of applicants, offers, and acceptances on a yearly basis; retention and graduation rates; and postgraduate employment. Information about all students’ background qualifications (e.g., undergrad/grad degrees, schools attended, GPA, GRE scores, etc.) will be collected and reviewed on an annual basis. The Director of Graduate Studies will bring assessment information to Speech Communication graduate committee regularly for review and input. At one meeting each year, the full assessment package will be discussed in detail to determine if program goals are being met. As evidence is collected that curriculum, program requirements or any other aspect of the program needs improvement, the graduate committee will move to make necessary changes.

b) Describe and attach any measurement tools to be used (exam results, performance criteria, evaluation/performance rubrics, etc.)

In addition to tracking assessment indicators described above, the Director of Graduate Studies will be responsible for collecting and maintaining information including, but not limited to:

- Number of applicants, offers, and acceptance
- Characteristics of incoming students including previous degrees, GPA, GRE scores
- Retention and graduation rates
- Employment rates and characteristics of employment (e.g., sector, position)
- Student satisfaction/feedback (as measured through student evaluations)

4. **Please provide a skeletal assessment plan (Mapping Guide) for your program:**

Provide a skeleton plan describing the specific activities and assessment method for each outcome.

Outcome 1: This will be addressed through the required thesis which includes enrollment in COMM 406.
Outcome 2: This will be achieved through enrollment in the core curriculum courses: COMM and additional elective courses and seminars.
Outcome 3: This will be achieved through enrollment in the core curriculum courses: and additional elective courses and seminars.
Outcome 4: This can be achieved in several ways, including participation in the intellectual life of the university, especially by attending public lectures, and by communicating students’ own research through participation in the Speech Communication Colloquium series, attending conferences, online commentary, and/or submission of research for publication.
Outcome 5: Students who work with human subjects in research will participate in a training course to subject their work to Oregon State University’s Institutional Review Board.

5. **Other activities that have informed decision making:**

Please report on any other activities that you feel fall under assessment that were not captured above. This may include general satisfaction surveys, employer input, or other initiatives that
9. Similar Programs in the State

a. Other Closely Related Programs: The only closely related program exists at Portland State University since the University of Oregon eliminated its Department of Speech, both undergraduate and graduate programs, in 1991.

Presently, the University of Oregon (U of O) offers only one program that might appear to relate to this M.S./M.A., an M.A./M.S. in Communication and Society, a division of the School of Journalism and Communication. As is noted in the liaison letter from the Dean of the School of Journalism and Communication at the U of O, their program differs significantly from the OSU program; Dean Gleason writes that the concentration in communication and rhetoric “distinguishes” the two programs. The scope of the U of O program differs significantly from that of the proposed OSU degree. Information published on its website explains that the U of O program reflects a strong mass media concentration; for example, the two, required, core courses for the M.A./M.S. examine mass communication and society and mass communication theories. The central focus is mass communication with topics like international communication or communication diversity as electives set in a context of media institutions. Likewise, the graduate certificate offered at U. of O. for communication ethics centers around mass media, training graduates in “ethical decision-making strategies covering a variety of media. . . .” (from the website)

The only overlap mentioned in Dean Gleason’s response cites the possibility that a student at OSU might design a course of study featuring a major emphasis in conflict management and conflict resolution; he mentions a possible overlap with the U of O degree in Conflict and Dispute Resolution. To that point, Dr. David Frank, Director of the U of O Robert Clark Honors College responds that “[t]he proposal you have included places a much-needed focus on the study of communication and rhetoric.” He further describes the OSU proposal as “the only systematic graduate program in communication between Portland and Humboldt State University in California,” asserting that the OSU program would “serve a unique function.” Dr. Frank offers his “full endorsement” of this proposed degree program.

Portland State University (PSU) offers an M.A. in Communication but does not include graduate study in rhetoric. Dr. Cynthia-Lou Coleman, Chair of the Department of Communication at PSU, describes the OSU program as “distinct” from the PSU M.A. and asserts that “the OSU program differs from ours at Portland State. Our program is quite broad in scope, and we offer no courses in rhetoric, argument, conflict and negotiation.” She cites that electives may be the only possible points of overlap because “[i]n terms of requirements, the programs are quite different and I see no overlap between the PSU master’s program and the one proposed at OSU.” According to its department website, PSU’s Department of Communication has 5 full-time,
graduate faculty who hold Ph.D.s in Communication and one faculty member whose Ph.D. is in political science who also serves as a department faculty member. In addition, two fixed-term faculty hold Ph.D.s. In contrast, the department at OSU has 11 faculty with Ph.D.s in Communication, including faculty in both areas of rhetoric and communication.

According to its website, none of the Ph.D. faculty at the Department of Communication at Portland State University focuses primarily on rhetoric and public address. In addition, topics of conflict mediation and resolution are housed in a separate department, the Department of Conflict Resolution, which brings together several disciplines concentrating on peace building, international contexts, mediation and negotiation. PSU’s Department of Communication strengths seem to be in mass communication, organizational communication, intercultural communication, and gender communication. OSU’s Communication program strengths include conflict and negotiation, classical and contemporary rhetoric, argument and advocacy discourse, persuasion, interpersonal and intercultural communication, organizational communication, and media aesthetics. The OSU program provides a significantly different program to students who can integrate rhetoric and communication combining, for example, contemporary rhetoric, conflict negotiation, advocacy discourse, organizational communication, media aesthetics, and intercultural communication.

b. Program Cooperation with Existing Programs: While the departments at PSU and OSU share some concentrations, each has developed unique curricular areas. Graduate students at either institution could benefit from the individual strengths of the other department. We envision working with PSU so that M.S./M.A. students could, when feasible, take some course work at the sibling institution. OSU students could enroll in specialty courses offered by PSU faculty and PSU students could elect from the range of OSU rhetoric courses not otherwise available to them.

c. Projected Impact on Other Institutions’ Enrollment: The M.S./M.A. program we propose will not draw students away from PSU because the nature of the programs is critically different. In addition, students will be deterred by the geographic distance between PSU and OSU. Since interaction between the programs will likely be constituted of particular offerings used only by certain students in each program, an M.S./M.A. program at OSU might contribute some modest course enrollment at PSU and vice-versa.

**Resources**

10. **Faculty**

a. List of faculty

i. Recurring appointment faculty (e.g., tenure-track)

   Dr. Judith Bowker, Associate Professor, Ph.D., University of Oregon (gender and family communication, communication theory, interpersonal communication)

   Dr. Bobette Bushnell, Instructor, Ph. D., Oregon State University (small group communication, nonverbal communication, training)
Dr. Natalie Dollar, Associate Professor, Ph.D., University of Washington (communication theory, intercultural communication, ethnography), OSU-Cascades campus
Dr. Trischa Goodnow, Professor, Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh (visual rhetoric, rhetorical criticism, semiotics, argumentation)
Dr. Robert Iltis, Associate Professor, Ph.D., University of Wisconsin (public address, argumentation, classical rhetoric, propaganda, ethics of rhetoric)
Dr. Mark Moore, Professor, Ph.D., Indiana University (rhetorical theory, rhetorical criticism, media criticism, environmental rhetoric, argumentation)
Dr. Mark Porrovecchio, Assistant Professor, Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh (rhetoric, history of speech communication, pragmatism, forensics).
Dr. Elizabeth Root, Assistant Professor, Ph.D., University of New Mexico (intercultural communication, instructional communication, qualitative research methods)
Dr. Gerald Voorhees, Assistant Professor, Ph.D., University of Iowa (new media communications, rhetorical theory, rhetorical criticism)
Dr. Gregg Walker, Professor, Ph.D., University of Kansas (conflict, negotiation, mediation, research methods, argumentation, organizational communication)
Beginning Fall 2012, we will have an additional faculty member in Organizational Communication. An offer has been made and is in the negotiation stage.

ii. All COMM faculty who hold a Ph.D. are members of OSU’s graduate faculty. The Communication area also employs a number of regular, part-time faculty.

b. New Faculty Needed: None.

c. New Support Staff Needed: None; this program can be maintained with current support personnel.

11. Reference Sources

a. Library Resources Audit:

According to the Category I Library Assessment Guidelines, the library audit occurs “after completion of a draft review meeting with Academic Planning and Assessment.” Loretta Rielly, Humanities/Social Sciences Librarian, explained she would do a preliminary assessment after the proposal was approved at the college level.

12. Facilities, Equipment, and Technology

a. Necessary Unique Resources: None.

b. New Resources Needed: None.
13. **External Reviewers**

   Ann Gill, Colorado State University*
   David Henry, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
   Dennis Jaehne, San Jose State University
   Michael Salvador, Washington State University*
   Benjamin Broome, Arizona State University
   Betsy Wackernagel-Bach, University of Montana  *OSU Peer institution

14. **Budgetary Impact**

   a. Estimated Cost of the Program: The budget outline sheet will be presented in accordance with the Category I Guidelines after the conclusions following a draft review meeting with Academic Planning and Assessment.

   b. Required Federal or Other Grant Funds: None.

   c. Budget Impact: No new resources are needed. The M.S./M.A. program in Communication can be supported without compromising existing Communication undergraduate and minor programs. The curriculum changes will include adding 4 new graduate courses (a total of 12 credits) to the Communication curriculum; one graduate course (COMM 524, a total of 3 credits) will be eliminated from the regular curriculum and subsumed into the graduate seminar rotation.

      The addition of those four course slots can be accomplished without new resources. Two years ago the department began offering a 3-credit graduate-only seminar; that course could be used as one of the 4 slots necessary. Two more slots could be gained by changing faculty options for COMM 412/512, a topics course. During 2006-7 and 2007-8 COMM 412/512 was offered more than twice a year. Reducing 2 faculty options for that course opens 2 more course slots that could be used for the M.S./M.A. Eliminating 2 sections of COMM 412/512 does not eliminate any regular graduate or undergraduate courses, but it does reduce the number of 400-level courses available for undergraduates. This reduction may not create enrollment issues; distribution of undergraduates to other 400-level courses may occur. Faculty agreed that if pressure for 400-level courses increases (as evidenced by sizes of waiting lists for courses), slightly larger class sizes for other 400-level courses being offered (an increase of 1-3 students per 400-level course) could constitute a possible solution. This plan, then, accrues 2 new slots by eliminating 2 412/512 offerings and 1 slot by subsuming the current, stand-alone graduate course for a total of 3 new course slots on existing schedules. In addition, as noted earlier, with the restructuring we have gained two new courses with the reduction of the Chair's course release. We have also gained one-half FTE in the tenure rank, adding three additional slots.

      The last course slot necessary to implement this M.S./M.A. program can be created by reducing a required, basic theory course (COMM 321) from 4 to 3 offerings a year. This course is taught by full-time faculty. Until 2004, COMM 321 had been offered regularly 3 times a year;
the department increased the offerings to 4 times a year in 2004 to reduce enrollment pressure on the course. The course now is offered regularly both during the summer session and online, so the enrollment pressure has decreased and the course may be reduced again to being offered 3 times a year. The scheduling slot made available by that reduction will be used for the fourth graduate-only course for this M.S./M.A.

The only other costs associated with this degree are administrative costs; current departmental infrastructure—including the Graduate Director and office management--is sufficient to accommodate this change, so no new resources will be necessary.
Appendix A

Three syllabi for example courses for COMM 590 and 591

COMM 590: Communication and the Environment
COMM 590: Feminist Rhetorical Theory
COMM 591: Social Identity in the Workplace
COMM 599: Topics in Speech Communication: Communication and the Environment
3 Course Credits: Course meets 3 hours per week in lecture
Spring 2006

Dr. Mark Moore
Office: Shepard Hall, Rm 102
Office Phone: 7-5387
E-mail: mmoore@oregonstate.edu
Office Hours: Tuesdays, 2:00-3:00pm; Thursdays, 2:00-4:00pm

Course Description

Communication and the Environment is designed to help students become more critical producers and consumers of environmental discourse. Through the course readings, class discussions, student research papers and assignments, the course explores the concepts of "nature" and the "environment" with respect to what they entail as communication phenomena. The course also considers the problems we face as humans communicating about the environment, along with the conflicting values, meanings, and modes of discourse that define nature and construct socially what we understand as the environment. To do this, the major premises and arguments for and against conservation and environmentalism will be examined, as well as the ways in which these premises and arguments influence environmental policy and the environmental movement as a whole. Therefore, we will study the natural environment as it is described through various types of discourse by focusing on the ways in which communication creates, shapes, and maintains our perceptions of reality and/or social reality. In doing so, the course will cover the following four units in this order: 1) A Communication Perspective of the Environment; 2) Environmental and Conservation Argument; 3) Communication and Environmental Policy; 4) Communication and the Environmental Movement.

Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of this course, students can be expected to:

–analyze substantive discourse and issues in public environmental controversies.

–critically examine how environmental arguments implicate audiences and structure audience responses to environmental problems.

–synthesize and locate sound ethical arguments for conservation and environmental policy-making.

–be more critical producers and consumers of environmental discourse with greater oral and written, environmental communication proficiency.
evaluate and apply environmental communication skills and knowledge of environmental conflicts to the practical challenges of current environmental problems.

Course Schedule

Week One: April 4

--Introduction to the course.
–A Communication Perspective for the Environment.

–INSTRUCTIONS FOR ORAL PRESENTATION

Week Two: April 11

–Communication Perspective for the Environment.
–Environmental and Conservation Arguments.

–Read: KB&H, Chapters 1, 2, & 3. ECY, Chapter 1.

–INSTRUCTIONS FOR TERM PAPER ASSIGNMENT
–INSTRUCTIONS FOR LEADING GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Week Three: April 18

–Environmental and Conservation Arguments.

–Read: KB&H, Chapters 4 & 5; ECY, Chapter 1.

Week Four: April 25

–Environmental and Conservation Arguments.

–Read: ECY, 10, 12 & 2.

