Academic unit: Art, Design and Creative Industries   College: Fine Arts

Date of last review 2016-2017   Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) 2011 _____

Trigged Programs MFA Studio Arts >20 Majors & >5 Degree

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree: Bachelor of Art_____   CIP* code: 50.0701_____

Degree: Bachelor of Fine Arts (Art) _____   CIP code: 50.0701_____

Degree: Bachelor of Fine Arts (Graphic Design) _____   CIP code: 50.0409_____

Degree: Master of Fine Arts _____   CIP code: 50.0701_____

*To look up, go to: Classification of Instructional Programs Website, http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55

Certificate (s): _____

Faculty of the academic unit (add lines as necessary)

NAME	SIGNATURE	TENURE OR NON-TENURE TRACK
Jeff Pulaski		Tenure
Ted Adler		Tenure
Barry Badgett		Tenure
Robert Bubp		Tenure
Jim Hellman		Tenure
Marco Hernandez		Non-Tenure
Kirsten Johnson		Tenure
Dr. Brittany Lockard		Tenure
Jared Macken		Non-Tenure
Dr. Claudia Pederson		Tenure
Jennifer Ray		Tenure
Dr. Lori Santos		Tenure
Larry Schwarm		Non-Tenure
Levente Sulyok		Tenure

Submitted by: Jeff Pulaski, ADCI Director _____   Date _____
          (Name and title)   (Date)

In yellow highlighted areas, data will be provided

Part 1: Impact of Previous Self-Study Recommendations

At the conclusion of the last program self-study performed, the committee provided recommendations for improvement for the department. Please list those recommendations and note your progress to date on implementation.

Recommendation	Activity	Outcome
The assessment of Learning Outcomes for each of the programs is weak. While there are numerous lists of clear, measurable learning outcomes for each program, the assessment tools and target criteria do not appear to align fully with the learning outcomes.	None to date. The faculty will review all learning outcomes in the upcoming semester and begin collecting data for analysis. Implementation will begin in August of 2019.	The following pages outline our plans for better assessment of our programs going forward.
Multiple programs include a target/criteria of "a grade of C or better" as the goal. This is not a rigorous assessment mechanism. It reflects performance overall in a course, but does not indicate whether a particular skill or competency was acquired	Beginning in the fall of 2019, we will analyze and collect data for all learning outcomes going forward.	
Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.	This is underway by the faculty. Better guidelines should be in place by the fall of 2019.	
For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.	We have stepped up our recruiting efforts among the Shocker Cities. Within the College of Fine Arts, we created a mailing list database of high school fine arts teachers in Kansas, Kansas City Missouri, Oklahoma City and Tulsa Oklahoma, and Dallas Texas. This included all high schools in the Shocker City counties. We developed a poster called 275 Art Jobs and mailed it along with our other marketing materials to all visual arts teachers on the list (more than 2,500 pieces).	It feels as if we have had more students from Shocker Cities visiting the school this year. I don't know that this can be attributed to our efforts so early in the process, but we are certainly trying. Anecdotally, I have had a number of teachers and students tell me that our posters are hanging in their high school art classrooms.

Part 2: Departmental Purpose and Relationship to the University Mission

The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.

Please list the program mission (if more than one program, list each mission), define the role of the program and tie them to the overall mission of Wichita State University printed above. (*Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs*)

a. Program Mission (if more than one program, list each mission):

The School of Art, Design and Creative Industries (ADCI) is focused on applied learning opportunities, community engagement, and interdisciplinary modes of creative inquiry. We emphasize strong foundations in basic skills and technique acquisition, then move on to conceptual development. We encourage all students to become investigators of and contributors to art and design discourse at local, national and international levels.

b. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission:

ADCI provides a high quality education in art and design to the students of south-central Kansas. Most of our students come from within the state. With implementation of the Shocker City Partnerships and increased focus on recruiting in these cities, we expect to see the number of out-of-state students rise over the next few years.

ADCI students, faculty and alumni are an active part of the cultural scene in Wichita and the surrounding communities. ADCI cultural outreach to our students, the campus and the greater community takes many forms. Three galleries in McKnight (Clayton Staples, ProjectSpace and PrintSpace) exhibit the work of artists and designers from around the country. ShiftSpace Gallery in downtown Wichita primarily shows off the work of WSU students year round. Through Final Friday activities, nearly 1,000 people per month visit ShiftSpace. ADCI faculty and staff are also an active community of artists and designers with work appearing in shows nearly every month of the year.

