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SUBJECT: Program Review for Art & Design

The Academic Policies Committee (APC) appreciates the time and effort invested by the Department of Art & Design (A&D) in preparing an in-depth self-study report and by both the internal review team and the external reviewer for conducting an extensive review of this department.

If Art and Design is indeed a signature program distinguishing the University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire as a premiere liberal arts institution rather than a regional comprehensive institution, then APC recommends that measurable actions should be taken to support and strengthen this program.

Department-specific Comments

Commendations

Art & Design is to be highly commended for doing so much with so little support. Evidence of their proactive initiatives follows:

1. Maintaining high quality instruction and contributing so much to the overall student body. Excellence of A&D instruction is evidenced by student feedback and national recognition of student work.
2. Revising and focusing the curriculum to align with the university’s liberal education learning goals and a defined/clarified vision.
3. Temporarily suspending their minors and topical minors in order to support the broader student body needs for A&D courses. However, APC recommends that A&D pursue initiatives to reinstate the minor as soon as logistically possible.
4. Addressing diversity issues indicated in previous reviews via revised recruiting/retention policies and procedures, as evidenced by current diversity in faculty.
5. Engaging in discussions/plans for interdisciplinary curricula with corresponding possibilities for shared facility and technology resources.
6. Implementing and continually improving an assessment plan to evaluate the curriculum and student learning.
7. Creating a pre-enrollment procedure which, although not perfect, is addressing the enrollment issue.
8. Planning for a public-awareness campaign to include both university and community audiences.

Recommendations

APC concurs with the internal and external recommendations and so will not repeat or summarize those here with the exception of one: APC strongly recommends that A&D protect the BFA while simultaneously providing service to the greater university student body. The following APC recommendations supplement the internal/external reviewers’ recommendations.

1. * Unhealthy air quality. Especially alarming is the fact that air quality was identified in a 1993 program review and continues to be a problem. APC acknowledges that $750,000 was spent on air
handling in 2001-2002 (based on a 2002 program review), but poor ventilation continues to be an issue in the 2011 review. In addition to being an ethical and health issue, this is a university liability issue. APC recommends that the university do whatever is necessary to correct the air-quality problem.

2. * Inadequate facilities. The lack of appropriate facilities was identified in a 1993 program review and continues to be a problem. The increased demand for A&D courses to mirror societal and business demand for specific skills, coupled with an increased demand to provide studio courses as part of the liberal education core, is increasing the burden of providing adequate facilities. APC recommends that the university find facilities somewhere (on or off campus) for courses, students’ in-process work, and storage.

3. * Staffing. Identified as a problem in 2003, staffing is now a critical problem, especially in light of the Fall 2011 position eliminations. A&D faculty continue to demonstrate excellence in both professional and instructional activities. In addition to the excellent recommendations the internal review committee made to nurture the A&D human resources, APC recommends the university prioritize A&D when considering both array of programs and staffing needs.

4. Advising/Pre-enrollment procedure. APC recommends that A&D coordinate with the departments of Computer Science or Information Systems and LTS to engage talented students (either paid or through service-learning) to automate this pre-enrollment procedure in much the same way as the CampS Planner.

**Review-specific Comments**

APC is also charged with reviewing the process with the intent of continual improvement.

**What Worked**

1. Qualtrics survey of students. The internal review committee surveyed all A&D majors and minors. The feedback obtained was very valuable and highlighted strengths and areas of improvement.

2. Maintaining both an internal and external review. The commonalities provided from both perspectives lent credibility to the recommendations; the differences introduced insight.

3. Categorical breakdown of review criteria for department and internal review committee. The pre-specified categories ensured consistency across program reviews and provided breadth of review.

4. Partial action on recommendations from previous reviews. Most notably is the increased and continued LTS support and a one-time $750,000 investment in the ventilation system.

**What Could be Improved**

1. University action on recommendations. Issues (see * issues above) from the 1993 and the 2003 program reviews are still issues in the 2011-2012 review, indicating inadequate action on the part of the university to address these issues. APC acknowledges that the current review process includes a “Provost/Vice Chancellor’s Response to the A.P.C. Recommendations.” APC recommends that stronger measures for university accountability be built into the review process.