–LEAD GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Week Five: May 2

–Communication and Environmental Policy.

–Read: KB&H, Chapter 6; ECY, Chapters 8 & 11.
–GROUP DISCUSSIONS
–ORAL PRESENTATIONS

–Term paper purpose statement due

**Week Six**: May 9
–Communication and Environmental Policy.

–**Read**: KB&H, Chapter 7; ECY, Chapter 6.

–ORAL PRESENTATIONS
–GROUP DISCUSSIONS

**Week Seven**: May 16
–Communication and Environmental Policy.

–**Read**: KB&H, Chapter 8; ECY, Chapter 4.

–ORAL PRESENTATIONS
–GROUP DISCUSSIONS

**Week Eight**: May 23
–Communication, Environmental Policy, and the Environmental Movement

–**KB&H**, Chapter 9; **ECY**, Chapters 7 & 9.

–ORAL PRESENTATIONS
–GROUP DISCUSSIONS

**Week Nine**: May 30
–Communication and the Environmental Movement.

–**Read**: ECY, Chapters 3, 5, & 9.

–ORAL PRESENTATIONS
–GROUP DISCUSSIONS

**Week Ten**: June 6
–Communication and the Environmental Movement
Key to Abbreviations: KB&H = Kempton, Boster, & Hartley text  
ECY = The Environmental Communication Yearbook, vol. 1

Assigned Reading


Course Assignments

Oral Presentation: Each student will be assigned a class date for the purpose of giving an oral presentation and then leading a question/answer period on a particular aspect of a current debate over a perceived environmental problem. The environmental problem to be considered for this class will be on the controversy of global warming. Students will provide a full-sentence outline to class members on the day of presentation that will include at least seven sources on the topic outside of class readings. Students should expect to speak for about 15-20 minutes and then lead a question/answer period for about the same length of time. The overall presentation will be worth 100 points. More specific details will be given with the instructions, but keep in mind that the focus of the presentation should be kept on the way that communication plays a role in the nature of the controversy. Attendance on presentation days is mandatory.

Class Discussion Leadership: Each student will lead two class discussions on two of the assigned readings in the syllabus. More specific instructions will given during the second week of class but students should give a summary or overview of the reading assignment and then lead a discussion of it based on a set of discussion questions prepared in advance. On the day that you lead your discussion you will turn in a copy of the questions with a summary of what you think would be a fitting response to each question. Of course, the success of such an assignment will demand that all students have completed the reading assignment to be discussed and are prepared to engage in discussion. Each assignment is worth 50 points. Attendance on days when group discussions are lead is mandatory.

Term Paper: For this paper, each student will select a current and controversial environmental problem, examine that problem, explain how communication plays a role in it, and then offer potential ways in which communication can play a role in its resolution. The paper will be worth 150 points. Specific details will be given with the instructions during the second week of class.
**Point Value for Assignments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Grading Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>315-350 A/A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Leader (2 X 50)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>280-314 B+/B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Paper</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>245-279 C+/C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210-244 D+/D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-209 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>points possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading Scale**

- 315-350 A/A-
- 280-314 B+/B-
- 245-279 C+/C-
- 210-244 D+/D-
- -209 F

**Course Requirements**

Oral presentations must be given on the assigned date and accompanied by a full-sentence outline to be distributed in class on the day of the presentation.

Group discussions to be lead will cover various assigned class readings that will include a list of discussion questions prepared in advance of the day discussions are conducted.

The topic for the term paper must be approved by submitting a purpose statement at midterm and the term paper itself must be turned in on the assigned date, in class.

Late presentations, discussions, and papers will only be accepted with the instructor's approval, and if approved there will be an appropriate point-value reduction for the assignment.

All graded written materials (outlines, papers, etc.) must be typed.

Due to the amount of group interaction and oral presentation, class attendance is essential to the success of each individual student and to the course as a whole.

All electronic devices and cell phones must be tuned off and put away during class.

**Statement Regarding Students with Disabilities**

“Accommodations are collaborative efforts between students, faculty and Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD). Students with accommodations approved through SSD are responsible for contacting the faculty member in charge of the course prior to or during the first week of the term to discuss accommodations. Students who believe they are eligible for accommodations but who have not yet obtained approval through SSD should contact SSD immediately at 737-4098.

**Statement on Academic Dishonesty**

Academic dishonesty is absolutely not tolerated. Link to Statement of Expectations for Student Conduct, i.e., cheating policies [http://oregonstate.edu/admin/achon.htm](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/achon.htm)
SAMPLE SYLLABUS 2

COMM 590
Feminist Rhetorical Theory
Fall 2010

Dr. Trischa Goodnow
204 Shepard Hall
737-5392
tgoodnow@oregonstate.edu
Office Hours: M 11:30-1, W 9-10 and by appointment

Objectives: During the course of this term we will explore the entrance of a feminist perspective into the realm of rhetorical study, examine the ways in which feminist theory has been articulated as rhetorical theory, and consider feminist rhetoric itself as an alternative to the traditional patriarchal rhetoric studied since the beginning of the art.

Learning Outcomes: Upon completion of the course, students will be able to
1. Identify and explain points of difference between traditional rhetorical theory and feminist rhetorical theory
2. Explain constructs that support a particular, feminist rhetorical theory
3. Locate and identify alternative ways to engage points of difference with others, ways juxtaposed to the traditional means espoused in standard, public speaking protocols
4. Articulate criticisms of feminist theory

Text: Course packet provided by University Readers. Here is the purchase information:
Detailed instructions are available at www.universityreaders.com/students/instructions/

Your custom course materials published by University Readers contain required readings that have been carefully selected for this course. If you hope to do well in this course, it is highly recommended that you purchase the course pack and always stay on top of your reading. To purchase your course materials, please visit University Readers at www.universityreaders.com and click the white "STUDENTS BUY HERE" button located within the red "Students" section in the upper-right corner of our home page. You will create an account and be prompted to choose your state and institution. Easy-to-follow instructions will lead you through the rest of the purchasing process. Payment can be made by all major credit cards or electronic check. Your order is then processed and shipped out to you (orders are typically processed within 24 hours and often same day). Shipping time will depend on the selected shipping method. If available for your course, you will also be emailed instructions on how to download a FREE 20% PDF download so you can get started on your required readings right away. If you have any difficulties, please e-mail orders@universityreaders.com or call 800.200.3908.

You should bring your reading packet to class.
Assignments:

Grades will be based on the following assignments:

- Reaction Papers/Question: 100 pts
- Literature Review: 200 pts
- Final Paper: 300 pts
- Presentation: 100 pts
- Non-Speech Experience Paper: 50 pts

**Reaction Papers:** Each week on Monday you will turn in a one page, typed and proofread reaction paper to the readings. This paper is due by the end of class. If you are not in class on a Monday, the reaction paper must be in my mailbox by the time I return from class. I will not accept late papers or papers via email. This paper should NOT be a summary of the reading. Nor should it be an assessment of the quality of the reading. Rather, you should engage the material. What do you think about the reading? What does it make you think about? Do you agree or disagree? Is there something that confuses you? The purpose of these papers is first, to make sure you’ve done the reading, but secondly, and more importantly, to make sure you’ve thought about the issues raised. This will lead to more productive discussions in class. To gain full points on the reaction papers you must illustrate that you’re thinking critically about the readings. The papers will be graded with the following points: 10 points means you’ve done a good job engaging the material, 5 points means you’ve done an adequate job and zero points means you barely tried. You must also proofread. If there are more than two errors, I will return the paper to you with zero points. There are eight weeks of readings. The Foss and Griffin reading is due Thanksgiving week. During the first month of the term (by Oct. 31), you should come talk to me in my office. We’ll have a little meet and greet in my office during the first two weeks that will count for the first reaction paper. This will be the 10th reaction paper. Each one is worth 10 points. Total: 100 points. **I WILL NOT ACCEPT REACTION PAPERS LATE OR VIA EMAIL!**

**Literature Review:** You will choose either one Feminist theory or one Feminist theorist that we study this term and conduct a literature review. If you choose the theory option you will examine the theory and reactions to it and ways in which others have used the theory. If you choose the theorist you will examine their body of work and how they have developed their theory(ies). This is a 7-10 page paper that follows the guidelines below except for the number of sources. This should be appropriate to the topic. This paper is due November 19.

**Final Paper:** You have several options for the final paper. These are to be typed and proofread. All options require a page length of 15 to 20 pages. Pages should be numbered with one inch margins. You should NOT have a cover page. The first page should ONLY include the title of your paper. The final page should include your name. Each paper will include a MINIMUM of eight outside sources. These sources should be scholarly sources. The following will NOT be counted toward the required total of sources: wikis, dictionaries, any readings from the course packet, more than one source from a webpage. You may include the above, but they will not count toward the required total. If you use a source, cite it. If I discover plagiarism (using another person’s words or ideas without giving them credit), you will receive a “0” for the
assignment. You should cite these sources according to the APA style manual. If you do not know how to cite according to this style, you can reference the Department of Speech Communication website: http://oregonstate.edu/dept/speech/writing.html. You can also access the APA style manual at the library. Failure to follow this style manual or any of these instructions will result in a full letter grade deduction for this assignment.

All essays should follow the following outline: introduction (attention getter, thesis statement, preview of how you will proceed in the paper), the body (this is a clear explanation of two to four arguments you wish to make in your paper with each argument be explained separately) and conclusion (review of main arguments, restate thesis, and concluding statement).

Options:

A) Choose one theory essay that we have read this term and refute it. We will read several essays that take issue with previous feminist theory. You should not just parrot these criticisms. While you may share some of their concerns, you should expand their logic, approach from a different angle, or explain your own critiques. The idea here is that feminist rhetorical theory is evolving and no theory is considered a law. Your job here is to challenge assumptions and advance theory by pointing out where a particular theory falls short.

B) Choose one theory essay that we have read this term and extend it. Theory is a starting point in the humanities. Consider the essay you’ve chosen. Are there weaknesses? Are there areas that have not been fully developed? In this paper, you might talk about ways that this theory could be used in areas the author(s) did not think about. The idea here is to think more broadly about the proposed theory.

C) Choose one rhetorical theory that you have studied in another class that would not be considered a feminist rhetorical theory. Using theory or theories we study this term draw a comparison between the traditional theory and the feminist rhetorical theory. In what ways are they similar? Where are the differences? Are the theories compatible or are they mutually exclusive? In this paper you will explore the place of the feminist theory in relation to traditional rhetorical theory.

D) For the final option, you may choose to explore one piece of contemporary rhetoric using one of the Feminist theories we explore this term. This is essentially a rhetorical criticism using Feminist theory. You will choose one speech act (either verbal or nonverbal/visual) and apply a feminist theory to draw conclusions. The essays on the Grimké sisters, Barbara Jordan, and Bernadette Devlin are examples of this assignment. However, you should not be constrained by methods used in these articles. The purpose here is to test the validity of the theory in practical application.

Papers are due Monday of finals week at 5 p.m.
**Presentation:** During the course of the term, you will lead a discussion of your topic for the literature review on the appropriate day in class. You will begin with a 15 to 20 minute lecture that covers your research. You will then lead the class in a discussion of the reading for that day.

**Non-Speech Experience:** One of the arguments that is made in a variety of ways in Feminist Rhetorical Theory is that women often seek alternative rhetorical outlets to public speaking. During the first three weeks of the term, you will experience one of these ways. You have two options: 1) *Birth* 2) *Unraveling the Ribbon*. *Birth* and *Unraveling the Ribbon* are plays sponsored by various organizations and the University Theatre. *Birth* explores the idea of women’s ownership of the birth process while *Unraveling the Ribbon* examines how breast cancer impacts relationships. *Birth* will take place on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday Oct. 9-11 at 7:30 in the Lab Theatre and on Sunday Oct. 12 at 2 in the Lab. Your admission is free (you will have to give your name at the box office). *Unraveling the Ribbon* opens the following weekend Oct. 16-18 at 7:30 in the Lab Theatre. Admission is free. Upon seeing one of the shows, you will write a two page reaction paper. This paper should not be about the quality of the production. Rather, the critique should engage the content of the play. How does it communicate its message to the audience? What is the message? How would this differ from a speech on the same topic? Is this a more or less effective way to communicate the message? What are the advantages and disadvantages of communicating through this medium? The paper should be types and proofread. It is due October 22 in class.

### Tentative Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Sarah Palin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>First entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Womanization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>The Grimke Sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>One Woman, One Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>Jordan and Devlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>Mother Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>Dow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>Blankenship, et. al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Blair, et. al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Clinton and Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>Biesecker and Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>Condit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>Foss and Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>No Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Catch up...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Overview: A focus on diversity in the workplace responds to demographic changes and anticipates future cultural shifts in the workplace by framing diversity as a process and a resource to be leveraged rather than as a problem to be solved. To be successful, managers must learn to integrate different viewpoints to enhance creative problem solving, task performance and leadership ability. In short, the organization of the future will be increasingly heterogeneous. Therefore, many of the key opportunities and challenges for diverse workplaces will center around people from different cultures working together effectively.

Course Credit Hours: 3

Course Objectives:
- Demonstrated knowledge, synthesis and critical assessment of fundamental theories of social identity and their impact on workplace relations and related outcomes
- Analysis, evaluation and understanding of theoretical concepts of social identity such that students can make use of and challenge theories of social identity
- Application and integration of personal experiences with social identity theories and principles via experiential assignments

Course Format: This course will begin with an overview of diversity issues in the workplace. More specifically, the goal of this course is to teach students how to make strategic use of intercultural and other synergies to help organizations improve market penetration, employee engagement, customer loyalty and the bottom line. To this end, we will examine organizational strategies for creating and sustaining a workforce which is inclusive of difference of race, gender culture and personal values.