With the addition of "Creative Industries" to the school name in 2014, there has been a greater focus on the professional side of art and design for our students. Professional Practices classes teach students essential professional skills needed when joining the workforce; Slow Burn, Quick Fire and Studio Practice classes are engaging students in real-world projects; Community and Social Practices classes are connecting students with the community. All of these efforts are to help students see how they can use their education in professional settings after graduation to help drive the economy.

c. Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review? ☐ Yes   ☒ No

If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

The school continues to look for new ways to advance our mission within the current environment.

d. Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the <u>program</u> (s) (programmatic). Have they changed since the last review? ☐ Yes   ☒ No

If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

ADCI offers three undergraduate degrees, the Bachelor of Arts in Art with concentrations in Studio Art and Art History, the Bachelor of Fine Art in Art with concentrations in Studio Art and Art Education, and the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Graphic Design. The school also offers the Master of Fine Arts in Art degree in the area of studio arts. Based on 20th day reports for the Spring 2019 semester, enrollment is around 250 undergraduate art and design majors and eight graduate students. The faculty is made up of seven full-time tenured faculty members, four full-time untenured faculty members and four part-time non-tenure track faculty members for a total of 15 regular faculty (12.75 FTE)*. The number of adjunct faculty varies from semester to semester and year to year, but during the 2019 academic year, 17 adjuncts were employed in the fall to teach 26 classes and 13 adjuncts were employed in the spring to teach 23 classes (12.25 FTE)**. With a total instructional FTE of 23, the current faculty-to-student ratio is approximately 1:11.

*Figures based on: 7 FT tenured faculty = 6.25 FTE (.25 for director), 4 FT untenured faculty = 4 FTE, 4 PT non-tenure faculty = 2.5 FTE (2 at .5, 2 at .75)
** Figures based on: 26 classes in fall + 23 classes in spring = 49 classes * .25 FTE = 12.25 FTE

Goals shared across individual degree offerings in ADCI:

Undergraduate Programs

(1) Functional competence in applying principles of visual and spatial organization;

(2) Demonstrate ability to think critically and creatively in courses that progress at varying paces and to exercise appropriate time management skills as they undertake assignments;

(3) Develop technical and presentation skills through the expression of ideas using a variety of subjects and approaches;

(4) Demonstrate ability to engage in visual and reading research, and to utilize information in a creative and individualized manner that is tailored to students' goals and the contexts for the production of their work;

(5) Awareness of the various movements, stylistic approaches, methods, histories, and conceptual foundations in historical, modern, and contemporary aspects of art and design practice;

(6) Develop abilities to analyze, contextualize, and defend creative undertakings, and to engage in related critical written and oral discourses;

(7) Contextualize learning in the arts, design and visual culture with regional, national and international histories, cultures, trends and practices; and

(8) Demonstrate ability to participate in academic or professional activities such as the exhibition of work or the fulfillment of client requests, and the presentation of creative research in various forms and contexts.

Graduate Program

(1) Advanced competence in the studio emphasis demonstrated through an original and inventive vision in approach to studio practice, form and content as preparation for a professional artist career;

(2) Additional competence in the studio minor or minors that enhance the studio emphasis and encourage inter-disciplinary studio practice, dialogue and critical thinking;

(3) Awareness of major historical and contemporary developments and issues in art practice, theory and criticism, with particular awareness of information that is most relevant to the student's own work;

(4) Developed facility in informed and meaningful written and oral presentation of ideas, issues and critical assessment;

(5) Ability to conduct meaningful creative research in visual, written and oral formats, and ability to utilize current technologies in the creation (as applicable), documentation, promotion and presentation of such research;

(6) Demonstration of engagement, self-discipline and motivation appropriate for a terminal academic degree;

(7) Evidence of ability to successfully engage in the profession through the exhibition of work, professional conference participation, presentation of research, grant or fellowship activity, artist residencies, etc.;

(8) Trained, supervised and assessed graduate teaching experience as preparation for a professional artist educator career; and

(9) Professional presentation of a cohesive body of work culminating in the terminal project exhibition and oral defense.

Part 3: Faculty Quality

Describe the quality of the program/certificate as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates, and scholarly/creative activity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

a. **What standards, if any, are in place for your college/department for the following areas?**

Provide assessment here: No standards are currently in place. The faculty will be discussing this during the spring 2019 semester and should have standards in place by the end of the fall 2019 semester.

