**STATUS REPORT FOR THE B.S. IN ART EDUCATION**

**Degree:** B.S. in Art Education  
**Date of Last Review:** 2008-2009 & 2006-2007  
**Program Director:** Mr. Joseph Haid (until fall 2010) and Ms. Tami Weiss (from fall 2010)  
**PRC Consultant:** Glendali Rodriguez and Debra Homa

**Purpose of the Status Report Review:** During the 2008-2009 status review, insufficient evidence was available to the Program Review Committee to determine whether the previous changes resulted in programmatic improvements. Therefore, program surveys were sent out to art education students, key instructors and advisory board members in late spring of 2010 to determine whether the changes were successful in addressing the indicated concerns in 2006-2007 and in 2008-2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 2008, one art education faculty member was reassigned to perform duties outside the B.S. in Art Education program and another art education faculty member was appointed to function as Program Director. Among other reasons, this was done to avoid the potential problem of providing students with conflicting information for program requirements and expectations. In addition, a new program plan sheet with a recommended sequence of study was developed during the 2009-2010 academic year to assist students in planning their program. Other steps included moving the Program Director in Art Education to a location in McCalmont Hall to ensure accessible clerical assistance, developing an advisement improvement plan in conjunction with the SOE Director to ensure the art education students received current and accurate information, and holding regularly scheduled group advisement meetings with students to respond to student questions and concerns in a more timely fashion.

In reviewing the 2010 student survey responses, it was apparent that students no longer complained about receiving conflicting program information from different individuals who either taught students or advised within the program. Instead, students complained about receiving unclear and inaccurate information about program requirements and how to plan out their programs of study to facilitate satisfactory and timely program completion.

As a result of this disappointing feedback from the students, the School of Education (SOE) took immediate steps to hire a new person to serve as the Program Director for the B.S. in Art Education program. The former Program Director in Art Education continues to supervise art education student teachers. Since August of 2010, the new Program Director has consulted with the SOE Director and the Chair of the Art and Design department on a frequent and regular basis. The new Program Director has created an advisement form in which the Program Director documents the student’s questions and issues and a specific plan to address the issues and questions is documented. The form also includes questions about whether the student was satisfied with the meeting, and the form documents if the needs brought forth in the appointment require a follow-up meeting or action. The student then signs the form and copies of the updated program plan. All documents are copied and placed in the student’s file after all issues and actions are complete. Other actions have included:

1. The new Program Director has sent out follow-up emails to art education students to let them know about the status of actions taken or answers to questions brought up during advisement appointments.
2. The new Program Director has sent out regular emails to all art education students regarding Benchmark information, PPST and PRAXIS II information, advisement schedules, e-Portfolios, and Mid-Program Review information.
3. The Program Director has included detailed information on a D2L “news page” with a pretest students can take to determine if they are acquainted with key program information. In addition, supplemental information is provided regarding how to develop and write a philosophy of education and a philosophy of art education.
4. A group advisement meeting was held with all art education students on Advisement Day in fall of 2010 in which the new Program Director and the student teaching supervisor delivered key program information to all students in the program. Lunch (pizza) was served to optimize student attendance and participation.
2. Communication – Inadequate communication appears to exist between the art education and the B.F.A. program faculty and staff

**Response:** Several steps were taken to improve communication between the art education and the B.F.A. program faculty and staff since 2008-2009. During summer of 2009, the Chair of the Art and Design department collaborated on the development of the Department of Public Instruction Program Report in anticipation of the DPI accreditation review. The Program Director invited staff from the B.F.A. program to participate on the Art Education Program Advisory Committee and the Chair of the Art and Design department invited the Program Director of the B.S. in Art Education program to department meetings. Further, the Chair of the Art and Design department participated in a few Benchmark interviews of students in the B.S. in Art Education program to facilitate a mutual understanding between representatives of both programs/departments about the standards and benchmarking system requirements for the art education students.

However, a few comments from the spring 2010 student surveys indicate a continued need for rapport and collaboration between the art education faculty and the studio art faculty. Since August of 2010, the new Program Director and the Chair of the Art and Design program have met regularly for face to face meetings and phone conversations regarding student advisement questions related to transfers, minors, substitutions, changes of major, and double major issues. Also, course syllabi for both the art education courses and the studio art courses required in the art education program were discussed and compared in a series of four meetings, specifically addressing Department of Public Instruction (DPI) requirements. Further, the Chair and Program Director discussed the specific requirements of the Mid-Program Review for art education students, and the Program Director will take part in the review itself, along with the studio art faculty. On a separate occasion, the Program Director and Art and Design Department Chair discussed the requirements in a Double Major program plan for the BFA: Studio Art and BS in Art Education. In addition, BFA staff members are serving on the Art Education Program Advisory Committee, including the Art and Design Program Director, Tamara Brantmeier, and Art professor, Bob Atwell. The new Program Director has had frequent contact with staff in the Art and Design Department regarding Winterim offerings and other questions related to program requirements for the art education students.