Course Methodology: Instructional activities consist of both lecture and discussion although I will try to emphasize the latter as much as possible. The success of this course is predicated upon highly interactive methods of teaching. Thus, students who offer original perspectives and who integrate examples from other contexts will be rewarded. This course requires on significant writing assignment as well as several short analytic papers and responsibility for one presentation.
Student Accommodations

Accommodations are collaborative efforts between students, faculty and Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD). Students with accommodations approved through SSD are responsible for contacting the faculty member in charge of the course prior to or during the first week of the term to discuss accommodations. Students who believe they are eligible for accommodations but who have not yet obtained approval through SSD should contact SSD immediately at 737-4098.

Academic Integrity

The highest standards of academic integrity are expected of all students. The failure of any student to meet these standards may result in suspension or expulsion from the university and other sanctions as specified in the academic integrity policies of the individual colleges. Violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, cheating, fabrication, tampering, plagiarism, or facilitating such activities.

Assignments

Your Area of Interest/Area of Honest Inquiry/Hot Button/Rationale/Other

During the first part of this course, you are expected to select an article (academic or popular culture), a film clip, or a book or maybe even a picture/photo that focuses on an area of interest to you related to social identity at work. Your topic may be linked to your thesis or project, to something you always wanted to explore or to something that you think is connected to a current event of interest. Your objective is to bring the article to class and conduct a mini-presentation of the issue to the class. Specifically, using 5-7 minutes, overview the topic and then using another 5-7 minutes lead us in a brief discussion about the relevance of the topic to workplace social identity and to our previous discussion of Chapters 1, 2 and 9 in the Allen text. This is considered part of your participation grade and will be assessed largely as "pass/fail" in terms of meeting the basic requirements outlined herein.

Presentation: Leading A Class Discussion

Each student will be responsible for a presentation which will articulate framing questions, offer an interpretive context, and introduce other resources relevant to a specific text, film clip or other course material. The format is flexible and can be, for example, an individual oral presentation, a structured debate with guest speakers or a video you make addressing the issues. This presentation will require you to exhibit careful analysis, creativity, originality and strong presentation skills. In essence, you will be given a portion of the class in which to lead discussion on a specific topic. Your goal is to teach the rest of us; give us some knowledge, awareness and skills that we can use in our professional lives. See the last page of this syllabus (articles for student-led presentations) for a list of the possible articles from which to choose your class presentation topic. They are available on a first-come, first-served basis.
Individual Experiential Paper (IEP): Being Exposed to Diversity

The purpose of this assignment is to expose you to a new situation that required to carefully observe your surroundings and asks you to both describe what you felt and what other individuals might feel about having you among them. Your assignment is to go by yourself (you may not take anyone with you) to a place you have not been before and to observe what you see (and participate if appropriate). Please note that these two conditions (going by yourself and doing something you have not done before) are important. After your field experience, you will write a 4-5 page paper that includes the following:

✓ Date and address of where the experience took place
✓ Length of time you were there
✓ Brief description of the setting
✓ Your reaction to the situation in terms of your behavior and feelings
✓ The reaction of the other individuals toward you
✓ What this experience teaches you about being different from others in your environment
✓ How such an experience might influence your development in you were to work in such a setting for a major period of your life
✓ Concluding comments

Listed below are some examples of places other students have visited:

- A protestant visits a Buddhist service
- A man takes a “Lamaze” class
- A Caucasian visits a Black church or student organization
- A student of color visits a resource center for a different minority group (e.g., Native American visits Asian cultural center)
- An atheist or agnostic visits any institution of faith (e.g., church, synagogue, etc.)
- A hearing individuals visit a school for the deaf
- A man visits a maternity clinic
- A student visits “dignity village” (Portland) or other local “homeless” shelter
- A younger person visits an assisted living facility for the elderly
- A single person visits a children’s nursery at times to include observation of the dropping off and picking up of children by their parents
- An able person visits student disabled services to learn about the range of disability issues the organization deals with
- Other

Do not choose to visit a setting where you might feel like an intruder into someone’s privacy. In some situations, you may need to get permission to observe the group. Use your good judgment. Do not place yourself in a situation that is physically dangerous. Choose a setting that you truly want to learn about so you don’t feel like an undercover agent. The papers are due at the end of
the term and must be double-spaced, and typewritten with 1-inch margins. They will be evaluated on the extent to which they are clearly organized, with no grammatical or spelling errors. In writing your paper, make sure to make specific references to readings and their content and to appropriately reference work when you draw from readings and other literature.

**Short Analytic Papers (HBR Case Studies)**

*For your choice of any 3 of the 5 topics below, develop a focused, cleanly written 2-4 page analysis addressing the issues raised in each question. For each paper, a well-thought out argument is required; to that end, use the questions below as a “jumping off” point for developing your perspective of the issues raised in the case. Each paper is worth 20 points and is due on or near the date the topic is discussed in class.*

1. How do stereotypes around leadership styles work to the “disadvantage of both men and women” in “Three Men, Two Women on a Raft?” What really happens in Raft No. 4 to undermine the team’s effectiveness?

2. At the close of “It Wasn’t About Race. Or Was It?”, Jack Parson must come up with an agenda for the Wednesday morning meeting. What are the underlying issues in the case? What should he do?

3. Based on the “Case of the Religious Network Group”, how should corporations “accommodate diverse religious practice and spiritual values” in the workplace setting? If you select #3, you must also do #5.

4. In “Mommy-track Backlash”, what are the work/life balance issues Jessica feels are clouding the waters for her in terms of making an equitable decision regarding her employees? What would you do and why?

5. In “Dear White Boss”, what parallels do you see with the Connor case study? (#3 above). For this case study, respond with a letter of reply as the “white boss.” If you select #5, you must also do #3.

**Note:** *As an alternative to one or more of the suggested topics above, individual students are welcome to propose their own arguments for short analytic papers. Theses topics must derive from particular course readings. My consent is required before submission.*

**Participation**

Class participation is central part of the learning process in this course. Classes may include discussions, role plays, pre-class/in-class writing, debates and guest lectures. Each student is expected to attend class fully prepared, complete assignment by due dates and contribute to class discussion. Additionally, students are expected to frame appropriate questions in anticipation of question and answer sessions with guest speakers.
Major Paper

Final papers can focus on one of two specific contexts:

1. A specific domestic social identity group
2. A specific organization or industry

Within the context of your choice, you have two options for completing your paper:

Option One involves conducting primary or secondary research on a specific topic of interest to develop implications for practice. For example, you might focus on performance, creativity, innovation or small group performance. Then, using your variable of interest, tell me what specific actions you would recommend be taken or avoided to a) promote and sustain an inclusive workforce, b) make welcome a particular employee subculture or c) more effectively recruit and also retain diverse employees and so forth.

Option Two involves choosing a specific organizational context and using course materials to develop a manual that would provide diagnostic questions for the resolution of conflict due to the integration of specific forms of diversity. Your manual might include suggestions for conflict de-escalation in specific situations and recommendations for conflict management system design, including specific steps an organization might take to anticipate and mitigate potential conflict due to diversity in the first place.

Each student must make a 12-minute presentation of his work. Presentations will be held on the last day of class or in the final exam time slot (not decided yet). Your goal is to teach the rest of us; give us some knowledge, awareness and skills that we can use in our professional lives.

Course Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Experience Paper</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBR Case Study (3 at 25pts each)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class discussion</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Paper</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Major Paper</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tentative Course Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Class Activity</th>
<th>Readings Covered/Assignments Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, 4/1</td>
<td>Course Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R, 4/3</td>
<td>Why examine social identity at work?</td>
<td>Allen, Ch. 1 and Ch. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, 4/8</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Allen, Ch. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R, 4/10</td>
<td>Power cont. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, 4/15</td>
<td>Social Identity at Work (your interests)</td>
<td>Students bring article, film clip, book or picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R, 4/17</td>
<td>Your issues cont. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, 4/22</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Allen, Ch. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R, 4/24</td>
<td>Class cont . .</td>
<td><strong>Mommy-Track Backlash due.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, 4/29</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Allen, Ch. 3; <em>Read Tannen's Power of Talk</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R, 5/1</td>
<td>Gender cont. . .</td>
<td>*Three Men, Two Women due; Class discussion leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, 5/6</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>*Religious Group Network due; Class discussion leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, 5/13</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Allen, Ch. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R, 5/15</td>
<td>Sexual orientation cont. . .</td>
<td>Class Discussion Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, 5/20</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Allen, Ch. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R, 5/22   Race cont. . . .   *About Race or Was it? and *Dear White Boss due.; Class discussion leader

Week 9
T, 5/27   Ability               Allen, Ch. 7; Read Wendt & Slonaker, Sr., (2006)
R, 5/29   Ability cont. . . .   Class discussion leader; IEP due.

Week 10
T, 6/3   Age                   Allen, Ch. 8; Class discussion leader; Read Paul & Townsend, 1993; Wilson, 2006
R, 6/5   Age cont. . .          Major Papers due.

*Case studies (short analytic papers); the two on race [5/22] are linked so that both must be completed. Complete any three of the five.

Regular italics, no asterisk, are supplemental readings designed to be read along with the Allen text.

__________________________________________________________________________

Student-Led Discussion Articles


*Note: These articles are not in the reserve reading packet; please locate online.*
Appendix B

Examples of schedules for M.S./M.A. students for 2006-7 and 2007-8:
Using the schedule of graduate courses offered in 2006-7 and 2007-8 (with the modifications projected to 2009-2010), these three fictional grad students could take these courses to complete their programs. Electives are noted in italics:

**Gregory Graduate**
Interest: Sustainability, Mediation and Facilitation

**First Year 2006-7**
- Fall: 200701
- Grad Seminar (520)
- Hist/Th Comm (589)
- Hist/Th Rhet (588)
- Winter: 200702
- Target Sem Comm (591)
- Comm Res Meth (515)
- Internat Conflict (546)
- Spring: 200703
- Target Sem Rhet (590)
- Rhet Res Meth (565)
- Initial Committee Meeting

**Second Year 2007-8**
- Fall: 200801
- Ethnography (516-method)
- Bargaining (542)
- Minor (Forestry)
- Winter: 200802
- Intercultural (526)
- Media Criticism (584)
- Minor (Forestry)
- Spring: 200803
- Minor (Forestry)
- Thesis (6 credits)
- Defense

Total: 54 credits

**Geraldine Graduate**
Interest: Peace, community relations or politics

**First Year 2006-7**
- Fall: 200701
- Grad Seminar (520)
- Hist/Th Comm (589)
- Hist/Th Rhet (588)
- Winter: 200702
- Target Sem Comm (591)
- Comm Res Meth (515)
- Internat Conflict (546)
- Spring: 200703
- Target Sem Rhet (590)
- Rhet Res Meth (565)
- Initial Committee Meeting

**Second Year 2007-8**
- Fall: 200801
- Bargaining (542)
- Comm Resrch Methods (514)
- Minor (Ethnic Studies)
- Winter: 200802
- Small Group (522)
- Intercultural (526)
- Minor (Ethnic Studies)
- Spring: 200803
- Thesis (6 credits)
- Defense

Total: 54 credits
**Grady Graduate**

*Interest: Law, persuasion*

**First Year 2006-7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall: 200701</th>
<th>Winter: 200702</th>
<th>Spring: 200703</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad Seminar (520)</td>
<td>Target Sem Comm (589)</td>
<td>Target Sem Comm (588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist/Th Rhet (590)</td>
<td>Minor (Political Sci)</td>
<td><em>Cont Theor Rhet</em> (559)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall: 200801</th>
<th>Winter: 200802</th>
<th>Spring: 200803</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhet 500-500 (556 or 558)</em></td>
<td>Comm Res Methods (514)</td>
<td>Minor (Political Sci)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adv Argumentation (545)</em></td>
<td><em>Internat Conflict (546)</em></td>
<td>Thesis (6 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor (Political Sci)</td>
<td>Minor (Political Sci)</td>
<td>Defense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 54 credits
### Appendix C

#### History: Student Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIS Students</th>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for Year</td>
<td>Two COMM Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIS Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for Year</td>
<td>Two COMM Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Summer 2008
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Faculty Curriculum Vitae

Judith Bowker
Bobette Bushnell
Natalie Dollar
Trischa Goodnow
Robert Iltis
Mark Moore
Mark Porrovecchio
Elizabeth Root
Gerald Voorhees
Gregg Walker
DRAFT LETTER
9 March 2011 (CLC)

Dear Professor Iltis:

Thank you for contacting the Department of Communication with the news that Oregon State University hopes to house a master’s program, and I appreciate the opportunity to review your packet.

Based on the information, the OSU program differs from ours at Portland State. Our program is quite broad in scope, and we offer no courses in rhetoric, argument, conflict and negotiation. Our main core courses engage students in three areas of theory and three areas of methods. Speaking briefly our required theory courses cover (1) Social, Institutional and Media Theories, (2) Cognitive and Relational Theories, and (3) Critical and Cultural Theories. Our three required research courses entail qualitative, quantitative and critical methodologies.

In terms of requirements, the programs are quite different and I see no overlap between the PSU master’s program and the one proposed at OSU. Indeed, the only areas where I see similarities are with the electives. For example, you note that each OSU faculty member will teach a seminar in her or his area of expertise, such as intercultural communication. To that end, we do have graduate faculty who teach, for example, intercultural communication as their area of expertise. But, unlike OSU, we typically teach courses in media studies, political communication, new technologies in mass media, health communication, metaphor, and conversation analysis.

In summary, I find the OSU program distinct from the master’s in communication at Portland State, and wish you every success.

/s/ CLC
From: Cynthia-Lou Coleman [mailto:coleman@pdx.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2011 3:59 PM
To: Itlis, Robert
Cc: Jeffrey D. Robinson; Grant Farr
Subject: RE: Request for Liaison, MA/MS Proposal, OSU

Prof. Itlis:
Thank you for the opportunity to review the materials for the OSU master’s program. I will make sure our department graduate advisor and the dean’s office gets a copy for their files.