Departmental Standards																
College/Dept.	Ref. Journal Articles				Non-Ref. Journal Articles				Conf. Proceedings				Presentations			
	S	A	P	NA	S	A	P	NA	S	A	P	NA	S	A	P	NA

S=Submitted, A=Accepted, P=Published, NA=Not Accepted

Departmental Standards													
College/Dept.	Books				Performances			Exhibits		Creative Work		Grants Submitted	Grants Awarded	Grant Value
	S	A	P	NA	CA	PA	PR	J	CC	J	NJ			

S=Submitted, A=Accepted, P=Published, NA=Not Accepted, CA=Winning by Competitive Audition, PA=Professional Attainment (e.g. Commercial Recording), PR=Principle Role in a Performance, J=Juried, CC=Commissioned or Included in a Collection, NJ=Non-Juried.

b. **Please use the tables below to share information about your departmental scholarly outputs.**

Departmental Outputs																
College/Dept.	Ref. Journal Articles				Non-Ref. Journal Articles				Conf. Proceedings				Presentations			
	S	A	P	NA	S	A	P	NA	S	A	P	NA	S	A	P	NA
2014-15	3	0	1	2	2	0	1	1	6	3	3	1	14	13	9	0
2015-16	4	3	1		2	2	0	2	5	3	2	0	17	16	10	0
2016-17	8	2	2	4	3	0	2	1	4	3	1	0	13	12	6	0
2017-18	2	2	1		2	1	1	0	6	5	1	0	7	5	5	0

S=Submitted, A=Accepted, P=Published, NA=Not Accepted

Departmental Outputs														
College/Dept.	Books				Performances			Exhibits		Creative Work		Grants Submitted	Grants Awarded	Grant Value
	S	A	P	NA	CA	PA	PR	J	CC	J	NJ			
2014-15	0	0	0					27	1	9	18	5	3	5,600
2015-16	0	0	2					22	3	7	20	4	5	13,000
2016-17	1	0	1				1	30	2	5	18	12	5	17,000
2017-18	1	0	2				1	30	1	5	18	6	5	13,000

S=Submitted, A=Accepted, P=Published, NA=Not Accepted, CA=Winning by Competitive Audition, PA=Professional Attainment (e.g. Commercial Recording), PR=Principle Role in a Performance, J=Juried, CC=Commissioned or Included in a Collection, NJ=Non-Juried.

Narrative: Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the faculty/staff using the data from the table above and tables 1-7 from the Office of Planning Analysis as well as any additional relevant data. Programs should comment on details in regard to productivity of the faculty (i.e., some departments may have a few faculty producing the majority of the scholarship), efforts to recruit/retain faculty, departmental succession plans, course evaluation data, etc.

Provide assessment here:

Scholarly output on the part of the faculty is good, most of the faculty are engaged in their research and are being very productive. There are still a few faculty who have slowed down in their output, but in almost every case, they are engaged in a high level of service to the school, college and university. It is important to note two things when reviewing the above chart. The studio faculty within the school are operating on a 65% Teaching, 25% Research and 15% Service load. This is due in large part to the way we are required to deliver our courses by our accrediting body NASAD. Our courses all have a lecture and lab component combined, which means that students and Faculty are in the classroom six hours a week for a three-credit class. All Studio based faculty (studio art and graphic design) spend 18 hours a week in class, plus additional time prepping, grading meeting with students, advising, etc. This limits the amount of time faculty are able to create and exhibit art, their primary mode of creative activity. The other important note is the lack of grant funding available to the visual arts. There are very few opportunities for a visual arts faculty to apply for and receive grant funding for their creative activities.

Table 1: Fiscal Year Summation of Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production

Course level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)							Rolling 5 FY average		
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017
Total	7,140	6,667	6,705	6,382	7,379	6,878	6,864	6,855	6,802	6,842
100-299	4,001	3,792	4,027	3,670	4,630	3,962	4,089	4,024	4,016	4,076
300-499	2,185	2,041	1,944	1,929	2,035	2,177	2,150	2,027	2,025	2,047
500-699	689	587	530	552	480	531	398	568	536	498
700-799	12	15	17	11	20	17	9	15	16	15
800-899	253	232	187	220	214	191	218	221	209	206
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings summated by FY for each census day; in some cases department level SCH includes entire department offerings.

