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Review Process

The School of Communication Studies prepared a Self Study following program review guidelines. An External Review Committee, composed of three faculty/administrators from other institutions, visited the campus, reviewed the Self Study, and interviewed unit personnel, students, and University administrators. The External Report and the Self Study were reviewed by the Program Review Committee. This document reflects the Program Review Committee (PRC) findings and recommendations.

Self-Study

Organization and Mission

The present School of Communication Studies was formed in 1995, although some of its components have been on the BGSU campus since the 1930s. The School currently comprises three departments: Interpersonal Communication (IPC) with 9 FTE, Journalism (JOUR) with 8.25 FTE, and Telecommunications (TCOM) with 9 FTE. JOUR and TCOM jointly support a Master's and Doctoral program in mass communications (MCOM). Interpersonal Communication has its own graduate program (M.A., Ph.D.). These three departments share in the over-all mission of the School, which is to promote and extend the study of communication processes ranging from interpersonal transactions to mass mediated communication.

Budget/Facilities

Within the School, each Department has its own budget, and the School Director has an additional School budget. The latter is approximately $50,000 a year, which includes generated income. JOUR has an additional budget of $14,644; IPC of $15,449; and TCOM of $15,617.

In the fall of 1997, for the first time, the entire faculty of the School were housed in the same facility due to remodeling of West Hall. While the remodeling has been most welcome, West Hall still presents numerous physical environment problems, primarily with heating and air flow. Another welcome event has been the opening of a state-of-the-art multimedia computer facility, which is shared by TCOM and JOUR.

Faculty/Students

Currently 22.5 tenured and probationary faculty are in the School, plus 3.75 temporary faculty. Only 3 of the fulltime faculty are professors; 8 are associate professors, and 11.5 are
untenured assistant professors. Most of the faculty are under 50 years of age. Around 850 students major in the School's programs, creating undergraduate major-to-faculty ratios for the three departments of 30-35:1. Advising ratios range from 19-60 undergraduates per faculty member. JOUR, in particular, prides itself on the amount and quality of its undergraduate advising. The School has a large number of women majoring in its programs: IPC and JOUR have approximately 65% women, while TCOM has 37%. Between 6-11% of the School's undergraduate majors are persons of color.

In addition, the School serves many majors from across the University, particularly though not exclusively, through IPC 102 Speech Communication. This course alone teaches an average of 703 students each semester and is required by a number of programs across campus. Indeed, 24 major programs require an IPC course. Given the School's interests in cultural diversity, it is interesting that no School course fulfills the cultural diversity requirement in the general education core curriculum.

School graduate programs are small but appropriately-sized, given the number of graduate faculty: IPC has 35 graduate students and MCOM has 38. Graduate student-to-faculty ratios for the two graduate programs are approximately 3:1 (MCOM) and 4:1 (IPC), although some individual faculty have as many as 13 doctoral students. The latter figure would make individualized training in research difficult.

School faculty teach approximately 2 courses per semester. Total SCHs/faculty member tend to range from 60-150 each semester.

**Curriculum/Pedagogy**

The undergraduate curriculum in JOUR has been regularly accredited by the Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. The Department received a favorable review again this year. Reviewers found the JOUR curriculum "imaginative," "logical," and "achievable." The other two departments do not have and are not eligible for accreditation. Experts (N=38) chosen by the Speech Communication Association ranked the intercultural communication aspect of the IPC doctoral program 24th in the country.

School courses are in strong demand. In Spring 1998, 865 students requested IPC 102 alone. There were a total of 1746 requests for the 12 IPC courses offered that semester. In JOUR demand exceeds capacity in courses capped at 15 due to the available number of laboratory computers. TCOM provided no information on course demand other than to state that demand was increasing.

Student course and program evaluations are generally quite positive across the School. JOUR also uses faculty peers to evaluate teaching.
Review of courses listed in the BGSU catalog raises questions about curricular redundancy across the School and, perhaps, across units external to the School. For instance, at the undergraduate level both JOUR and TCOM offer introductory courses with almost the same name: Introduction to Mass Communication(s) (JOUR 100 and TCOM 103). Overlap in content across TCOM's radio and video courses and JOUR's broadcast news courses seems quite possible. Obviously, there are differences in emphasis, but there must also be considerable similarity. Potential redundancy is also apparent at the graduate level between such courses as IPC 644 Ethics and Persuasion and MCOM 716 Persuasion in Mass Communication, or IPC 724 Interpretive Research Methods in Communication and MCOM 606 Introduction to Qualitative Methods. Overlap must also occur in the quantitative research courses offered separately by the two programs.

