Response to the council’s latest questions:

GC: Graduate Council requests additional information, including: need and employment market analysis; further information on the relationship between curriculum, and assessment and learning outcomes; and clarification of slash and stand-alone courses.

SC: We have included the economic feasibility study in a separate tab. The study clearly shows a need for Masters in communication. According to the report, “A majority (59%) felt the degree would be very or somewhat valuable.”

We have provided substantial explanation of how the curriculum addresses the learning outcomes and how these will be assessed. These have been reworked in sections 8: 1-5. The purpose of the program is to provide students with advanced study in the theory and practice of communication, specifically interpersonal communication and rhetoric (as general labels). Students who successfully complete the core coursework and Master’s thesis will have met the learning outcomes expressed in this proposal.

The Masters in Communication is a minimum of 45 credits, of which 27 are required stand-alone credits. Students may complete all but six credits with stand-alone credits. We have streamlined course requirements to clarify this confusion.

GC: Details: Denise noted that requested proposal revisions were made in some instances but, in other cases, she could not find the requested revisions. Two new required methods stand-alone graduate courses were created.

SC: We have included the descriptions in the proposal in Section 3B.

GC: there is still a question about whether a minor is required for the degree program

SC: This has been clarified in Section 3A with the following wording:

15 credits **Minor - optional (a student may complete a minor which requires an additional 15 credits for a total of 60 credits)**

GC:; and it is still uncertain as to the difference between the MA and MS.

SC: This has also been clarified in Section 3A with the following wording:

Students wishing to pursue the Master of Arts degree must meet the above requirements and exhibit a 2nd year proficiency in a second language.

This wording is consistent with other programs in CLA that offer both MA and MS degrees.

GC: Some of the unit responses stated that they weren’t making requested revisions because other unit’s aren’t doing it, i.e. specific labor market data analysis was not provided because other programs have not provided the information.

SC: We have commissioned an economic feasibility study which included as separate tab.

GC: Their assessment strategy has a list of activities, but not how the activities will be achieved.
SC: The assessment is based on student success in courses and in the final thesis project. The chart in Section 8 outlines how coursework and the thesis connect to the learning objectives.

GC: The budget is neutral, with no funding allocated to address recruiting.

SC: We have included a Foundation allocation of $2500 to cover initial recruitment and advertising with a commitment for additional funds as needed.

GC:
• If the purpose of the program is to provide instruction, Jim questioned whether the education minor being worked on by Brenda should be incorporated. If providing instruction is no longer the purpose, the proposal should be revised.

SC: The program has never been intended to provide instruction. That was a misinterpretation of an earlier inclusion which has since been reworded.

GC:
• Cass stated that he is not ready to vote until there is a market analysis and until he sees the Category II courses in the system so syllabi can be viewed. Denise questioned why one would prepare Category II proposals if the program is not approved. Bruce noted that concurrent Category I and II proposals could be prepared and the Category II courses would be approved only upon approval of the Category I. Jim felt that the minimum requirements (i.e., learning outcomes and assessment) for each course needs to be available for review.

SC: We have included course syllabi for the proposed courses. We are not prepared to propose these classes unless this proposal is approved. Since, if the proposal is not approved we would not teach those courses.

GC:
• Regarding proposals, Carolyn noted that the Graduate Council needs to be consistent in enforcing requirements and/or requested revisions.

SC: This is what we have suggested in providing examples of inconsistencies in the last response.

We believe that we have addressed all of the council’s concerns. We have streamlined the proposal, clarified areas of confusion, and commissioned an economic feasibility study. We hope that the grad council will enable us to move forward with this program.