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Degree: B.S. in Art Education
Program Director: Ms. Tami Weiss
PRC Consultant: Glendali Rodriguez and Debra Homa

Purpose of the Status Report Review: During the 2010-2011 status review, the committee determined that the changes to the program made in response to the 08-09 review were too recent to discern programmatic improvements. Although the SOE Director and new Program Director had taken strong and positive steps to address these issues identified in the 08-09 review, the spring 2010 survey concerns pre-dated those changes. Therefore, surveys were again distributed to art education students, key instructors and advisory board members in fall of 2011 to determine whether the changes had addressed the concerns identified in 2006-2007, 2008-2009, and 2010-2011.

Introductory Remarks: The results of the fall 2011 surveys strongly indicate significant improvements in the Art Education program. While some issues of concern remain, there are many references to improvements and positive changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Issues of Concern</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication – Conflicting advisement/instructor-based communications regarding program requirements and expectations.</td>
<td>Student surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication – Inadequate communication appears to exist between the art education and the B.F.A. program faculty and staff</td>
<td>Faculty surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum – Course repetition/overlap exists between the Practice of Art and Senior Seminar courses, as well as the Intro to Art Education and the Foundation of Education courses</td>
<td>Student surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Curriculum- Students may not be sufficiently prepared in the area of assessment, teaching strategies, and content/curriculum</td>
<td>Student surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Curriculum – A need for more practicum experience is needed throughout the program</td>
<td>Program Advisory Committee surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curriculum – A need to update the curriculum/develop new methods of instruction</td>
<td>Student and faculty surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Curriculum – Low freshman retention rates</td>
<td>Program Advisory Committee surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Resources – Some classrooms and labs do not provide the necessary cleanup (i.e., water and sink related) as well as storage-based needs for the methods courses.</td>
<td>Student and faculty surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Resources – There is a perceived need for additional clerical staff for both the Art Education and the BFA programs.</td>
<td>Student and faculty surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status of the Following Issues:

1. Communication – Conflicting advisement/instructor-based communications regarding program requirements and expectations.
   **Response:** In reviewing the fall 2011 student survey responses, it is apparent that students are no longer receiving conflicting program information from different individuals who either taught students or advised within the program, and they are no longer receiving unclear and inaccurate information about program requirements and how to plan out their programs of study to facilitate satisfactory and timely program completion. Many comments indicate a change in students’ advisement experiences for the better.

2. Communication – Inadequate communication appears to exist between the art education and the B.F.A. program faculty and staff
   **Response:** Fall 2011 survey responses had a mean of 4.55 for “communication between the program director and yourself” for Key Faculty – B (Art Department faculty). Student surveys did not include any comments about a needed improvement in collaboration between art education faculty and the studio art faculty.

   The Program Director has added faculty and staff from the B.F.A. program on the Art Education Program Advisory Committee, including both the Program Director and Chair of the Art and Design department. Further, there is constant communication with art faculty, regarding curriculum, program requirements, Senior Show, Visual Arts Classic, and course offerings. Current discussions include the specific requirements of the Mid-Program Review and Senior Show for art education students, moving towards more of an educational focus.

   This year, the Program Director has started attending Art Department meetings, and she is on the agenda to present at an upcoming meeting, regarding art education objectives within studio and art history syllabi.

   Last year, course syllabi for both the art education courses and the studio art courses required in the art education program were discussed and evaluated, addressing Department of Public Instruction (DPI) requirements.

3. Curriculum – Course repetition/overlap exists between the Practice of Art and Senior Seminar courses, as well as the Introduction to Art Education and the Foundation of Education courses.
   **Response:** Only one “weakness” comment indicated overlapping content in the Practice of Art and the Senior Seminar courses. Further, no concerns were raised regarding content overlap between the Introduction to Art Education and the Foundations of Education courses. As such, the previous work done by the Program Director, Chair of the Art and Design Department, and the faculty to address the overlapping content between these courses appears to have resolved overlap issues pertinent to these courses. Only 2 students out of the 15 respondents to that particular survey item indicated “somewhat disagree” or less.

4. Curriculum – Students may not be sufficiently prepared in the area of assessment, teaching strategies, and content/curriculum.
   **Response:** There were no student comments from the fall 2011 survey that indicated a need for more information on assessment, methods, strategies, or content/curriculum. Overwhelmingly, students indicate feeling prepared, confident, knowledgeable, and positive about their educational experience in the program. Course evaluations have also indicated a very high satisfactory response to curricular content and experiences.
5. Curriculum – A need for more practicum experience is needed throughout the program.

Response: Comments from the fall 2011 student surveys did not suggest that most students continue to believe that there is a need for more practicum experience in the program. However, efforts have been made to ensure that all students get substantial pre-student teaching experiences in ARTED 208 and ARTED 308. Further, the new Program Director has met with the SOE Coordinator of Field Experiences and the SOE Director to develop a plan to ensure that students spend additional hours in both elementary and secondary art education settings as a required component for both courses. In addition, students will be required to engage in a “paired” practice teaching experience in ARTED 208 and an “individual” practice teaching experience in ARTED 308 in the future.

6. Curriculum – A need to update the curriculum/develop new methods of instruction

Response: Survey responses of fall 2011 now indicate the strengths of curriculum and new methods of instruction.

7. Curriculum – Low freshman retention rates

Response: In the past, it appeared that some students who had not been admitted to the B.S. in Fine Arts entered the art education program as a “backdoor” route to enroll in studio art classes. As a result, some students left the art education program once admitted to the B.S. in Fine Arts program. This is still happening, though apparently not as often.

Various efforts have been made to more frequently advise students and to encourage retention in the program. An SOE Student Ambassador from the B.S. in Art Education has been added to the SOE Student Ambassador team, an advisory group for the SOE Director. The new Art Education Program Director has included many retention strategies for the program: 1) the “mentoring” of freshmen by art education students who recently experienced the Praxis tests and Benchmarks. 2) Inviting guest speakers to give presentations and have a question and answer session with the students in class meetings. 3) Learning communities via a blog network among students in art education courses. 4) Facebook page. 5) There is also an enthusiastic cadre of students on the National Art Education Association student division who are actively including freshmen in activities and providing guidance and support to these pre-education students in the major.

8. Resources – Some classrooms and labs do not provide the necessary cleanup (i.e., water and sink related) as well as storage-based needs for the methods courses.

Response: Comments from the fall 2011 student surveys did not suggest that students continue to have concerns about the classroom facilities and resources. However, one student did state that the art education students would benefit from having updated supplies for instructional purposes.

9. Resources – There is a perceived need for additional clerical staff for both the Art Education and the BFA programs.

Response: Cheryl Jones, the support person, has been incredibly helpful to the previous and current Program Director. She organizes program files, sets up advisement meetings, and works with the Program Director to convey needed program information to ARTED students.

Concluding Remarks: The Dean of CEHHS, SOE Director, and ARTED Program Director thank the Program Review Committee for their input and help to facilitate improvements in the B.S. in Art Education program.