Table 2: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production at Fall Census Day

Course level:	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
Total	3,380	3,510	3,337	3,200	3,551	3,310	3,346	3,396	3,382	3,349
100-299	1,898	2,184	2,157	1,935	2,227	1,893	1,989	2,080	2,079	2,040
300-499	1,043	970	831	947	1,016	1,073	1,046	961	967	983
500-699	309	222	234	195	199	247	181	232	219	211
700-799	6	15	11	8	11	3	3	10	10	7
800-899	124	119	104	115	98	94	127	112	106	108
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings at Fall census day.

Credit hour production across the school has remained fairly steady in the period when looking at the rolling five-year averages. The largest decline seems to be in the 500-699 credit-hours which have dropped about 10%. Curriculum changes in the past five years have seen a reduction in the number of 500-level Art History courses required of our studio art majors which probably accounts for the change.

Table 3: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production among Department Instructional Faculty on November Employee Census Day (entire term SCH)

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
Program total	3,002	3,309	3,074	2,727	3,167	3,096	3,121	3,056	3,075	3,037
Tenure eligible faculty	2,029	2,117	1,939	1,035	1,647	1,149	1,353	1,753	1,577	1,425
Non-tenure eligible faculty	422	387	132	1,323	633	369	268	579	569	545
Lecturers	533	593	908	282	701	1,329	1,082	603	763	860
GTA	0	0	0	0	0	216	246	n/a	n/a	n/a
Unclassified professional	18	212	96	87	186	33	172	n/a	n/a	n/a
Classified staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
GSA, GRA, UG std	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: faculty/staff with active class assignments and employment at November freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix.

Table 4: Instructional FTE Employed on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
Program total	17.3	19.3	19.3	15.4	19.6	24.1	23.9	18.2	19.5	20.5
Tenure eligible faculty	10.2	11.6	11.6	8.7	10.7	10.7	11.0	10.6	10.7	10.6
Non-tenure eligible faculty	2.8	2.3	1.3	4.2	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.6	2.5	2.5
Lecturers	3.7	4.4	5.7	1.7	5.4	6.9	5.1	4.2	4.8	4.9
GTA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
Unclassified professional	0.7	1.0	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	2.3	n/a	n/a	n/a
Classified staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a
GSA, GRA, UG std	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix.; fte of 1 based on 80 hour bi-week appointment;

employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; KBOR minima for faculty (TTF) 3 for UG, plus 3 for masters, plus 2 for doctoral.

Credit hour production has remained fairly consistent over the reporting period although there has been a change in the teaching loads of tenure-eligible faculty and lecturers. At the end of 2012 FTE in the school dropped due to a retirement and a change in the Director. This had a large impact on credit-hour production among the tenured faculty.

Table 5a: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for University Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
(University level) Total	235.6	230.5	222.3	225.3	222.1	212.8	216.3	227.2	222.6	219.8
Tenure eligible faculty	226.7	215.6	194.0	193.5	195.2	183.1	193.4	205.0	196.3	191.8
Non-tenure eligible faculty	300.2	284.5	289.3	306.7	304.5	295.5	293.8	297.0	296.1	298.0
Lecturers	273.9	269.4	295.3	301.8	292.6	263.5	254.7	286.6	284.5	281.6
GTA	212.5	208.6	201.7	206.0	183.4	192.4	184.8	202.4	198.4	193.7
Unclassified professional	116.3	156.8	121.8	105.7	100.5	94.0	114.2	120.2	115.8	107.2
Classified staff	42.1	53.3	120.5	77.1	115.2	61.7	5.9	81.6	85.6	76.1
GSA, GRA, UG std	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5b: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for College Division Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
(College Division level) Total	128.7	138.0	131.3	145.6	123.9	118.1	131.6	133.5	131.4	130.1
Tenure eligible faculty	116.8	116.8	108.7	96.2	93.3	93.0	119.0	106.4	101.6	102.0
Non-tenure eligible faculty	171.7	180.1	166.7	267.9	167.5	185.1	204.0	190.8	193.5	198.2
Lecturers	190.9	222.2	244.7	277.3	226.1	184.6	162.3	232.2	231.0	219.0
GTA	72.3	48.0	48.8	140.4	79.3	64.8	60.9	77.8	76.3	78.9
Unclassified professional	22.4	75.1	44.7	31.8	52.7	11.4	48.3	45.3	43.1	37.8
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GSA, GRA, UG std	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5c: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for Program Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
(Program level) Total	173.9	171.9	159.0	177.4	161.3	128.3	130.8	168.7	159.6	151.3
Tenure eligible faculty	198.9	183.0	167.1	118.7	153.4	107.1	123.0	164.2	145.9	133.9
Non-tenure eligible faculty	153.5	172.0	105.6	312.3	254.6	148.4	131.5	199.6	198.6	190.5
Lecturers	145.5	134.4	160.3	169.4	129.5	192.3	213.1	147.8	157.2	172.9
GTA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	71.9	70.3	n/a	n/a	n/a
Unclassified professional	27.7	206.8	116.4	116.0	186.0	33.0	76.4	n/a	n/a	n/a
Classified staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a
GSA, GRA, UG std	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