The PRC also questions the possible overlap between various TCOM courses and courses in the School of Art and the College of Technology. While we understand the differences in emphasis described in the TCOM Self Study, we ask whether similarities outweigh differences, and whether closer collaboration could eliminate redundancies and improve all three programs.

**Student Outcomes Assessment**

All Departments in the School have embarked on assessing student outcomes. The most developed program is in JOUR. Their system starts with a gateway course and criteria for entrance into the major, includes capstone courses with projects that draw upon learnings and skills accumulated throughout the program, and ends with two internships prior to graduation. Most of the other School programs have focused primarily on course outcomes and have done less work developing assessment procedures for programmatic outcomes. As work on assessment continues, the faculty need to focus their assessment procedures for the internships/practica on the programmatic role of these courses in integrating and generalizing knowledge gained across the curriculum.

**Scholarly Productivity**

Given teaching loads of two courses/semester [loads equivalent to those in many Research I universities], faculty research productivity is low across the School. Graduate faculty in the MCOM program, for instance, averaged 5 articles across the last 5 years, or 1/year. This productivity is also unevenly distributed. Some faculty show outstanding productivity and external grant procurement; others are less productive, given the released time they are receiving for research. Most units seem to recognize that they need to publish more frequently in the top scholarly journals of their respective fields.

**Service**
On the other hand, faculty service is strong. Across the School, faculty are serving their professional organizations at the national level, as well as within the state and region. A prime regional example is the School sponsorship of the Great Lakes Interscholastic Press Association, which promotes journalism and mass communication at high schools and junior high schools within Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana. Its fall workshop brings approximately 1000 high school students to campus each year.

School faculty feel overwhelmed with Departmental and School service. Since merit is distributed at the Department level, they have been somewhat reluctant to serve within the School, particularly within the MCOM graduate program. Their perception is that such service will not be valued as much at the Department level and, therefore, not rewarded by merit.

**Work Climate**

Morale in the School is very low. Some faculty feel they are not respected on campus and that they are underpaid relative to their peers across the country. They particularly feel overworked and point to the programs that are staffed predominantly by assistant professors who also have the added pressures of trying to achieve tenure/promotion. Many of the faculty blame the School structure for their morale problems; a few feel that the School leadership may be more to blame than the structure itself. Others feel the College of Arts and Sciences has not been responsive to their needs. Few blame themselves. The solution favored by the faculty for "changing the culture" is to dissolve the School, letting the three departments "go it alone" in the College of Arts and Sciences.

**Results of Previous Reviews**

Each Department within the School has had previous reviews, but this review is the first for the present School. In 1992 a Task Force reviewed the School structure, recommending the present formation.
External Review Findings

Strengths

The External Review Team praised the faculty for being committed and effective teachers and "reasonably productive" scholars. They were particularly impressed with the "high quality" of recent hires and were pleased at the presence of women and people of color on the faculty. They felt the number of students being served was appropriate and comparable to other programs. Also praised were IPC's graduate emphasis in intercultural communication and the international composition of its students, TCOM's expertise in new communication technologies, and MCOM's international communication and development communication. The team noted that the three Department Chairs had the support of their faculty and seemed to be "effective leaders." Further, they noted that the BGSU School structure is in line with the national trend toward integrating interpersonal and mass communication.

Weaknesses

The External Review Team expressed concern about the "unhealthy" climate within the School of Communication Studies because it was interfering with productivity and even affecting graduate student concerns and attitudes. They identified four problems: 1) lack of clarity, consistency, and/or communication about personnel review policies, 2) the inconsistent role of the faculty in School decision-making and insufficient communication to the faculty about decisions affecting them, 3) graduate student perceptions of competition between the two graduate programs for resources, to include concerns that MCOM lacked its own graduate coordinator, and 4) lack of accountability at both the Department and School levels for the faculty time that is released for research.

Recommendations

The External Review Team recommended retaining the existing School with its three Departments for at least 5-10 years. They felt the Departments were too small to be viable on their own. To make the School "work," the Team made 13 additional recommendations revolving around governance, faculty cooperation, and curriculum.

