

Program Assessment and Review Committee  
**Review and Recommendations Concerning  
The Art Program**  
May 8, 2009

Simon Aloisio  
Scott Frisch  
Alex McNeill  
Tiina Itkonen  
Jaye Smith  
Greg Wood

Don Rodriguez  
Liz King  
Nancy Mozingo  
Jesse Elliot  
Marie Francois  
Ed Nuhfer

Harley Baker  
Nelle Moffett  
Stephen Clark  
Betsy Quintero  
Karen Jensen  
Luda Popenhagen

Mike Riley  
Steve Lefevre  
Peter Smith  
Dennis Downey  
Brad Monsma

**I. Introduction**

In the program review process, the Program Assessment and Review Committee (PARC) is asked to provide a University-wide perspective. In that role, the *Guidelines for Program Review* state that PARC will:

- A. Review each program's self-study, external review, and responses to that review, and
- B. Evaluate all recommendations and send its report to the Program Chair, Provost, Dean of Faculty, and AVP for Academic Programs.

In completing this assignment, a subcommittee was formed by PARC in spring 2009 which reviewed the Art Program's self-study, comments on the self-study by the Provost and Dean, and the report of the external reviewers. Subcommittee members also drew also on their own familiarity with the Art program in drafting comments and recommendations. These recommendations, which appear here, were in turn reviewed, discussed and approved by the PARC Committee.

**II. Suggestions and Recommendations**

The Committee found it helpful to separate its review comments into four areas: 1) curriculum and program requirements, 2) resource availability and needs, 3) assessment and learning outcomes, and 4) structure and organization of the Art program. Each of these is treated separately below. *But the Committee also wishes to underscore three findings which were derived from the materials. These three findings or recommendations are offered to assist the Art program and administration as they collaboratively develop a final memorandum for the program.*

1. As the program considers implementing an MFA degree approved by the Academic Senate in 2008, the Art program should consider developing an implementation plan for that degree to assure that the quality of the

undergraduate program is maintained and even enhanced. The Committee finds that the Art program may be at a fork in the road with respect to its future direction. It should consider the impact the proposed graduate degree will have on current instructional resources, space, and program culture, especially at a time when University budget revenue and enrollments are uncertain.

2. Recommendations in the reports identify several needed resources: more tenure track faculty, more studio and computer lab space, permanent/dedicated gallery space, more studio and computer lab technicians, and greater administrative support. PARC finds these requests meritorious. However, these requests for resource are made without saying what would be accomplished through adding these resources. We recommend the reverse strategy: the Art program should articulate a plan for what will be accomplished and indicate the resources required to fulfill the plan. Such a plan would respond to the Dean's question: what evaluation mechanism does the program use to determine resource needs? We recommend this be the direction that the Art program take with the strategic plan that we understand it is now considering, thereby also laying the basis for the memorandum of understanding it will enter into with administration. In the words of former provost Ted Lucas, "I would recommend that, in order to build a stronger case for additional resources, the Art Program undertake the development of a comprehensive assessment plan that addresses all of the program's learning outcomes."

3. Regarding assessment and documentation of student learning, the Committee notes that the Art program built its initial assessment plan in 2005 at the same time as the other initial CSUCI majors. Learning outcomes data were collected and analyzed in the following year. The program has not built an assessment plan that fully looks forward from these initial efforts. To this end, PARC recommends that the Art program consider first review and map its course outcomes to program outcomes. Following that, the program should develop and implement an assessment plan with at least one learning outcome assessed every year so that all learning outcomes are assessed within a program review cycle. PARC recognizes that assessment activity needs resource support, and it urges the administration to consider how it can better support and structure assessment, for Art and for other disciplines.

**A. Curriculum and Program Requirements**

***Strengths***

The self study (p. 5-6) demonstrates that the Art curriculum is integrated very well into the University, including general education, and is very

supportive of University's mission goals, especially internationalism and interdisciplinarity (p. 7).

The program focuses on innovation, and prepares students for future success by integrating course work in digital, graphics, studio, and art history fields. The major prepares students well, with a focus on art careers (p. 11-12).

The program has developed a strong curriculum with an emphasis on student engagement through internships and capstone projects.