I am happy to write a letter that supports the program, which is substantively different from ours. Your focus in rhetoric, argumentation and conflict makes it quite distinctive. I have drafted a letter (attached): let me know if this meets your needs and, if so, I will send you a clean copy.

Success, Cindy Coleman

Cynthia-Lou Coleman, Chair
Department of Communication
Portland State University

Website: http://www.pdx.edu/communication/cynthia-lou-coleman-0
Blog: http://nativescience.wordpress.com/

****

From: Itlis, Robert [mailto:ritlis@oregonstate.edu]

Professor Cynthia-Lou Coleman, Chair
Department of Communication
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97403

Dear Professor Coleman:
In September 2001 Professor David Ritchie provided a favorable liaison letter to Dr. Gregg Walker for our department’s Master of Arts proposal in Communication. Unfortunately, budget constraints in the College of Liberal Arts required the tabling of that proposal and others in the college. With a more favorable economic scenario the Department of Speech Communication is resubmitting the proposal. I am writing to request again a liaison letter.

We hope to complement your excellent program’s focus on Urban Life, Media Theories; Critical, Cultural and Relational Theories and Cognitive Theories. Our proposed program’s strengths include conflict and negotiation, classical and contemporary rhetoric, argument and advocacy discourse, persuasion, interpersonal and intercultural communication, organizational communication, and media aesthetics. The O.S.U. program will provide a significantly different program to students who can integrate rhetoric and communication combining, for example, contemporary rhetoric, conflict negotiation, advocacy discourse, organizational communication, media aesthetics, and intercultural communication.

We believe that graduate students at either institution could benefit from the individual strengths of the other department. We envision working with your program so that M.S./M.A. students could, when feasible, take some course work at the sibling institution. O.S.U. students could enroll in specialty courses offered by P.S.U. faculty and P.S.U. students could elect from the range of O.S.U. rhetoric courses not otherwise available to them.

The proposal is fundamentally the same as the one Dr. Ritchie reviewed in 2001, except that we will offer an MS option as well as the MA.

I have attached the current draft of the proposal as well as a copy of your letter from 2001.

It is facile to say that your time is valuable, but it is true. I regret requesting an update of an old letter, but members of the University Curriculum Committee properly reasoned that new liaison letters would be prudent. Too much time has passed.

Of course I am happy to answer any questions you may have about the proposal.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Iltis, Ph.D.
Chair
Department of Speech Communication
Shepard Hall 104
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331

541-737-2461
541-737-4443 (fax)
December 9, 2010

Robert S. Iltis, Ph.D., Chair
Department of Speech Communication
Shepard Hall 104
Oregon State University
Corvallis OR 97331

Dear Professor Iltis:

Thank you for the opportunity to again review the Master of Arts degree program in Communication.

As I wrote when reviewing the proposal in September 2001, the proposed program's focus on communication and rhetoric distinguishes it from the graduate programs offered in the University of Oregon School of Journalism and Communication.

I will note that the proposal does propose “conflict management and resolution” as a major option. This option may overlap with the UO’s Master's Degree Program In Conflict and Dispute Resolution, http://conflict.uoregon.edu/.

Sincerely,

Tim Gleason
Edwin L. Artzt Dean
Professor of Journalism
Dear Dr. Walker:

I am delighted that you have asked me to offer my judgment on your M.A. proposal. As you know, the University of Oregon was forced to eliminate its Speech department, leaving a significant void in our curriculum and leaving students interested in pursuing graduate work in non-mediated communication with very few choices of programs in the Pacific Northwest. I hold a Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Communication, and am qualified to assess the proposed program.

The proposal you have included places a much-needed focus on the study of communication and rhetoric. The program objectives, clearly set forth in the first paragraph of the proposal, would provide graduate students with refined insight on the functions played by symbols in human society. While other disciplines touch upon the symbol, the field of communication and rhetoric places the symbol at the center of research and instruction. Scholars of communication and rhetoric build on a heritage of some 2,000 years, providing theoretical insight and practical guidance on the most important problems in society. Without question, students entering and graduating from OSU with a M.A. in Communication would be well prepared to enter careers in marketing, public and community relations, and a host of other occupations.

As part of the curriculum, the program would offer coursework in organizational communication, rhetoric theory, and a number of other curricular options. Oregon State would have the only systematic graduate program in communication between Portland and Humboldt State University in California. The program would serve a unique function and offer an essential discipline to students.

ROBERT D. CLARK HONORS COLLEGE
1293 University of Oregon · Eugene OR 97403-1293 · (541) 346-5414

As an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act
Oregon State has the faculty and the facility to offer a graduate degree, and I give my full endorsement of the proposal you have included. You have developed a strong proposal, deserving adoption. If I can be of assistance, I am hopeful you will contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David A. Frank, Ph.D.
Director
Robert D. Clark Honors College
University of Oregon
Category I Proposal
Guidelines for Addressing Accessibility of New Programs

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities and mandates the provision of reasonable accommodations to ensure access to programs and services. Oregon State University is committed to providing equal opportunity to higher education for academically qualified students without regard to a disability.

For questions and assistance with addressing access, please contact the Office of Disability and Access Services (737-4098) or the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity (737-3558)

Title of Proposal: Proposal for the Initiation of a New Instructional Program Leading to Master of Science/Master of Arts Degree in Communication

Effective Date: September 2010

Department/Program: Department of Speech Communication

College: College of Liberal Arts

X Faculty Guidelines (http://ds.oregonstate.edu/facultystaff.aspx?Title=ResponsibilitiesFacultyStaff )

X Information Technology Guidelines (http://oregonstate.edu/accessibility/ )

By signing this form, we affirm that we have reviewed the listed documents and will apply a good faith effort to ensure accessibility in curricular design, delivery, and supporting information.

Sign (Dept Chair/Head; Director) 3/4/10  Robert J. His Print (Department Chair/Head; Director)
OSU Libraries
Collection Development

Library Evaluation for Category I Proposal

Proposal for the Initiation of a New Instructional Program Leading to the Master of Science/Master of Arts Degree in Communication

Title of Proposal

Speech Communication

Department

College of Liberal Arts

College

The subject librarian responsible for collection development in the pertinent curricular area has assessed whether the existing library collections and services can support the proposal. Based on this review, the subject librarian concludes that present collections and services are:

[  ] inadequate to support the proposal (see budget needs below)
[ x ] marginally adequate to support the proposal
[  ] adequate to support the proposal

Estimated funding needed to upgrade collections or services to support the proposal (details are attached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Ongoing (Annual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monographs $500/year</td>
<td>Monographs $500/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New journals $5,433/year</td>
<td>New journals $5,433/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $5,933/year</td>
<td>Total $5,933/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments and Recommendations:

Date Received: 10/5/2010

Subject Librarian

Date Completed: 10/19/2010

Signature

10/19/2010

Head of Collection Development

Signature

Date

University Librarian

Signature

Date

Created: October 15, 2010
Updated: October 19, 2010
Oregon State University Libraries
Collection Evaluation for the proposed MA in Speech Communication

Overview
In response to the Category I Proposal submitted by the Speech Communication Department, I reviewed the monographs collection, including the age of the OSU collection, the number of monographs published in the discipline, use of the current collection as well as the number of titles being published in the discipline. I also compared some of this data with other institutions with programs similar to the one being proposed. For serials, I reviewed the journals with the highest impact factor, compared this to our holdings, usage statistics, journals titles recommended by Magazines for Libraries¹, the journals cited by faculty, and journals where our faculty have published. I also solicited journal title recommendations from the faculty. In general, the monographic holdings compare favorably to other institutions but purchasing has declined significantly in the last decade and the collection is not adequate to maintain an MA program. The collection is also missing several core journals in the discipline. This is especially crucial when considering an MA program that requires a thesis.

Comparator Institutions Overview
I reviewed the current collection against 4 comparator institutions recommended by the Speech Communication faculty. These institutions were selected because they are considered a) peer-institutions of Oregon State and b) they off an MA program that is comparable in course work and course offering to the proposed OSU program. All are MA programs with the exception of NCSU which also offers a PhD. I reviewed the class lists to see if generally the curriculums are comparable. They require fewer credit hours for the MA program than the proposed OSU program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Credit hours</th>
<th>MA Thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State</td>
<td>27 credits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State</td>
<td>30 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State Fullerton</td>
<td>30 credits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSU</td>
<td>27 credits</td>
<td>Comps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collections - Monographs
The Category I proposal identifies four areas of concentration for the MA program.

- Persuasion and argumentation
- Conflict management and resolution
- Cultural and intercultural communication
- Organizational and group issues

Speech Communication is interdisciplinary. Students and faculty doing research in speech communication use the collections in the areas of philosophy, rhetoric, political science, history, mass media, psychology, business and education. This assessment used subject areas rather than call numbers due to the interdisciplinary nature of the subject.

The last assessment of the communications collection was done in 2000. That assessment acknowledges that in conjunction with collections in other disciplines “the collection is able to support the department at a much higher level - at a level 3b or 3c” but the summary of that assessment concluded that “the collection is barely able to

support Masters level research and should be brought to and maintained at a 3c level. Overall, the picture is one of an aging collection unable to keep up with publishing trends." Since then, the number of monographs purchased for the collection has decreased in all but a few areas which makes is unlikely that the collection is now at the 3c level.

Comparing our holdings to other libraries is not a perfect indicator, since we do not have collection ages for these institutions and we do not know which of those titles are for graduates or undergraduates. I used selected Library of Congress Subject Headings, based on the areas that the program wants to emphasize, to make the comparison. This indicates that there are gaps in our collections. Overall, OSU has from 58-93% of the number of titles owned by the comparator institutions depending on the subject area. The largest gaps (under 55%) are in conflict management, crisis management, discourse analysis, mediation (international), negotiation, and visual communication. Our collection in the subject heading of communications is equal to Cal State Fullerton but less that Colorado State (82%), San Diego State (74%), and NCSU (70%). See Appendix A for OSU holdings compared to peer institutions.

Speech Communications is a discipline that still relies on monographic literature. This based on a conversation with the Speech Communications faculty and the library use statistics for selected subject headings. Usage of monographs is quite high, indicating that the need for a healthy book budget to continue the support of the program. See Appendix B: Use Statistics. Access to print materials (books, videos) can always be supplemented with Summit and Interlibrary Loan materials. However, there are always costs involved with Summit and Interlibrary Loan and the OSU Libraries cannot be only a borrower but also needs to be a lender in the alliance. To rely solely on other collections for books is not advisable.

Since we are purchasing far fewer items than in the past, we are also looking at an older collection which is an area of concern. In some areas of the discipline, such as the history of rhetoric, this is not a major problem but it is in political discourse, mass media and visual communication, for example. MA students and faculty will require access to the latest research. Again, I used subject headings rather than call numbers. In all but 3 areas, mass media, rhetoric--philosophy, rhetoric--political aspects (United States) and visual communication, the number of books purchased has declined by an average of 33% between 1991-2000 and 2001-2010. See Appendix C: OSU Breakdown by Age of Collection.

I searched YBP, our book vendor service database, to get an overview of how many titles were published for certain Library of Congress subject areas in 2009, 2008 and 2007 to see if the number of items publish has increased, decreased or remained stable. In all areas the number of titles published has increased from anywhere from 27% to 100% (average of 240 titles in selected areas). See Appendix D: Monographs published in selected areas in the last 3 years.

The current book budget for Speech Communications is:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>$995 (12 books/year)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>$8,700 (112 book/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$9,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firm order books are selected by the subject librarian or used to purchase faculty requests. The approval books come in under the YBP approval plan and are primarily university press titles.

I asked several of the peer- institutions⁴ about their budgets for Speech Communications but only one was willing to provide the information. Again, the interdisciplinary nature of the study makes it hard to compare budgets.

---

² Conspectus Level 3c is considered the level necessary to support advanced study in an MA program
³ Average cost of a social sciences monograph is $77. Per YBP Annual Book Price Update 2009/2010.
⁴ The librarian asked me not to include the institution's name.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OSU budget is quite comparable for purchasing scholarly and academic sources (YBP Approval) but Speech Communication also requires trade publications. If we want to maintain the collection and keep up with publishing output, I recommend supplementing the firm book budget by 50% raising the book budget to $1,500. This would allow us to purchase an additional 20 books per year. In the first 2 years, we can build up the areas which are currently less well developed and then use the funds to improve the collection overall in the coming years. This should help create a robust collection and we can continue to supplement the collection with Summit and Interlibrary Loan.

**Recommendations:**
- Increase the firm order book budget by $500.

\(^5\) This librarian estimated the cost of a title at about $98.
Collections-Serials

The last assessment of the Communications collection was done in 2000. The summary of that assessment concluded that “the journal collection is very low - an absolute minimum to support our programs.” As with all other programs, Speech Communication has had serials cancellations in the last few years.

To review the journals holdings, I
1. Used Journal Citation Reports to see which journals have the highest impact factor\(^6\) and compare this to what titles OSU owns
2. Reviewed where our faculty are publishing
3. Reviewed what journals the faculty are citing in their research
4. Reviewed ILL statistics to see what faculty and students in Speech Communication are requesting most frequently
5. Reviewed list of journals recommended by *Magazines for Libraries* for Communications

Indexes and Abstracts

Discoverability is not as difficult as it used to be with the advent of Google Scholar. It is much easier to locate citations to articles in journals that are not included in a major index but a search in Google Scholar will not locate all of the literature on a given topic. Access to the major indexing sources is a must especially for an MA program where comprehensive research is required.

*Magazines for Libraries* lists the recommended journals for a specific discipline. It also includes where these journals are indexed. There are 52 indexes listed. Not all of these are completely relevant, such as the American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Languages or Index Islamicus, but appear on the list because a specific journal is indexed there. *Magazines for Libraries* lists the following as important indexes for communications related topics: America, History and Life, ComAbstracts, Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts, MLA, Peach Research Abstracts, PsycInfo, Sociological Abstracts, Social Sciences Citation Index, Social Sciences Abstracts, and Violence and Abuse Abstracts. See Appendix E: Databases for Communication Studies for a complete list.