Relative to governance, they suggested that a national search be conducted for the next Director of the School and that the role and responsibilities of the Director be clarified relative to those of the Department Chairs. They felt that this delineation of duties would then clarify the appropriateness of summer compensation for the Chairs. In addition, they recommended that clearly-stated, consistent criteria be established for assigning faculty to Graduate classes. They noted that faculty active in research in an area should be teaching in that area, and that students' needs for timely course offerings should also be considered in making teaching assignments. The
External Review Team further recommended that an elected and representative School-wide Personnel Committee replace Departmental committees.

In terms of faculty cooperation, the Team urged collaboration across Departmental lines, possibly in the form of cross-appointments and joint research. They pointed out the interconnecting themes of culture, development communication, and new technologies crossed all three departments. The External Review Team suggested the faculty hold a retreat, facilitated by a national figure in communication studies, to build a sense of trust across departmental lines and to increase faculty identification with the School and its goals. They also proposed regular, formal or informal opportunities for the School faculty to get together for brown bag research presentations, social hours, and School awards. The setting of School-wide goals in fund raising, alumni/external relations, shared technology, and recruiting of minority students was suggested. The External Review Team urged the addition of three faculty lines to the School at the Associate or Full Professor rank. They said that those hired should have an integrated perspective on communication study.

In the area of curriculum, the External Review Team recommended that the two graduate programs move toward becoming a single program in communication, with the opportunity for sub-specializations. The Graduate program would thus become a School program rather than Departmental. While the undergraduate programs would remain housed within the three separate Departments, the External Review Team suggested a School-wide review of the curriculum to increase opportunities for students to take courses across departmental lines. This review could also discourage course duplication and encourage collaborative relationships with other campus units.

Program Review Committee Determinations

The PRC has reviewed the Self Study conducted by the School of Communication Studies, the report provided by the External Review Team, and the rebuttals to the report provided by the faculties of TCOM, IPC, JOUR, MCOM, and the School Director. Following are its determinations:

Strengths

The School of Communication Studies provides a unique and important contribution to undergraduate and graduate studies at Bowling Green State University. Contrary to the perceptions expressed in their Self Study, particularly by the TCOM faculty, the School's faculty are valued by their colleagues on this campus. Especially impressive is the faculty's commitment to cultural diversity and their desire to understand the role and nature of communication in a culturally-diverse society and world. Additionally impressive is the School commitment to undergraduate education, particularly noticeable in JOUR, and to graduate education, particularly noticeable in IPC and TCOM. The loyalty of past students and faculty,
who have donated considerable sums of money to JOUR, is to be applauded. The Committee also wishes to acknowledge the valuable service rendered by the School to many university undergraduates through classes like IPC 102. Moreover, the Committee recognizes the value of the extensive service provided by the School faculty to their professions and to the geographical region through outreach activities.

Concerns

Despite these strengths, it is clear to the PRC that faculty in the School are hurting and that it is time for an intervention. In considering the various alternatives and differences of opinion relative to problems within the School, the Committee used the pursuit of excellence as its primary guide for making recommendations. We have asked the questions, "What is needed for the programs in the School to become nationally-recognized for their excellence?" "What should the School and the University do over the next seven years to achieve that goal?"

Higher Aspirations. Our first answer is for School faculty to have higher aspirations. The Self Study revealed a School somewhat parochial in its goals. The PRC believes that the current faculty can achieve national prominence, such as already achieved by broadcast journalism, given that energies currently consumed in frustration were more positively directed toward achieving excellence. From now on, the School faculty need to make decisions focused on becoming outstanding in the country in teaching, research, and service.

Characteristics of Outstanding Graduate Programs. Secondly, the School faculty need to focus on the characteristics of outstanding graduate programs, specifically those that grant the Ph.D. Departments of seven and eight faculty do not have the resources to develop nationally-prominent doctoral programs as well as to teach hundreds of undergraduate students. Doctoral work requires the doctoral student to have hands-on research opportunities with a faculty member who is actively conducting research. Faculty who are carrying heavy service and teaching responsibilities cannot interact with their doctoral students in the manner characteristic of a nationally-prominent program. Even under ideal conditions, it would be the unusual faculty member who could simultaneously handle more than five doctoral students at different stages in their studies, given the professor's other responsibilities.