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.

**Response:** Comments from the spring 2010 student surveys did not suggest that students continue to have concerns about 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.

However, a spring 2010 survey comment indicated that one student believed that overlap exists between two Art and Design courses: Aesthetics and Practice of Art. The new Program Director will work with the Chair of the Art and Design Department to determine the need for a plan to address this concern.

In addition, frequent comments from the spring 2010 survey reveal that the art education students found that all of the ARTED classes (108, 208, & 308) included the same content and information. As a result, the SOE Director will work with the new director/faculty member in the art education program to develop a curriculum plan with an appropriate scope and sequence for the three
ARTED courses. After the curriculum plan is developed, a need for revised curriculum and program plan will be determined. If a revision to the program or curriculum is needed, the revisions will be submitted to the curriculum/program review process in fall of 2011.

4. Curriculum- Students may not be sufficiently prepared in the area of assessment, teaching strategies, and content/curriculum.

Response: In 2009, upon the recommendation of the SOE Director, the ARTED Program Director/lead faculty member attended two professional development conferences with support from the School of Education to enhance his skills in the area of assessment, teaching strategies, and curriculum. In addition, several books and resources recommended by the National Art Education Association were purchased to enhance the faculty member’s levels of expertise in the area of assessment, teaching strategies, and curriculum. Further, a consultant was hired to work with the ARTED Program Director/lead faculty member for several days in summer of 2009 in an effort to assist him in developing courses and revising the program to include a focus on content in assessment, teaching strategies, and content/curriculum.

However, student comments from the 2010 survey reveal that many students continue to believe they need to learn more about how to teach art. Students identified the need for more information on assessment, methods, and parent-teacher relations.

The new Program Director and faculty member, who has current and several years of experience as a PK-12 art teacher, has infused more content on assessment criteria, rubrics, and developing tests into the curriculum. Further, the new Program Director has included more information on instructional technologies, the Wisconsin Teaching Standards, grant writing, ordering supplies, inter-disciplinary and multicultural content, curriculum writing and mapping, and “real life” art teacher projects in the curriculum. Course evaluation feedback in fall of 2010 and spring of 2011 will be carefully examined to determine the need for further changes and additional emphases on the areas of assessment, teaching strategies, curriculum, and parent-teacher relations.

5. Curriculum – A need for more practicum experience is needed throughout the program.

Response: Although one student indicated a need to “get students out into the classrooms more often,” comments from the spring 2010 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 since the last PRC status report. 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: Despite the various efforts to update the curriculum and develop new methods of instruction described above, comments from the spring 2010 student surveys indicate that students continue to call for revisions to the curricular content of the program. As such, the SOE Director, the new Program Director, and the Chair of the Art and Design Department will work to make needed changes in the program over the 2010-2011 academic year with the intent to submit a revised ARTED program for review by the SOE, CEHHS, and UW-Stout curriculum review committees in fall of 2011. Careful attention to course evaluation feedback, survey data from cooperating teachers, and student survey information will be used to guide program and curricular development.

7. Curriculum – Low freshman retention rates
Response: In the past, it appeared that some students entered the art education program as a “backdoor” route to take studio art classes when they were denied admittance to the B.S. in Fine Arts program. As a result, some students left the art education program once admitted to the B.S. in Fine Arts program.

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 the following strategies in the 108 classes and at Advisement Day to encourage retention in the major: 1) the “mentoring” of freshmen by art education students who recently experienced the Praxis tests and Benchmarks, and 2) inviting guest speakers to give presentations and have a question/answer session with the students in class meetings. There is also an enthusiastic Board 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: One of the main classrooms used for the ARTED classes was completely remodeled in January of 2009, and a SmartBoard (interactive whiteboard) was added to that same classroom in spring of 2010. That classroom (103 Heritage Hall) includes new and appropriate cabinets, sinks, chairs, tables, and storage cabinets on wheels. Most comments from the spring 2010 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 a “studio like place where we can practice demonstrations of ceramics, painting, etc.” The new Program Director will work with the SOE Director to ensure that needed classroom or studio space and supplies are available for instructional purposes.

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

Response: The previous Program Director in Art Education was relocated to McCalmont Hall in January of 2009 so that more clerical support was accessible to him and his students. The new Program Director has also been provided with an office in the same building. 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 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. We would like to request the distribution of future follow-up surveys in spring of 2012 to determine whether the appointment of a new Program Director/faculty member and our planned revisions to the program result in significant improvements. We will also carefully consider the faculty to student and advisor to student ratios to determine the need for additional personnel support in the program.