OSU provides online access to all of these except Peace Studies Abstracts, Social Sciences Abstracts and Violence and Abuse Abstracts. There are no journals indexed in these databases that are not indexed elsewhere. Other relevant indexes to which OSU has access includes Communications and Mass Media, Education Research Complete, Education Reference Complete, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, Psychology Collection, Social Services Abstracts and Women's Studies International. We have access to the major indexes and do not need to purchase any additional databases. We do need to make sure, however, that databases that are crucial to communication studies are maintained.

Serials

Serials are always a challenge since they are an ongoing financial investment and costs generally increase every year. We can use Interlibrary Loan to supplement journal needs but this too can become expensive and may even be more expensive that actually purchasing the journal itself.

\(^6\) This is a quantitative measure that reflects the frequency with which the "average article" in a given scholarly journal has been cited in a particular year or period. Used in citation analysis, Impact Factors are calculated each year by the Institute for Scientific Information.
I compiled a list of 105 journals based on the factors of use\textsuperscript{7}, impact, citing and publishing by faculty, recommendations by faculty, interlibrary loan requests and recommendations by \textit{Magazines for Libraries}. Of those journals, OSU libraries does not own 38 titles (27\%), either in print or online, which is not an unreasonably large number. However, there are some journals that are high impact and high use that OSU does not have and should acquire to support the program. See Appendix F for a Journal Summary including the selection criteria.

For the high impact journals, as determined by Journal Citations Reports, OSU Libraries owns 21 out of 55 titles (38\%). Two of these titles are particularly important since they also have the highest impact factor; \textit{Journal of Computer Mediated Communication} and the \textit{Journal of Communication}.

Interlibrary Loan data indicates there were over 400 interlibrary loan requests for communication related journals in 2009. The data cannot tell us who requested the item (which department) but does tell us if the person is undergraduate, graduate or faculty. Of the 400 requests, 247 were from faculty or graduate students (62\%). Of the 15 top requested journal articles, we do not own 8. Several of these journals are high impact journals.

Journals with the highest number of interlibrary loan requests were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>OSU Holdings /online</th>
<th>OSU holdings /print</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
<th>times cited by OSU faculty</th>
<th>times OU faculty published</th>
<th>2009 Uses</th>
<th>2010 Uses</th>
<th>H.I.(Fac/Grad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Composition and Communication</td>
<td>1990-</td>
<td>1971-</td>
<td></td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{8}</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1989-2006</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Communication and Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric Review</td>
<td>1982-</td>
<td>1989-2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Quarterly</td>
<td>1976-</td>
<td>1976-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Research</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1974-2007</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Communication and Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1995-</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Communication Journal</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1988-2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSU Libraries had access to several Wiley journal packages in the past through a consortial agreement. This agreement ended in 2009 and OSU lost access to some important, high-impact journals in the field. These include Communication Theory, Human Communication Research, Journal of Communication, and Journal of Computer Mediated Communication. All four are Wiley titles. Three additional titles that are high impact or have been recommended by the faculty. The high impact journals are also the most expensive but need to be considered if we are to support a MA program.

\textsuperscript{7} Usage data is not available for all titles
\textsuperscript{8} Not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Holdings</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
<th># of times cited by OSU faculty</th>
<th># times published in</th>
<th>2009 Uses</th>
<th>2010 Uses</th>
<th>ILL (Fac/grad)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Communication</td>
<td>2006-2009 (Cancelled)</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Computer Mediated Communication</td>
<td>2006-2009 (Cancelled)</td>
<td>3.639</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Communication Research</td>
<td>2006-2009 (Cancelled)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Theory</td>
<td>2006-2009 (Cancelled)</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Journal (Faculty recommendation)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Communication: Journal of Nature and Culture (Faculty recommendation)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,433</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Putting together all of the criteria of use, impact, citing and publishing, interlibrary loan requests and faculty recommendations, there are 6 titles I recommend adding to the collection.

**Recommendation:**
- The library does not need to purchase any additional databases/indexes.
- Purchase subscriptions to:
  - Journal of Communication
  - Journal of Computer Mediated Communication
  - Human Communication Research
  - Communication Theory
  - Negotiation Journal
  - Environmental Communication: Journal of Nature and Culture

**Summary**
The library collection is currently small but provides a good beginning foundation for an MA in Speech Communication, especially when it comes to the monographs. The journal collection requires some additional resources. If we want to maintain and grow the library collection for Speech Communication and support a growing student population, I recommend the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monographs</th>
<th>$500/annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Journals</td>
<td>$5,433/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,933</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix A: OSU Holdings Compared to other Institutions/Summit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCSH</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Colorado State</th>
<th>San Diego State</th>
<th>Cal State Fullerton</th>
<th>NCSU</th>
<th>OSU compared to lowest peer</th>
<th>OSU compared to median</th>
<th>Summit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration International</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>119%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis management</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Analysis</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language - Rhetoric</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>1,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal communication</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation, International</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oratory</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>122%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion (Rhetoric)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political oratory – United States</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>10,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric – philosophy</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>142%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Communication</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>9,259</td>
<td>13,693</td>
<td>13,381</td>
<td>10,429</td>
<td>14,453</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix B: Usage Statistics of OSU Collections for Selected LCSH areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCSH</th>
<th>Titles for 2000+</th>
<th>30+</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>% of collection that circulated in 2009/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 Circulation statistics may include multiple copies of a title
## Appendix C: OSU Breakdown by Decade (Age of Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>-38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication – Sex differences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in small groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in social action</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis management</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Analysis</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language - Rhetoric</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal communication</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation, International</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oratory</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion (Rhetoric)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political oratory – United States</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric – philosophy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric – political aspects</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>+62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric – political aspects – United States</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>+111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Communication</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>+67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TITLES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,555</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,183</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,386</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Monographs published in selected areas in the last 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published by year (YBP). Restricted to General academic, Advanced academic</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>% increase 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>48% (475 titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27% (26 titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75% (3 titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Management</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35% (11 titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Analysis</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50% (82 titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56% (27 titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19% (5 titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation, International</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100% (4 titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>50% (195 titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Communication</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58% (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TITLES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1552</strong></td>
<td><strong>834</strong></td>
<td><strong>740</strong></td>
<td><strong>Average of 52%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YPB may not include all publishers in the field.
# Appendix E. OSU Databases that Index Communications Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database Title</th>
<th>Online access</th>
<th>Print access</th>
<th># of Comm. Journals indexed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyclInfo</td>
<td>1887-</td>
<td>1927-1977</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics &amp; Language Behavior Abstracts</td>
<td>1973-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences Citation Index</td>
<td>1970-</td>
<td>Unclear from bib record</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Research Abstracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>1926-</td>
<td>1956-1987</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America: History and Life</td>
<td>1964-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Mass Media Collection</td>
<td>1980-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Research Complete</td>
<td>Varies by title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Reference Complete</td>
<td>1980-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection</td>
<td>1966-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Collection</td>
<td>1980-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Abstracts</td>
<td>1980-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies International</td>
<td>1972-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Databases for Communication Studies (Based on Magazines for Libraries journal listings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Databases</th>
<th>OSU Online Access</th>
<th>OSU Print Access</th>
<th># of Communication Journals Indexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America: History and Life</td>
<td>1964-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts</td>
<td>1973-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>1926-</td>
<td>1956-1987</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Research Abstracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycInfo</td>
<td>1887-</td>
<td>1927-1977</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences Citation Index</td>
<td>1970-</td>
<td>Unclear from bib record</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences Abstracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence and Abuse Abstracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Databases selected based on the number of communications journals indexed according to *Magazines for Libraries.*
Appendix F: Journal Summary (sorted alphabetically)

Codes:
- MFL: Listed in *Magazines for Libraries* as an important journal
- MFLx: Listed in *Magazines for Libraries* as a basic journal in the discipline
- U: Where OSU faculty in Speech Communications have published
- ILL: Requested via Interlibrary Loan
- HI: JCR High Impact Journals
- C: Journals OSU Speech Communications faculty have cited
- R: Recommended by Speech Comm. faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>OSU Holdings/online</th>
<th>OSU holdings/print</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
<th># of times cited by OSU faculty</th>
<th># times published in</th>
<th>2009 Uses</th>
<th>2010 Uses</th>
<th>ILL (Fac/Grad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>American Communication Journal</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx</td>
<td>Argumentation and Advocacy</td>
<td>1992-</td>
<td>1988-1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Business and society review</td>
<td>1974-</td>
<td>1974-1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>College Composition and Communication</td>
<td>1990-</td>
<td>1971-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL,</td>
<td>Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx,</td>
<td>Communication Education</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1976-2006</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Communication Monographs</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1976-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL,</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1989-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx</td>
<td>Communication Reports</td>
<td>1988-</td>
<td>1989-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL,</td>
<td>Mass Communication and Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx</td>
<td>Communication Research Reports</td>
<td>1988-</td>
<td>1995-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Communication Research Trends</td>
<td>1999-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Communication Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI, ILL</td>
<td>Science Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Communication Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Communication World</td>
<td>1984-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Comunicar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Quarterly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>OSU Holdings/online</th>
<th>OSU holdings/print</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
<th># of times cited by OSU faculty</th>
<th># times published in</th>
<th>2009 Uses</th>
<th>2010 Uses</th>
<th>ILL Fac/Grad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Critical arts</td>
<td>1992-0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI, ILL</td>
<td>Health Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, HI</td>
<td>Cyberpsychology and Behavior</td>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse (Berkley)</td>
<td>2000-0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education</td>
<td>1999-2009</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL, HI, C</td>
<td>Discourse and Society</td>
<td>1999-0</td>
<td>1999-0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Discourse Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Educational technology research and development</td>
<td>1989-0</td>
<td>1989-2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL, C</td>
<td>Electronic Journal of Communication Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI, R</td>
<td>Environmental Communication: Journal of Nature and Culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL, C</td>
<td>European Journal of Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>FSB: Fortune Small Business</td>
<td>1999-0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Health Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx, P, C, U, HI</td>
<td>Human Communication Research</td>
<td>2006-2009 (Cancelled)</td>
<td>1985-2005</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, HI</td>
<td>Political Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>INTERACT STUD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, HI</td>
<td>International Journal of Advertising</td>
<td>2000-0</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>International Journal of Communication</td>
<td>2007-0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, P, U, HI</td>
<td>International Journal of Conflict Management</td>
<td>1997-2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>International Journal of Press/Politics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, HI</td>
<td>International Journal of Public Opinion</td>
<td>1996-1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Javnost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, HI</td>
<td>Journal of Advertising</td>
<td>1972-0</td>
<td>1984-2008</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>OSU Holdings/online</th>
<th>OSU holdings/print</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
<th># of times cited by OSU faculty</th>
<th># times published in</th>
<th>2009 Uses</th>
<th>2010 Uses</th>
<th>ILL(Fac/Grad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Journal of Advertising Research</td>
<td>1965-</td>
<td>1960-1997</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Communication Research</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1986-2006</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Communications Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Journal of Broadcasting &amp; electronic media</td>
<td>1985-</td>
<td>1985-1998</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Journal of Business and Technical Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>Language and Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Journal of Communication Inquiry</td>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL,</td>
<td>Journal of computer mediated communication</td>
<td>2006-2009</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>3.639</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Journal of contingencies and crisis management</td>
<td>1993-2009 (12 mo. Embargo)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Journal of corporate citizenship</td>
<td>2001-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Journal of Family Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, HI</td>
<td>Journal of Health Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Journal of Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Journal of International and Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Journal of Language and Social Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Journal of leadership &amp; organizational studies</td>
<td>2002-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, HI</td>
<td>Journal of media economics</td>
<td>1994-2009 (cancelled)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Journal of Narrative Life and history</td>
<td>Ceased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Journal of public affairs</td>
<td>2001-2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Journal of small business and entrepreneurship</td>
<td>2003-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL, P</td>
<td>Journal of Social and Personal Relationships</td>
<td>1999-</td>
<td>1993-2007</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Journalism and Mass Communication Educator</td>
<td>1995-2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>OSU Holdings/online</th>
<th>OSU holdings/print</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
<th># of times cited by OSU faculty</th>
<th># times published in</th>
<th>2009 Uses</th>
<th>2010 Uses</th>
<th>I.L.L. Fac/Grad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C, P</td>
<td>Journalism Quarterly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1928-1994</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U, C</td>
<td>Language &amp; Communication</td>
<td>1995-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx</td>
<td>Communication Quarterly</td>
<td>1976-</td>
<td>1976-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Leadership quarterly</td>
<td>1995-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Management Communications Quarterly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx, P, HI, C</td>
<td>Communication Research</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1974-2007</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Media International Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Media Culture and Society</td>
<td>1999-</td>
<td>1987-2007</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Media Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI, C</td>
<td>Narrative inquiry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Negotiation Journal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, HI</td>
<td>New Media and Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Personal Relationships</td>
<td>2002-2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Philosophy and Rhetoric</td>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>1974-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Place branding and public diplomacy</td>
<td>2007-2009 (12 mo. Embargo)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Popular Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Public Culture</td>
<td>1988-</td>
<td>1999-2005</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, HI, C</td>
<td>Public Opinion Quarterly</td>
<td>1937-</td>
<td>2004-2006</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Public Relations Review</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Public relations tactics</td>
<td>1994-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, P, HI</td>
<td>Public Understanding of Science</td>
<td>1999- (3 mo. Embargo)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.981</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Qualitative Research Reports in Communication</td>
<td>2005-</td>
<td>2002-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx, P, C, U, HI</td>
<td>Quarterly Journal of Speech</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1928-2006</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.L.L.</td>
<td>Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change (Series)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Research on Language and Social Interaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Review of Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>OSU Holdings/online</th>
<th>OSU holdings/print</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
<th># of times cited by OSU faculty</th>
<th># times published in</th>
<th>2009 Uses</th>
<th>2010 Uses</th>
<th>ILL/Fac/Grad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information, Communication and Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Rhetoric Society Quarterly</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1988-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1995-</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Justice: A journal of crime, conflict and world order</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLx</td>
<td>Southern Communication Journal</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1988-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Studies in media &amp; information literacy education</td>
<td>2001-2009 (18m mo. Embargo)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, HI</td>
<td>Technical Communication</td>
<td>1992-</td>
<td>1975-2010</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U,</td>
<td>Technovation</td>
<td>1995-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, P, HI</td>
<td>Telecommunications Policy</td>
<td>1995-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Text and Performance Quarterly</td>
<td>2007-2009 (Cancelled)</td>
<td>1993-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Text Talk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>TIJDSCR COMMUNWET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Translator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Vital Speeches of the Day</td>
<td>1934-</td>
<td>1934-1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Web Journal of Mass Communication Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, C</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>1991-</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MS / MA Degree in Communication

Faculty List (All Vitae are on file)

Judy Bowker, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Bobette Bushnell, Ph.D., Instructor
Trischa Goodnow, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Robert Iltis, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Mark Moore, Ph.D., Professor
Mark Porrovecchio, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
Elizabeth Root, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
Judi Sanders, J.D., Adjunct Instructor
Gerald Voorhees, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
Gregg Walker, Ph.D., Professor
Celeste Walls, Ph.D., Associate Professor
April 20, 2011

To: University Curriculum Council

From: Robert S. Iltis, Department of Speech Communication

Subject: Liaison Responses for MS/MA Proposal

Please note that we have included our responses to liaison letters in the liaison pdf’s. We incorporated responses to points raised by the liaisons into the proposal that the CLA Curriculum Committee approved.
Hello Gary,

I hope your summer has gone well also.