In addition, the main criterion for excellence in doctoral programs is the scholarly productivity of the faculty. Currently that productivity is low (about an article a year) in both MCOM and IPC, when averaged across faculty. The doctoral program faculty need to be publishing substantially more, and they need to be publishing in the top, scholarly, refereed journals of their fields. To support this research and to obtain graduate assistants, they need to be seeking more external funding as well.

Advantage of a School. Thirdly, in their discussions to retain or dissolve the School, the faculty need to recognize the advantages that the School currently gives them. A School (or large department) provides the critical faculty mass needed to sustain simultaneous undergraduate and
graduate instruction. In the case of Communication Studies, the School affords three small departments the chance to remain separate undergraduate entities, yet pool their resources to conduct graduate instruction. This is the PRC’s understanding of what the External Review Team meant when they indicated that the departments would not be viable on their own. If the departments wished to conduct only undergraduate instruction, perhaps with a small Master's program, then they could be viable on their own.

In addition to providing the critical number of faculty for undergraduate through graduate instruction, the School structure provides the opportunity to achieve more efficiency in the delivery of curriculum. By eliminating course duplication and overlap at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, faculty could be freed to better serve their students in other capacities as well as to increase their own research productivity. The PRC urges the School faculty to take advantage of their School structure by comparing undergraduate programs for curriculum duplication and sharing or merging courses where possible. This approach is particularly critical at the graduate level. Further, by taking advantage of differential loading of faculty, the strengths of individuals could be better used to reach the goals of the School. Faculty highly productive in research should maintain the present two course teaching load, while other faculty should increase their teaching and service loads, thus allowing the School to take advantage of the combined strengths of all.

Lastly, when interacting as a School, faculty have the opportunity to sense commonalities across departments that can lead to interdisciplinary study in curriculum and in research. These days almost every discipline finds that its most critical questions need interdisciplinary answers. While the presence of interdisciplinary research does not require a School, a School can help interdisciplinary research occur more easily.

In summary, the PRC believes that it is easier for units to achieve excellence in all three foci of the academy (teaching, research, and service) if the joint endeavors of 23 faculty are pooled. Seven to eight professorial faculty sequestered in three separate departments, each serving 300 undergraduate majors, will not have the time and skills to enable each department to achieve excellence in all three areas. As pointed out by the External Review Team, the current School structure has already positioned the faculty of the three Departments so they can begin to take advantage of each other's presence. Whether "everyone else" in the country is moving in this direction or not, a School of Communication Studies at Bowling Green State University makes good sense from a curriculum and research perspective.

Consolidating the Graduate Program. Just as a Department of seven to eight cannot produce excellent undergraduate through graduate education, a School of 23 does not have the resources to run two separate, nationally-recognized graduate programs. As the External Review Team noted, a consolidated program with sub-specializations, run at the School level, could lead to curricular innovation, produce better prepared students, and reduce time spent in administration. This program could be a national model for the next century.
Such a program might be centered around a core of common research/methodological/issue courses that would help students generate the questions that need to be answered in communications studies and give them the skills to answer those questions. The current content-specialty courses could then branch off this core, allowing students/faculty to call themselves telecommunications, or print, or IPC specialists, etc., if they wished. As faculty became accustomed to this new organization, the need for further changes in the curriculum to reflect a "communication studies" perspective would become apparent. For instance, each specialization could start requiring their students to select a course or two from another specialization. Later, actual interdisciplinary "communication studies" courses might be created as needed.

In addition to solving the critical mass problem, other advantages of this arrangement are obvious. One graduate coordinator could easily head such a program. Admission and program requirements, assistantships, and other resources would be equalized across the one program. Specialty faculty could still meet as "curriculum areas" to suggest solutions to area problems, but the coordinator would meet with the graduate faculty as a whole to make programmatic decisions on the degree. Preliminary examination and dissertation committee members could be selected from the total School graduate faculty rather than from eight in a department, thus spreading the workload. One degree with specializations makes sense for students by allowing them both generality and specificity in their studies. As the External Review Team mentioned, even the current students acknowledge that they may be called upon in future jobs to teach coursework currently offered in the other program. One degree with specializations is the best chance the PRC sees for the School to create and maintain a nationally-recognized doctoral program, given current faculty resources.