The program has cultivated many successful liaisons, with off-campus speakers, institutions, and a downtown gallery. Through these links, the program provides its students with many experiential opportunities.

As the external reviewers observe, there is a collegial environment within the Art Program and between the program and other divisions, especially the library. These reviewers also complement the existing collaborative efforts between the Art program and external groups, as well as the support the program gives to interdisciplinary courses with other disciplines.

### ***Considerations***

As noted by external reviewers, there may be need for greater clarity in program requirements on art's web page. We invite the program to consult with their art students to see if they find the description of program requirements to be clear and complete.

As the external reviewers note, the program is invited to look into giving language credit to art history students transferring from other institutions. In this way they will be prepared to read material/critical texts in their original language. This could be a solution in the short-term, i.e., until CSUCI's language program can grow to accommodate additional languages.

The external reviewers comment that the art major is a high unit major, indicating that its unit count approaches that of a BFA program rather than a BA program. Should Art consider reducing its unit count? Statistics in the data pack do not show that the total units taken by graduates are particularly high. But, the committee asks: would reduction make sense in terms of the student's educational experience?

## **B. Resource Availability and Need**

### ***Strengths***

A clear strength of the art program is its dedicated faculty and staff. Information presented in the self-study demonstrates the quality and productivity of the tenure track faculty, and the high qualifications of the adjunct faculty who, in addition, are well integrated into the program.

### ***Considerations***

The 32% ratio of tenure track to lecturer faculty is very low. The program needs additional tenure track faculty given the large number of majors it is serving.

While the program has made creative use of its facilities, the program needs more studio space, computer lab space, and classroom space designed to meet the needs of Art History. As the external reviewers note, it is important to remember that with additional space will come the need for additional technical staff for the two and three-dimension art studios, and for the technical and digital areas.

## **C. Assessment and Learning Outcomes**

### ***Strengths***

The curriculum is aligned to accomplish desired student outcomes. Program learning outcomes have been identified and modified (*Self-study, Appendix 15*), giving the program valuable experience in setting and revising its program alignment.

Some Art courses have been mapped to learning outcomes, as evidenced by the self-study. And one learning outcome was selected and reviewed for assessment in 2005-06.

Evaluation components use multiple measures, including an exit questionnaire, portfolios, critiques, etc., as explained in the self-study report (p. 8).

### ***Considerations***

The Program should develop a four-year plan for each option to help students determine which courses they need. A two-year plan for GE certified transfer students should also be developed. These plans or roadmaps should appear online and be integrated into advising in the major.

The self study does not provide evidence that the Art program has comprehensively mapped its course offerings to its program outcomes. This is a first step toward collecting data that demonstrates the degree to which its students are meeting goals set for them by the faculty. The mapping chart of courses to outcomes would convey more information if the cells indicated the level of the outcome that is promoted in the course (i.e., introductory, advanced, review/reinforcement, integration).

Student evaluations should be administered in the same way and frequency to both tenure tract and lecturer faculty. From the self-study it appears that they are different.

### **D. Structure and Organization of the Unit**

#### ***Strengths***

Under the leadership of a chair who founded the program, the faculty and staff have focus on the mission of the program and a commitment to its goals.

The program has a strong history of participation and success in exhibitions, competitions, community projects, internships with the community, and art sales for charity. The Art program does a masterful job providing a rich experience for its students, with many opportunities to display their art works (galleries on campus and in "Old Town" Camarillo), to meet with the many guest artists they host, and compete in events such as the CSU Media Arts Festival, and to see their faculty engaged as producing artists.

The program's links to its alumni are strong, with the program using its master list to include alumni in its events and activities.

### ***Considerations***

The Self-Study report gives little evidence of regular program meetings. More regularly scheduled meetings can continue the momentum and follow through with projects and ideas initiated at the first meeting of the semester. External reviewers observe that art faculty meetings can help solidify common goals and identify areas where attention is needed. Meetings are also opportunity for the chair to inform faculty on important matters from the Dean and the wider university constituents.

Respectfully submitted by the Art Program Review Sub-Committee:

Simon Aloisio

Nelle Moffitt

Scott Frisch

Luda Popenhagen

Tiina Itkonen

Liaison Liz King