You are correct – we approved the MA, MS in Communication proposal at our last meeting.

There were no fundamental budgetary issues with this proposal – all members in attendance voted to approve the proposal. Please use this email as the formal written confirmation of the FY11 BFP Committee’s approval of this proposal.

Thanks,
Steve Hoelscher
541-737-6631
To the Graduate Council: Responses to questions received October 20, 2011

1. We were not able to find the responses to CLA Liaison.

Responses to the CLA liaisons were integrated into the text of the proposal. For clarity, we have attached copies of both the liaison comments and our responses to those comments. Please note in our responses the specific item and line for each reply or change we made.

2. We were confused by a statement at the bottom of page two of the English Liaison document. The liaison letter indicates that when graduate students name Speech Communication as both their first and second areas, they complete their masters’ work using only 9 credits outside the department. Yet page 12 of the proposal states that these students earn 36 of their 48 credits from the Communications department. Please explain the disparity, and how this meets the MAIS requirement of 15 credits from each of the three areas.

The confusion may stem from two points: the 36/48 is an average and the 15-credit presumption is incorrect. After we explain these figures, however, we also will explain how these figures must now be adjusted to reflect changes in the MAIS program, changes that occurred after this proposal began its journey through the university system.

First, the 36/48 comparison cited in the observation above is explained in the text as an average based on the average ratio drawn from the 3-year record of students who named Speech Communication as 2 of their 3 areas. The statement reads that “[t]hese students earn approximately 36 of their 48 credits from this department.” In the MAIS program operating at the writing of this proposal, some 2-area students earned as many as 39/48 credits from our department; others earned fewer than 39/48. The average was 36/48. We were demonstrating the existing reliance by 2-area, MAIS students on our program for 4/5 of the courses they use to complete their degrees. Our argument throughout the proposal is that 1) we already are providing a significant proportion of a 2-area graduate students’ degrees and 2) the majority of our MAIS students are 2-area Comm students. These figures were evidence to support our argument.

With limited changes in our program, we can offer to these students—who are at present trying to maximize their work in our discipline—an MA/MS focused on Speech Communication. Those curriculum changes on our part also would open new possibilities for us to attract prospective graduates from across the nation who are looking for an MA/MS program in Speech Communication. We make these arguments in our proposal.

The second part of your question—and the second part of the confusion with these figures--results from an inaccurate presumption. As cited below, at the time of the writing of this document and also after the recent MAIS changes, the MAIS required a minimum of 9 credits in each of the 3 fields of study rather than 15 as cited in the question. Therefore, if a student elected two areas of Comm, that student could complete as many as 39 credits divided between the two Comm areas, taking only 9 more credits outside Comm in the third
Program Requirements

The Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies (MAIS) degree is granted for attainment of broad, advanced knowledge and achievement integrated from three fields of study. Any graduate major or minor may serve as a field for this degree. Two of the three fields may be from one department if the areas of concentration within these two fields are different. A **minimum of 9 credits in each of the three fields of study is required.** The degree requires a minimum of 49 credits, including 4 credits of course work on interdisciplinary research methods.

As the third part of our response to your inquiry, we will explain how these figures must now be adjusted in this MA/MS document to reflect changes in the MAIS program. The MAIS requirement of total credits has changed since this document was submitted to the council; the “48” credit requirement has changed to “49” in the document and will be used in this answer as the minimum graduate credits required for an MAIS degree. In addition, the MAIS program now requires that 4 of those 49 credits consist of 3 credits of IST 512 and 1 credit of IST 511. As a consequence, MAIS students now will divide their 3 areas of concentration among 45 credits (instead of the 48 credits in the old program). At present, then, a 2-area Comm graduate could enroll in as many as 36 of 45 credits. Although the actual numbers have changed slightly, the new ratio of the number of credits in Speech Communication to the number of credits in the program changes only very slightly. (Old ratio of 39/48 = .81; new ratio of 36/45 = .80)

3. **We were not able to find a clear distinction between the MA and the MS degree requirements within the proposal.**

In clarifying this point, we have altered the language in 3.b. to include:

“Students pursuing the Master of Arts degree must show foreign language proficiency (including American Sign Language) equivalent to that attained at the end of a second-year university course in that language with a grade of “C” (2.0) or better. The foreign language requirement must be completed before the student takes the final oral examination for the degree.”

We believe the M.A. option is appropriate for students pursuing certain areas of study, such as intercultural communication, or for students intending on pursuing Ph.D. work in Communication or Rhetoric. The M.S. option is appropriate for
students intending the Masters degree to be a terminal degree.

4. The Category 1 lists Fall 2011 as the implementation date. (pg 4, item 1c)

We continue to reset the date to the nearest possible start time; we will continue to make this change as the proposal moves through committees. The date has been changed to Winter 2013.

5. We are concerned with the extensive use of slash courses in the proposal. If the thesis credits are removed from the equation, at least 41% of the course work is slash courses. Since the proposal is for building an MA/MS degree with a projection of 20 students, why not develop the proposal with more stand-alone graduate coursework? What is driving the choice of using slash courses in the curriculum?

We have several responses to this concern. First, the related item in Question 6 has been rectified. We concur that methods courses should be offered at the graduate level as stand alone courses. To that end we have added two methods courses to the required graduate class load, one in Communication Research Methods and one in Rhetorical Research Methods. This increases the required stand alone graduate course load for MA/MS students to 21 required stand alone credits not including the 6-9 thesis credits.

We believe these totals to be consistent with other MA/MS programs in the College of Liberal Arts. For example, English, with 4 credit courses, requires only 4 stand alone courses, allowing 16 credits of slash course work, Women Studies requires 21 stand alone credits with 12-13 credits of slash course work permitted. Consequently, requiring 21 stand alone credits is appropriate.

6. Related to the point above, we note that the research methods courses are slash courses. We believe it may be more appropriate to use stand-alone graduate coursework for research methods.

See answer to Question 5 and 3A in the proposal.

7. Given the large percentage of slash courses, would this degree program really be an option for OSU Communication undergraduates?

Even without the addition of the two stand alone methods courses, a large percentage of our M.A.I.S. students come from our undergraduate population. Of the current group of MAIS students only one comes from outside of Oregon State University. While this may seem to diminish the need for the degree outside of OSU, the difficulty in recruiting students has been in the offering of the M.A.I.S. degree rather than a discipline based degree.

8. Pg 9, item 3d – Learning outcomes. The third learning outcome suggests
the thesis will integrate the minor area. However, the curriculum proposed does not specify the requirement for a minor area. Please explain.

The curriculum proposed specifies 12 credits of a minor area of study under 3A, Proposed Course of Study.

9. The proposal cites that the GRE will be required for admission, but does not specify minimum scores. How will the results of the GRE be used in the selection decisions? (pg 10)

Because of the recent changes in the GRE exam, we feel that it would be premature to cite a minimum score at this time. However, as we collect data and begin to assess how GRE scores correlate to graduate success, we may put in place a minimum score. We would note that the History of Science Masters requires a GRE without citing a minimum score.

10. On page 11 (item 6aiii), the proposal seems to justify the need for this degree program because GTAs are needed to teach lower-division Communication classes. From the university perspective, and giving consideration to the lost revenue associated with tuition remission, it would seem that the use of professional faculty to deliver classes would be more cost effective. The GTA positions should be used to attract highly qualified candidates for the degree program.

We want to attract excellent scholars from our discipline to OSU to pursue graduate course work. Students’ opportunities to earn Graduate Teaching Assistantships operate as enhancements for this program rather than justifications for a need. If we can attract high quality students whose interests are directly targeted to Speech Communication, we can focus our courses and our student research endeavors on discipline-based issues and discipline-based inquiries. We have sufficient professional faculty to deliver courses; we would make choices about course instruction based on who can provide the finest service to students and to the department.

11. Is data available on the current enrollments in the UO and PSU Master in Communication degree programs?

The School of Communication and Journalism at the UO accepts between 110 and 120 applicants for ALL of its Masters programs.

David Sandin of Portland State reports they have 40 graduate students currently in their program.

12. Pg 12, item 6b – Needs for employment:
What are the specific labor market projections (Oregon and US) for master's graduates from CIP # 09.0101? (n.b., http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/cipdetail.aspx?y=55&cipid=88045)

We attempted to access the information at the site provided. However, no information was available. Further, we would note that this information is not required of degree programs, and, therefore, has not been provided.

13. To the point that many of the MA/MS students will come from the MAIS program:
   • Can placement results from past MAIS-dual-communication-area graduates be provided? The proposal makes very general statements regarding demand for graduates from this degree program. It would seem that the placement results of past graduates could be used to demonstrate demand and the types of career opportunities available.

   Because we do not have placement results from MA/MS graduates, it would seem that placement results from the MAIS would be misleading as to the desire for the MA/MS degree. We can, however, summarize some trends in our MAIS students and their course of action after receiving the MAIS degree:
   Community College or University Instruction: 12
   College Recruitment: 2
   Ph.D. Programs: 6
   Management 4
   Law 2

   • Is there any data to suggest the number of students who are currently pursuing the MAIS with a concentration in Communication that would opt to switch to a Communication master's degree?

   In responding to a query sent to current MAIS students with a Communication concentration, 15 students responded. 12 stated that they would switch should the MA/MS become available, 2 stated that they would not switch because of the status of their current program but would have entered as an MA/MS student had the option been available. One student would not switch as, though Communication is her concentration, her main area is Theatre, which is listed under Communication.

14. Is there data on the number of alumni from the MAIS with a dual concentration in Communication that would have instead opted for a Master in Communication?

   We do not have specific numbers at this time. However, three years ago, we did do a survey of 14 then-current MAIS students and who would switch to the MA/MS and at that time all said they would.
15. Pg 14, Item 8. Assessment. The proposal indicates that assessment will be based on individual courses and the evaluation of the thesis. If so, then the learning outcomes need to be mapped to the specific courses in which they are evaluated and assessed. Given the current emphasis within the university on assessment, a more thoughtful program for assessment should be included in the program.

We have revised the assessment plan to be in line with current master's program plans. See section 8 in the proposal.

16. The proposed budget does not seem to reflect the diversion of faculty time for teaching additional stand-alone graduate classes and guiding up to 32 thesis projects. If it is budget neutral with no additional faculty resources, then what impact would this degree program have on the quality of the current undergraduate program?

Since we initially proposed this program, our faculty has changed to the benefit of the MA/MS proposal. We have gained an additional .5 FTE is a Provost’s Initiative Hire whom we share with New Media Communications. Further, with the College reorganization, we have gained two courses. This occurred with the elimination of the Chair’s position who was granted a three course release for Chair duties. In the current structure, the Department Liaison has only a single course release. Thus, the Department nets two additional courses, for a total of five additional courses since the MA/MS was first proposed. In addition, our increasing presence in e-campus provides ample opportunities for undergraduates in our program.

We are currently chairing 20 MAIS committees. With 10 and 1/2 full time faculty, that averages approximately 2 committees each in the proposed MA/MS program. Given that at certain times, particular faculty have chaired between 5 and 7 committees, three seems reasonable.

When the proposal has been revised, please re-submit the proposal using the CPS. If you wish this proposal to be re-considered at the next Graduate Council meeting on 2 November, we will need the revised proposal one week before that date. However, we would encourage you to take all the time necessary to make a full response to the Council’s concerns.

(comment from Walter Loveland on October 19, 2011 10:33 pm)
Hello Kerry,

Our proposal for an MA/MS in Communication has now been pre-vetted by college and university administration, and will be sent to the CLA Curriculum Committee in the next couple of days.

This note is to thank you and our colleagues in English for your thoughtful responses to the proposal. Faculty members across campus have been pressed to do “more with less” and we appreciate the time your faculty devoted toward improving our proposal. You’ll find below responses to each comment. My thanks to Judy Bowker in our department, who developed these responses and took the lead in incorporating the responses into the final document.

Overall, we made some changes in the language in the document to reflect our focus on rhetoric in the oral tradition to help clarify our emphasis and delineate it from a focus in rhetoric and composition. For example, we changed the course description for COMM 588 from “a survey of Western rhetorical traditions from 500 B.C. to present. . .” to “a survey of Western rhetorical oral traditions from 500 B.C. to present. . .”