**Change Attitudes Rather Than Structure.** The PRC understands that none of the views expressed in this review will work if the faculty do not trust each other or their administrators. The issue of trust returns the focus of the program review to the structure of the School. No structure works without the respect and trust of one's colleagues and of one's administrators. The PRC feels that the structure of the School is not the problem. The implementation of that structure is. Parochial and vitriolic attitudes do not allow the structure to work. Neither, however, does leadership that does not see itself in service of the faculty. At this time it is difficult to place blame for the anger of both faculty and Director; it would seem that both have contributed to the present power struggle. Since neither side appears totally right nor totally wrong, it is time to stop the wrangling and get on with a solution.

This fall semester, 1998, the Departments must decide whether they wish to be a School with a doctoral program, or whether they wish to separate into three Departments emphasizing undergraduate study. If they decide on the latter, they must understand that teaching loads will, in general, rise to three courses a semester. Also they would need to devise a new three-year plan focusing on the pursuit of excellence for their undergraduate programs and refocusing the mission and size of their Master's programs.
The faculty of those Departments choosing to remain in the School and the current School Director must resolve their differences, or ask the Dean to commence a search for a new Director. The latter solution would not mean that the current Director did not do his job in forging the new School; it would mean that someone else was now needed to fine tune the unit to make it function successfully. The current Director has much to offer as a senior faculty member in IPC, where he could lead by example.

Regardless of who the Director is, the faculty must commit to the School to make it work. They have to look for similarities across their Departments rather than differences. The suggestions for retreats and brown bag get-togethers provided by the External Review Team (summarized on p. 4 of this report) should help in this regard. Most importantly, the School faculty need to be empowered to run the School: They need to meet as a faculty on a regular (perhaps monthly) basis and make key decisions about the directions the School takes; the Director's Advisory Council also needs to meet regularly (perhaps biweekly) to discuss key issues and bring items back to their respective units or to the School faculty meetings.

Having a strong School does not mean that the Departments cannot continue to be strong. They would remain the tenuring units; therefore, (contrary to the External Review Team's recommendation) the Departments need to have Personnel Committees. As the University Academic Charter clearly states, the School Personnel Committee and the Director then act as further levels of personnel review.

The PRC also recommends that the School have a School-wide Merit Committee. Moving merit from the Departments to the School would create a single, larger pool of merit money for distribution, help the elected members of the Committee appreciate the contributions of their colleagues from other units, forge common criteria for faculty performance, assure faculty that School as well as Department service will be rewarded, and eliminate duplication of merit committees across Departments. One criterion for high merit should be participation in interdisciplinary efforts in either teaching, research, or service.

Technology and Personnel Needs. In agreement with the School Self Study, the PRC feels some help for the faculty should come in the form of resources. Today's study of communication is technology-intensive. The faculty need help acquiring cutting-edge technologies to share with their students as well as support for maintaining those technologies in working order. Another helpful resource would be senior faculty lines. Like much of the campus, the School is disproportionately weighted with junior faculty, who are particularly vulnerable to the pressures and stress of internecine warfare, such as is occurring in the School. Often the junior faculty have the most skill in research, but because there are so few senior faculty, the junior faculty feel the burden of heavier advising, teaching, and service loads than they would have in a more demographically-balanced unit. On the other hand, the few senior faculty also feel disproportionately loaded with administrative, service, and teaching responsibilities, as well as with the need to mentor the junior faculty. An example is the current
Director teaching two sections of students (N=75) while trying to meet the demands of administration.

However, in order to effect a change in the status quo, the PRC feels that the condition for receiving additional resources, whether technological or personnel, needs to be a change in the outlook and behavior of current faculty. When the faculty demonstrate completed steps toward a School perspective, then technology and personnel resources should follow.

The next section of this review provides recommendations and timelines meant to help the School of Communication Studies grow to the national prominence that the PRC feels it is capable of reaching. We urge the School faculty and its Director to read these recommendations with the understanding that they are made in the belief that the School structure provides their best chance for overall excellence in the next century and their only chance for creating and maintaining a nationally-prominent doctoral program.

Recommendations and Timelines

Academic Years, 1998-2001

1. By the end of September, 1998 the three Departments must take departmental votes on whether to stay in the School and participate in a School doctoral program, or leave the School and become undergraduate departments in the College of Arts and Sciences. At least two departments need to vote to remain in the School for the School to continue.

   a. If any units leave the School and return to undergraduate departmental status, they should work with the Dean of Arts and Sciences to set new goals/objectives for the next three years, among which should be the modification of their curriculum and course loads to reflect their renewed undergraduate focus. The units should also study the type of Master's degree that would complement their renewed undergraduate emphasis. Admission to all current graduate degree programs would be suspended as of Jan. 1, 1999 with current students being allowed to complete their studies. Revised Master's programs should be in place by January, 2000 if not sooner.

   b. At the end of three years the departments will again undergo Program Review so that progress toward their new goals may be assessed.