As the school has lost a few positions, the teaching loads have shifted somewhat to more adjunct teaching in the Foundation program. These classes tend to have larger enrollments than the upper-division classes in studio art, thus the shift downward of credit hours by tenure-eligible faculty and the increase in credit hours of Lecturers. The credit hour production for tenure-eligible faculty is lower than the numbers for the university as a whole, but higher than the college average. This is due in large part to the one-on-one nature of teaching in the visual arts. The vast majority of our classes are not lectures to large groups of students, but one-on-one instruction and critique of the work that they are doing.

Table 6: Program Majors (including double majors) on Fall Census Day – STUDIO ART

Student Class	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
Total	303	287	283	264	257	249	247	279	268	260
freshmen	62	63	62	59	61	57	55	61	60	59
sophomore	65	55	56	48	45	46	46	54	50	48
junior	61	60	64	55	49	52	57	58	56	55
senior	99	95	87	86	88	80	74	91	87	83
masters	16	14	14	16	14	14	15	15	14	15
post masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: majors include all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; other includes guest or non degree students; KBOR minima 25 UG, 20 GR masters and 5 GR doctoral.

Table 6: Program Majors (including double majors) on Fall Census Day – GRAPHIC DESIGN

Student Class	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
Total	54	53	48	40	38	42	39	47	44	41
freshmen	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
sophomore	1	0	4	4	0	0	1	2	2	2
junior	10	15	5	4	5	9	6	8	8	6
senior	41	38	39	32	33	33	32	37	35	34
masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
post masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: majors include all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; other includes guest or non degree students; KBOR minima 25 UG, 20 GR masters and 5 GR doctoral.

The number of program majors in the studio art chart is a bit misleading as this includes all BA and BFA students in art, art education, art history, and studio art. For example, when looking at the numbers in Banner for the fall of 2016 on the census day, there are 230 students listed in the various studio art degree codes. Of these students:

25 are in the BA in Art, Art concentration (F18A)
7 are in the BA in Art, Art History concentration (F18B)
12 are in the BFA in Art, Art Education concentration (F16E)
34 are in the BFA in Art, Studio Art concentrations (F16A, F16D, and F16F)

This makes 71 students that should be juniors and seniors mainly in the studio arts. The 7 students in the Art History degree track take a very different curriculum. The remaining 152 students are in the Pre-Art & Design degree code (F18F). These are freshmen and sophomores that have not been through Mid-Program Review and have not been allowed to change their major code to their intended major.

Majors within the school have been in decline over this reporting period. As mentioned in other places in this report, more recruiting efforts are underway to reverse this trend. Additional concentrations were developed for the studio art degree that we hope will appeal to more students.

Around 2011, the graphic design curriculum was changed and the number of students allowed to progress into the junior level was limited to around 20. This was implemented due to the lack of resources and faculty available to teach more students in the upper-division classes. Before this change, faculty were regularly teaching overload classes to handle all the students. Since the curriculum change has fully gone into effect, the quality of the graduating senior portfolios have gone up and the program has stabilized at around 40 upper division students.

Table 7: Degree Production by Fiscal Year – STUDIO ART

Degree level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)							Rolling 5 FY average		
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017
Total	37	27	33	41	23	30	29	32	31	31
Doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	8	3	2	6	4	3	5	5	4	4
Bachelor	29	24	31	35	19	27	24	28	27	27
Associate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; KBOR minima 10 UG, 5 GR masters & 2 GR doctoral.

Table 7: Degree Production by Fiscal Year –GRAPHIC DESIGN

Degree level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)							Rolling 5 FY average		
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017
Total	16	21	22	24	10	25	15	19	20	19
Doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bachelor	16	21	22	24	10	25	15	19	20	19
Associate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; KBOR minima 10 UG, 5 GR masters & 2 GR doctoral.

The number of graduates is holding pretty steady for both programs when considering the rolling five-year averages.