One writer objected to “d, iv, v, and vi” (meaning 6d). The writer also questioned the phrase, “more communication faculty,” which appears in 6d, ii.

6d. ii. In section 9a of this document, we report the number of graduate faculty for P.S.U. and O.S.U. That section also describes in more detail differences between the P.S.U. and O.S.U. programs. To clarify our description, however, we have changed the language in this M.A. proposal document from “more Communication faculty” to “more Communication graduate faculty.”

6d. iv. We have changed the language in this item from the MA complements “an emerging set of graduate offerings” to “emerging graduate offerings.” Indeed, any new offerings in New Media, Women’s Studies, Ethnic Studies, Political Science, History, English, and Anthropology (as well as other areas including some science topics) complement students’ foci in communication or rhetoric in those areas.

6d. v. Portland State University is the only other public university offering an M.A. in Speech Communication in Oregon. The University of Oregon does not offer this degree. Other options for students such as private universities, online degrees, or entities such as the University of Phoenix may be available.

6d. vi. This statement is true. Students wanting to study rhetoric in Speech Communication at the graduate level must go out of state.

When we wrote “additional courses from other departments,” we intended to convey our flexibility to allow students some leeway in designing their programs. We do not anticipate that a graduate student in this program will draw from other departments except to complete her/his minor or to include in his/her program a specialty course directly related to the focus of the program. In our department, we offer a sufficient number of graduate-only courses for students to comply with the 50/50 Graduate School
requirement.

For example, a student who might use courses in the English Department would be one who desires an English minor for their Speech Communication M.A./M.S. That student would need approval by and authorization from the English Department as well as approval from his/her committee to name English as a minor. The only other use of English courses by students in the Speech Communication M.A./M.S. program might involve an occasional, “specialty” course that uniquely fits the student’s program focus.

The other issue, New Media, operates in a like manner. At O.S.U. New Media is a separate area from Speech Communication. A student might choose New Media as a minor area of study or might include a New Media course (by approval of both her/his committee and the New Media Department) for a specific purpose.

We do not anticipate that graduate students will take many classes in other departments; our curriculum provides a complete menu of courses and a sufficient number of graduate-only courses to fulfill their program needs. We do, however, experience the occasional circumstance when an M.A.I.S. student will draw 3 credits from a department outside the Speech Curriculum; we wanted to extend that same flexibility to M. A./M.S. students.

We added this paragraph to 3b to explain:

“At a minimum, three of these five courses will be offered each fall term: COMM 520, one of the survey courses, and the complementary topics course. Each fall, the survey/topics pair will rotate; the rhetorical pair will be offered one fall and the communication pair the next. Each winter, the opposite survey course will be offered and each spring its complementary topics course will be offered. With this rotation, graduate students in the program will have access to five, graduate-only courses in this department in their first years and a sixth course in the fall of their second years, bringing their graduate-only course total to 6 courses (3 credits each), or 18 credits. Together with 9 thesis credits, students would therefore accumulate 27 credits of graduate-only course work. If students include no other graduate-only courses in their programs, they will still meet the 50/50 requirement of the Graduate School. If students enroll in other graduate-only seminars in our department or in their minor areas, they will further exceed the number of courses listed in that requirement.”

Regarding concerns about budget and committee work: the Department of Speech Communication participates in the M.A.I.S. program and offers two areas of concentration, one in Rhetoric and Social Influence and one in Interpersonal and Small Group Communication. Graduate students routinely name Speech Communication as both their first and second areas; those graduate students complete their masters’ work using only 9 credits outside our department. Because we have such a large number of graduate students and such a large number of graduate students who primarily take only our courses, our department has in place the necessary graduate-school relationships and protocols. We have a Graduate Director who screens applicants and convenes conferences or committee meetings as necessary to discuss questions about applicants. Our faculty meets regularly to vet applicants. The Graduate Director acts as advisor to all incoming graduate students; within the first quarter, she/he helps students select an appropriate committee chair. Some of our cohorts of graduate students have created informal “graduate student groups” and the Graduate Director has contributed to those efforts and the meetings of the groups. (The present cohort has not formed such a group.) The Graduate Director also attends regional and national conferences and recruits new students; the Graduate Director (and other faculty) also often sponsors graduate students to attend these conferences both for personal enrichment and for professional experience. Our Graduate Director will continue in that role with the M.A./M.S. No change in budget is
necessary.

Regarding GTAs, the department long has had in place a mandatory, week-long, GTA orientation training before classes begin in Fall; weekly-convened GTA training and instruction during all three quarters; and close supervision through classroom observation as well as oral and written criticisms. Both COMM 111 and COMM 114 are directed by a faculty member who meets with GTAs weekly to supervise their progress as teachers. In addition, the faculty as a whole meets regularly to discuss the program progress of all graduate students. These systems are in place and will not require budgetary changes when the M.A. begins to operate.

With regard to scheduling matters, we have plotted out a two-year model of course schedules (using the example of the schedule we used in the previous two years) and have been successful at incorporating courses necessary for the M.A./M.S. while retaining a sufficient number and kind of courses for undergraduates. Since we have such a large contingent of graduate students completing the M.A.I.S., we already have in place four courses that operate in a fashion similar to the five courses we name in the proposal; in other words, we currently offer COMM 520 and three topics courses. To accommodate the M.A., we need only to change one of our three topics courses to a survey course and add the second survey course. These changes do not accrue any costs.

In addition, we have juggled our curriculum over the last five years several times and have found the right "fit" for the rotating graduate-only courses. To put the M.A./M.S. in place, the sum total increase in number of classes to our curriculum will be the addition of one course. We recognize, however, that the number of courses is not the only change that will occur. We also have considered the qualitative changes to the curriculum, including relative sizes of methodology courses (which we already offer in significant numbers to accommodate undergraduate enrollment) and other upper-division offerings (as we anticipate higher enrollment of graduates in the "slash" courses). We have used these considerations as we organized the new, two-year schedule and have been able to accommodate the changes.

Again, we thank you for the careful consideration of this proposal.
Hello, Robert.

A big step forward! I read your proposal this morning, and it all looks good to me. English will support you in any way we can in all the transitions. My only worry is the statement that Speech can support the M.A. program without any added budget.

At your convenience, we could get together to talk about the following, among others:
1. The admissions committee work is considerable.
2. GTA orientation and supervision (our Director of Writing now replaces the former Composition Coordinator, and either arrangement involves a reduced teaching load--providing coherence in the GTA-taught courses and guidance/community in the GTA academic experience is a job).
3. English also has a Graduate Coordinator--we are redefining the duties right now--who advises, runs a fall-term M.A. Writing Group to help with thesis preparation, and receives a one-course reduction. The M.F.A. side has a Director, similarly defined.
4. Speech will have a new relationship with the Graduate School--the requirements for the M.A. degree involve 50% 500-only work which thesis and donut-course hours only help to cover, and even without that pressure, scheduling becomes a bit more complicated (Ann Leen in English is a genius at this sort of thing) 5. did someone say "four-credit conversion"?

Cheers,
Kerry
Please review the enclosed/attached materials and send your comments, concern, or support to me by March 11. An e-mail response will suffice. Your timely response is appreciated. As per Oregon State University procedures, please note that a lack of response will be interpreted as support.
Thank you for your time and input.

<<2008MAproposal.doc>>
Robert S. Iltis, Ph.D.
Chair
Associate Professor
Department of Speech Communication
Shepard Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
541-737-2461
541-737-4443 (fax)
Hello, Robert.

I sent your attachment to selected faculty here, and I will forward you the comments as they come in. My faculty assumes that the proposal will be closely read at PSU and the U of O, among other places, and wants to play a similar role in advance. Please see below.

Cheers,
Kerry

Chair, Department of English
240D Moreland Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
541 737-1634
kahearn@oregonstate.edu

On first read, the claims on under “d”, iv, v, vi are somewhat questionable. Can it really be true that this there are “more communication faculty” than in any program in Oregon?

Can it really be true (vi) that there are no other degree options for students in “rhetorical theory and practice” in Oregon? We might want to nicely and candidly raise a question about this one by reminding Robert that graduate students can take an MA with emphasis in rhetoric and writing in English, and that we intend to keep this in our revised MA program. There’s a point early where “additional courses from other departments” are mentioned. We could ask how they envision drawing upon the resources of courses in rhetoric and composition, advanced writing, rhetorical theory in English studies. Seems relevant since we have a graduate area.

I’m also really curious about how new media fits in. There could be increasing competition for new media students at the graduate level—we (“we,” as in the rhetoric and writing group, see this as a huge, huge area, and want to stay involved where appropriate—we’re already involved with the writing minor there anyway). The proposal is extremely general on the highly significant point of relations to “other programs emerging in CLA” (see again d, iv, v, vi).
Hello, Robert.

I paste another response below. Thanks.

Kerry

Chair, Department of English
240D Moreland Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
541 737-1634
kahearn@oregonstate.edu

I've looked at the proposal, and have flagged some points for your attention.

It stands to reason that stepped-up attention to student access be seen as a justification for a discipline-based program in Communication. I note that it is not only COMM 111 but COMM 114 and (some) COMM 218 that may be covered by graduate students in the program.

The proposal does not address pedagogical practicum courses or TA training, although it does make brief mention (7c) of “internships and practica as a common feature of communications programs.” In our experience, pre-service orientation and guidance (prior to the fall term of teaching), continuous assessment and training in the first term of teaching are the bare minimums for any peer institution working with grad TAs. Costs associated with pedagogical training and faculty supervision include cost of covering practicum courses and some course down time for faculty charged with scheduling and administration of a multi-faceted discipline-based program in which the whole university is served by well-trained GTAs.

In our experience in English, the quality of grad students is essential to a successful program and effective teaching university-wide. From this standpoint, I am encouraged by the mention of graduate record exams, but minimum scores are not noted.

The proposal does not clarify how the 50/50 grad school requirement will be met. I assume (since they are not in the present catalogue), that new courses ENG 590, 591, 588, 589 are being created (perhaps as well the 2 “research methods courses,” although I’m not sure) in order to meet that component. How does the creation of new 500-only courses bear on program costs? What will be a “full load” for faculty supervising GTAs?

I’d like to see some fleshing out around two points in particular on page 10/d/iv, v, vi. Which “emerging sets of grad offerings in CLA” are complemented? The proposal notes that other similar comm. programs in the state (e.g. PSU) do not offer training in the historical depth of rhetorical traditions. However, OSU/English offers a graduate area in rhetoric and writing with appropriate sequences in the history of rhetoric. We are familiar with some of the differences in rhetoric offered within English departments and communication departments, but we might want to minimize potential overlaps there. Our WR gmas would not be able to meet requisite teaching of writing courses in COMM courses, and perhaps
COMM students would not fulfill the “public address” requirements in our rhetoric and writing advanced courses. Still, we should note that OSU does offer and intends to continue to offer (in our revised MA proposal) a rhetoric and writing graduate strand.

Hope this helps.
Ilitis, Robert

From: Ilitis, Robert
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2010 2:23 PM
To: McMurray, David
Subject: RE: Liaison request

Thanks, David. We will.

Robert S. Ilitis, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Speech Communication
Oregon State University
541-737-2461
541-737-4443 (fax)

From: McMurray, David
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2010 2:21 PM
To: Ilitis, Robert
Subject: Re: Liaison request

Robert, Our Department has reviewed your Cat 1 proposal and we were impressed by the way you plan to organize the curriculum. We would just ask that you take into consideration the presence in Anthropology of courses that would be complimentary, particularly in the area of language and communication.

Good luck with your new MA/MS.

David McMurray
Chair, Anthropology Department
Oregon State University

From: Robert Ilitis <rilitis@oregonstate.edu>
Date: Wed, 12 May 2010 14:07:50 -0700
To: David McMurray <david.mcmurray@oregonstate.edu>
Subject: Liaison request

Hi David,

I'm requesting an expedited liaison regarding my department's MA/MS proposal. The CLA Curriculum Committee noted that we had not sought liaison with Anthropology regarding your department's emphasis in Language and Cross Cultural Communication in your MA program. I'm glad the committee noted the oversight, and apologize for not seeking liaison at the beginning of the process.

Our proposal includes a minor. While the specific outcomes of our respective programs differ, we will encourage students to draw on your coursework as a resource, and to minor in Anthropology.

I'm sending a copy of our proposal.

Robert S. Ilitis, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Speech Communication
Oregon State University
541-737-2461
541-737-4443 (fax)

5/25/2011
Anticipating another possible liaison question, I asked David Bernell for this letter. Please include.

The Anthro letter should follow tomorrow.

Robert

Robert S. Iltis, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Speech Communication Oregon State University
541-737-2461
541-737-4443 (fax)

-----Original Message-----
From: Bernell, David
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 3:25 PM
To: Iltis, Robert
Subject: MA in COMM

Robert,

It was good to run into you earlier today. I'm excited for the MA program you're proposing. As you know, a sizable number of students in the MAIS degree program are really interested in earning an MA in COMM, and this proposal will allow them to do so.

This will have an impact on applications to the MAIS and our overall numbers, by as much as 30-40%. This is not a problem for me at all. We'll end up with students whose interests will represent a stronger fit with the aims of the MAIS.

Also, I've spoken with Sally Francis about this in the past, as she's been supportive of the idea that the MAIS could decrease in numbers as new masters programs are developed in CLA. I can't speak for the Graduate School on this particular proposal, but as for me, as your proposal impacts the MAIS, you've got no opposition.

David

David Bernell
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Director, Interdisciplinary Studies Program (MAIS) Oregon State University
312 Gilkey Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331
541-737-6281
Jon,

We worked through the committee’s responses, and are resubmitting the proposal for the committee’s consideration. Attached please find a letter to the committee, and the revised proposal. Please let us know if you need other documents. Susie Leslie told me by phone that her office works with departments on budget matters and requests the library assessment after the college endorses the academic merits of the proposal. E-mails regarding those matters are in the letter.