   *The remainder of these recommendations and timelines are written for those units voting to remain within the School of Communication Studies.*

2. With those units voting to remain in the School, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences must attempt to reconcile differences between the faculty and the current Director. For
the reconciliation to be successful, the Dean must be satisfied that faculty are supporting the School, and the Director is giving the faculty considerably more input into the governance of the School.

a. If reconciliation cannot be achieved by the end of 1998, the Dean of Arts and Sciences should appoint an Acting Director, as well as decide if a search for a new Director of the School should begin January, 1999, or at some later date. The search should seek a Director who will stress faculty participation in decisions and who will have a broad perspective on communication studies. The new Director should be tenurable as a full professor in the School department best matching his/her background.

b. The School graduate faculty should elect a School Graduate Coordinator, who will form a School committee of graduate faculty to draft the steps needed for creating one doctoral program, admission to which would begin Fall, 2001. Admission to the two current Ph.D. programs will be terminated as of Spring, 2000 whether the new program is completed or not. In creating the new program, the steps should include, among other things, focusing the curriculum on the research strengths of the graduate faculty and reviewing the tutorial role of the advisor in insuring the quality of each dissertation.

3. The School faculty shall meet monthly to discuss School business. The meeting shall be chaired by the Director.

4. The Director's Advisory Council shall meet every other week to set goals for the School and to generate the agenda for faculty meetings. The Director shall chair the meetings.

5. Faculty in each department should develop/improve assessment procedures that focus on undergraduate programmatic outcomes. Results of this process should be shared across Departments in the School. Similarities in desired outcomes can help the faculty begin to identify programmatic and curricular overlap across departments.

6. The School Director will draft for School faculty consideration a differential workload policy for tenured and probationary faculty. The faculty will adopt a final differential policy by Spring, 2000 so it can be applied to Fall, 2000 scheduling. Only probationary faculty and tenured faculty producing satisfactorily for a doctoral program should continue to teach two courses per semester.

7. The School Governance Document should be rewritten by the faculty to create a School Merit Committee. The Committee will serve for the first time in the Spring semester, 2000. Criteria for high merit should include across-School, interdisciplinary behaviors.
8. If the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Provost feel the School has completed the above tasks in a satisfactory manner, then provisions will be made to make additional Operating Budget money available to the School for the 2000-2001 academic year.

9. If the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Provost feel the School has completed the above tasks in a satisfactory manner, then a new senior level faculty position will be made available to the School in an area to be determined by the Director in collaboration with the Director's Advisory Council. The person hired will be tenured in a School department, but interest in interdisciplinary work across the School must be a stated criterion in the position description and in the selection of the candidate. The search would occur during the 2000-2001 academic year.

10. The School Committee responsible for the Spring 2001 merit exercise should take differential loading into account.

**Academic Years, 2001-2003**

11. The School faculty should revise their Master's program(s) in light of the changes that have occurred at the doctoral level. Consolidation should take place where possible.

12. The faculty should continue to examine their undergraduate curricula and report to the Dean on progress and elimination of curriculum overlap across Departments.

13. In light of their interests and strengths in cultural diversity, School faculty should prepare a cost/benefit report to the Dean relative to their potential for contributing to the general education core curriculum.

14. Assessment procedures for all practica/internships should be refined to ensure that these experiences integrate and culminate prior learnings gained from the curriculum.

15. If the School faculty are beginning to collaborate internally, then TCOM faculty should meet with their counterparts in the School of Art and the College of Technology to study collaboration as well as possible overlap in programs and curriculum. A report of this study with recommendations should be presented to the appropriate School Directors and College Deans by the summer of 2002.

16. The School faculty, under the guidance of their Director, will identify further steps that would strengthen both their undergraduate and their graduate programs, increase faculty research and grant productivity and, thereby, position the School for a favorable program review in 2004-2005. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences should consider the School for a third, new faculty position based on the need established in this report.

*The School of Communication Studies should report annually to the Dean of Arts & Sciences, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.*