Please let me know if I can provide additional material, and thanks in advance for reviewing the resubmission.

Robert

Robert S. Iltis, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Speech Communication
Oregon State University
541-737-2461
541-737-4443 (fax)
Ilitis, Robert

From: Lewis, Jon
Sent: Sunday, May 02, 2010 10:37 AM
To: Ilitis, Robert
Subject: Cat 1 proposal

Robert: Two members of the college curriculum committee went over the Speech/Comm Cat 1 proposal. What follows are their comments/suggestions. No doubt you know the drill -- you will need to speak to these comments/suggestions and then resubmit. The timing for resubmission is a little problematic, in that we will have only one more/one last meeting this term (May 15) so if you can get all of these problems solved by then, by all means resubmit -- if not, you will probably have to wait for next fall ... I will make sure that next year's chair has a full record of this first look at the proposal so next year's committee does not simply re-start the process. Feel free to contact me for more details ... JL

Here are the committee's comments/suggestions:

**Comments on Category I proposal to create an MS/MA Degree in Communication**

- First of all, the proposal should be paginated
- Cat I proposals take sometimes 12 months to approve, so there is little possibility it could be operational by Fall 2010. Perhaps Fall 2011?
- There is no justification given for the existence of an M.S. degree and sometimes it is referred to simply as the M.A. program. It seems rather odd that one would bypass a foreign language requirement for a Masters in Communication. If the M.S. is motivated by a track that requires a focus other than language, that should be spelled out in the proposal.
- P. 5 last paragraph talks about a sixth graduate-only course, but it's not clear what this is.
- Under 7. Change “insure” to “ensure”?
- 14. Budgetary Impact - Faculty have done a good job in figuring out how to offer the requisite number of graduate courses without unduly affecting their undergraduate program. However, it is naïve to think that no new funds will be necessary. At a minimum, we must withhold judgment until the library assessment is completed. Furthermore, it is our understanding that many of the lower division classes that will be taught by the graduate students depend on access funds. If this is to be the only way to fund graduate students, there should be a bit more permanency in the budget. Suzy Leslie is your source on these kinds of matters, we think you should have been in touch with her already so that she could advise you on how to put together the budget section.
- There will also be an increase of workload for both the faculty and the administration. Not only will each faculty member have more graduate students, but they will all be writing theses as opposed to many MAIS students who do papers. Admissions and committee work is considerable and who will mentor and coordinate the GTAs?
- The Titles and numbers of courses listed in the sample syllabi must match the course of study on page 3
- Appendix C shows quite poor graduation rates for MAIS students with a Communication focus. How does this compare with other MAIS students? We think the following possibilities should be explored 1) Are they too lax in who they admit to the program? 2) Does requiring them to teach early and without much training put them at risk of not finishing? These questions should be looked into and addressed before launching a new program that might suffer from the same problems.
- We were concerned with the response to the liaison letters from English. It seemed as if a bridge could be made between Rhetoric and Writing and History of Rhetoric in English and this new program. Instead, the response was to differentiate what they do (oral) from the written word. It
also seems like liaison should have occurred with Anthropology's Language and Cross Cultural Communication MA and with New Media.
## Budget Outline Form
Estimated Costs and Sources of Funds for Proposal

Total new resources required to handle the increased workload, if any. If no new resources are required, indicate the year ___

Institution: Oregon State University
Program: MA/MS Communication
Academic Year: 2011-2012

Prepare one page each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Current Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Institutional Reallocation from Other Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>From Special State Appropriation Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personnel
- Faculty (Include FTE)
- Graduate Assistants (Include FTE)
- Support Staff (Include FTE)
- Fellowships/Scholarships
- OPE
- Nonrecurring

Personnel Subtotal | 0

### Other Resources
- Library/Printed
- Library/Electronic
- Supplies and Services
- Equipment
- Other Expenses

Other Resources Subtotal | 2,500

### Physical Facilities
- Construction
- Major Renovation
- Other Expenses

Physical Facilities Subtotal | 0

GRAND TOTAL | 2,500 | 5,933
sed Program
ed, the budgetary impact should be reported as zero.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First four years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Federal Funds and Other Grants</td>
<td>From Fees, Sales and Other Income</td>
<td>LINE ITEM TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 8,433 | 8,433 | 8,433 |
Budget Outline Form
Estimated Costs and Sources of Funds for Proposal
Total new resources required to handle the increased workload, if any. If no new resources are required, indicate none. Prepare one page each of the following.

Institution: Oregon State University
Program: MA/MS Communication
Academic Year: 2011-2012

Indicate the year: __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Current Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Institutional Reallocation from Other Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>From Special State Appropriation Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personnel**

- Faculty (Include FTE)
- Graduate Assistants (Include FTE)
- Support Staff (Include FTE)
- Fellowships/Scholarships
- OPE
- Nonrecurring

**Personnel Subtotal** 0

**Other Resources**

- Library/Printed 5,933
- Library/Electronic
- Supplies and Services 1,000
- Equipment
- Other Expenses 1,500

**Other Resources Subtotal** 2,500

**Physical Facilities**

- Construction
- Major Renovation
- Other Expenses

**Physical Facilities Subtotal** 0

**GRAND TOTAL** 2,500 5,933
The budgetary impact should be reported as zero.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First</th>
<th>XXX</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**First four years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Federal Funds and Other Grants</td>
<td>From Fees, Sales and Other Income</td>
<td>LINE ITEM TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Budget Outline Form

**Institution:** Oregon State University  
**Program:** MA/MS Communication  
**Academic Year:** 2011-2012

Indicate the year: XXX

Prepare one page each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Current</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>From Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Realocation from</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Appropriation Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personnel

- Faculty (Include FTE)
- Graduate Assistants (Include FTE)
- Support Staff (Include FTE)
- Fellowships/Scholarships
- OPE
- Nonrecurring

**Personnel Subtotal**: 0

### Other Resources

- Library/Printed: 5,933
- Library/Electronic: 1,000
- Supplies and Services: 1,500
- Equipment: 1,500

**Other Resources Subtotal**: 2,500

### Physical Facilities

- Construction
- Major Renovation
- Other Expenses

**Physical Facilities Subtotal**: 0

**GRAND TOTAL**: 2,500 5,933

Total new resources required to handle the increased workload, if any. If no new resources are required, please explain why.
sed Program

ed, the budgetary impact should be reported as zero.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First four years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Federal Funds and Other Grants</td>
<td>From Fees, Sales and Other Income</td>
<td>LINE ITEM TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Budget Outline Form

Estimated Costs and Sources of Funds for Proposal

Total new resources required to handle the increased workload, if any. If no new resources are required, write 0.

---

**Institution:** Oregon State University  
**Program:** MA/MS Communication  
**Academic Year:** 2011-2012

Indicate the year: ______________________

Prepare one page each of the following columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Current Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Institutional Reallocation from Other Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>From Special State Appropriation Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Personnel

- Faculty (Include FTE)
- Graduate Assistants (Include FTE)
- Support Staff (Include FTE)
- Fellowships/Scholarships
- OPE
- Nonrecurring

**Personnel Subtotal:** 0

#### Other Resources

- Library/Printed: 5,933
- Library/Electronic: 1,000
- Supplies and Services: 1,000
- Equipment: 1,500

**Other Resources Subtotal:** 2,500

#### Physical Facilities

- Construction
- Major Renovation
- Other Expenses

**Physical Facilities Subtotal:** 0

**GRAND TOTAL:** 2,500 5,933
First Second
Third XXX Fourth

First four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Federal Funds and Other Grants</td>
<td>From Fees, Sales and Other Income</td>
<td>LINE ITEM TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sed Program
ed, the budgetary impact should be reported as zero.
1. Review - College Approver - Liberal Arts

Sent Back by Sarah Williams Coord-Curriculum / Acad Prgms/Assess/Accred, June 1, 2011 10:12am

Comments
Sarah Williams (College Approver - Liberal Arts) June 1, 2011 10:12am
Returning to Originator so that he can enter the CIP code on the proposal. SW

2. Originator Response

Robert Iltis Associate Professor / Speech Communication, June 1, 2011 10:34am

Comments
Robert Iltis June 1, 2011 10:34am
I submitted the new version, with CIP added. The addition of the CIP was the only change.
RSI

3. Review - College Approver - Liberal Arts

Approved by Sarah Williams Coord-Curriculum / Acad Prgms/Assess/Accred, June 1, 2011 10:58am

Comments
Sarah Williams (College Approver - Liberal Arts) June 1, 2011 10:58am
Per email from Gary Beach: "The revised proposal has been reviewed and approved by the CLA Curriculum Committee (via a confirmation email from Jon Lewis on Friday, May 27th)." We are moving this proposal along to Budgets and Fiscal Planning. SW

4. Review - Curriculum Coordinator

Approved by Sarah Williams Coord-Curriculum / Acad Prgms/Assess/Accred, June 1, 2011 10:59am

Comments
Sarah Williams (Curriculum Coordinator) June 1, 2011 10:59am
Moving this proposal forward to Budgets and Fiscal Planning. SW

5. Review - Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee

Approved by Sarah Williams Coord-Curriculum / Acad Prgms/Assess/Accred, September 13, 2011 3:33pm

Comments
Sarah Williams (Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee) September 13, 2011 3:33pm
Approved by B&FP on June 13, 2011. SW

6. Review - Graduate Committee - Liberal Arts (M-Z)

Sent Back by Walter Loveland, October 19, 2011 10:33pm

Comments
Walter Loveland (Graduate Committee - Liberal Arts (M-Z)) October 19, 2011 10:33pm
The Graduate Council is returning this proposal for clarification of a number of points. Our proposal review team has produced the following report on this proposal.

We have reviewed the Category I proposal for the MA/MS in Communications and believe that additional information about the proposal is needed to inform the deliberations and decision by the council.

- We were not able to find the responses to CLA Liaison.
- We were confused by a statement at the bottom of page two of the English Liaison document. The liaison letter indicates that when graduate students name Speech Communication as both their first and second areas, they complete their masters' work using only 9 credits outside the department. Yet page 12 of the proposal states that these students earn 36 of their 48 credits from the Communications department. Please explain the disparity, and how this meets the MAIS requirement of 15 credits from each of the three areas.
- The Category 1 lists Fall 2011 as the implementation date. (pg 4, item 1c)
- We are concerned with the extensive use of slash courses in the proposal. If the thesis credits are removed from the equation, at least 41% of the course work is slash courses. Since the proposal is for building an MA/MS degree with a projection of 20 students, why not develop the proposal with more stand-alone graduate coursework? What is driving the choice of using slash courses in the curriculum?
- Related to the point above, we note that the research methods courses are slash courses. We believe it may be more appropriate to use
stand-alone graduate coursework for research methods.

- Given the large percentage of slash courses, would this degree program really be an option for OSU Communication undergraduates?
- Pg 9, item 3d – Learning outcomes. The third learning outcome suggests the thesis will integrate the minor area. However, the curriculum proposed does not specify the requirement for a minor area. Please explain.
- The proposal cites that the GRE will be required for admission, but does not specify minimum scores. How will the results of the GRE be used in the selection decisions? (pg 10)
- On page 11 (item 6a(i)), the proposal seems to justify the need for this degree program because GTAs are needed to teach lower-division Communication classes. From the university perspective, and giving consideration to the lost revenue associated with tuition remission, it would seem that the use of professional faculty to deliver classes would be more cost effective. The GTA positions should be used to attract highly qualified candidates for the degree program.
- Is data available on the current enrollments in the UO and PSU Master in Communication degree programs?
- Pg 12, item 6b – Needs for employment:
  o What are the specific labor market projections (Oregon and US) for master's graduates from CIP # 09.0101? (n.b., http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/cipdetail.aspx?y=55&cipid=88045)
  o To the point that many of the MA/MS students will come from the MAIS program:
  - Can placement results from past MAIS-dual-communication-area graduates be provided? The proposal makes very general statements regarding demand for graduates from this degree program. It would seem that the placement results of past graduates could be used to demonstrate demand and the types of career opportunities available.
  - Is there any data to suggest the number of students who are currently pursuing the MAIS with a concentration in Communication that would opt to switch to a Communication master's degree?
  - Is there data on the number of alumni from the MAIS with a dual concentration in Communication that would have instead opted for a Master in Communication?
- Pg 14, Item 8. Assessment. The proposal indicates that assessment will be based on individual courses and the evaluation of the thesis. If so, the learning outcomes need to be mapped to the specific courses in which they are evaluated and assessed. Given the current emphasis within the university on assessment, a more thoughtful program for assessment should be included in the program.
- The proposed budget does not seem to reflect the diversion of faculty time for teaching additional stand-alone graduate classes and guiding up to 32 thesis projects. If it is budget neutral with no additional faculty resources, then what impact would this degree program have on the quality of the current undergraduate program?

In addition the Council discussed this proposal at length and is concerned about the proposal. The overall feeling is that this is a weak Master's program with a coursework degree and a minimal thesis. Part of the justification for the program seems to be recruit graduate students to help teach the large undergraduate course program in Communications. Another possibility would be to employ fixed term instructors to do that teaching. We encourage the proposers to re-build this proposal to create a strong program that builds on the strengths of the faculty. Possible use of Ecampus to deliver the program in a hybrid or on-line version might be productive.

When the proposal has been revised, please re-submit the proposal using the CPS. If you wish this proposal to be re-considered at the next Graduate Council meeting on 2 November, we will need the revised proposal one week before that date. However, we would encourage you to take all the time necessary to make a full response to the Council’s concerns.

7. Originator Response

Trischa Goodnow Professor / Speech Communication, April 18, 2012 11:20am

Comments

Trischa Goodnow April 18, 2012 11:20am

We have revised as requested and added a document in response to Walt Loveland and the Graduate Council's concerns.