Part 4: Academic Program(s) and Emphases

Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan (s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).

a.   **Narrative:** For undergraduate programs, compare ACT scores of the majors with the University as a whole. (Evaluate table 8 [ACT data] from the Office of Planning and Analysis).

Provide assessment here:

Table 8: Mean ACT score of Juniors and Seniors Enrolled on Fall Census Day (source=Fall Census Day) — STUDIO ART

Statistic:	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
University level	22.7	22.8	23.0	23.0	23.1	23.0	23.1	22.9	23.0	23.0
Program majors	21.8	21.9	21.4	21.1	21.7	21.8	22.5	21.6	21.6	21.7
Program majors count	160	155	151	141	137	132	131	149	143	138
reporting ACT	95	92	94	86	86	86	92	91	89	89
Percent reporting	59.4%	59.4%	62.3%	61.0%	62.8%	65.2%	70.2%	60.9%	62.0%	64.2%

note: if ACT missing and SAT available, SAT is used converted to ACT metric; KBOR captures ACT data for enrolled juniors & seniors only; KBOR minima >=20.

Table 8: Mean ACT score of Juniors and Seniors Enrolled on Fall Census Day (source=Fall Census Day) — GRAPHIC DESIGN

Statistic:	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
University level	22.7	22.8	23.0	23.0	23.1	23.0	23.1	22.9	23.0	23.0
Program majors	22.6	22.1	22.4	22.6	22.3	22.4	21.8	22.4	22.4	22.3
Program majors count	51	53	44	36	38	42	38	44	43	40
reporting ACT	27	33	32	29	28	27	22	30	30	28
Percent reporting	52.9%	62.3%	72.7%	80.6%	73.7%	64.3%	57.9%	67.1%	70.0%	69.7%

note: if ACT missing and SAT available, SAT is used converted to ACT metric; KBOR captures ACT data for enrolled juniors & seniors only; KBOR minima >=20.

For the last rolling 5-year average, undergraduate studio art students have slightly lower ACT scores, 21.7, than the University average at 23. Over the reporting period, the scores are generally 1-1.5 points lower with a few exceptions. For the last three reporting cycles, the average was 21.6, 21.6 and 21.7 on the rolling 5-year averages, based on around 62% of the students reporting their scores. During the same periods, undergraduate graphic design students have also reported slightly lower ACT scores than the university average, generally .5-1.0 points lower.

While this might be a concern from a strictly numbers perspective, we continue to see many excellent and well-prepared students in our programs. Creativity is not a metric measured by standardized testing, but critical for success in the visual arts.

b. **Narrative:** For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs. (<mark>Evaluate table 9 [GPA data] from the Office of Planning and Analysis</mark>)

Provide assessment here:

Table 9: Mean Application GPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications)									
	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)							Rolling 5 FY weighted average		
Statistic:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017
University level	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Program majors	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5
Program majors count	8	11	12	9	9	7	5	10	10	8
reporting GR gpa	6	10	12	9	8	5	4	9	9	8
Percent reporting	75.0%	90.9%	100.0%	100.0%	88.9%	71.4%	80.0%	91.8%	91.7%	90.5%

note: graduate student application gpa based on last 60 hours of course work earned.

MFA graduate student GPAs are in line with university averages. The trend has continued for all six years of available data.

c. **Narrative:** Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes in the following table. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results.

Foundation Program

The Foundation Program in ADCI is meant to give students a strong and common footing in basic visual art principles. All incoming students are expected to complete the program during their first two years at WSU. For graphic design and studio art students, this curriculum is made up of Foundation studies (13 hours), Introductory Studies (12-18 hours depending on the program of study), Introductory Art History courses (6 hours) and the General Education Basic Skills courses. Students planning on pursuing Art History take a slightly modified version of the program, which includes fewer hands-on studio-based courses. A complete listing of required courses for each degree can be found on the check sheets for each program in the appendix. These courses work together to provide a solid foundation for students wanting to study visual art. ARTF 202 Mid-Program Review is taken in the spring of the sophomore year as a review of student progress. During this course, students present a comprehensive portfolio of work from all the Foundation Program courses. This portfolio is evaluated by the faculty in their chosen area to determine if the student has met the learning outcomes and can proceed into their selected program of study. Individual learning outcomes are primarily accomplished by successful completion of classes as defined below in the table.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
Demonstrate familiarity with critical interpretation and analysis of visual concepts including formal analysis, narrative, metaphor, symbol, style, and compositional structure, in written form.	Written assignments and exams in *ARTF 102 Introduction to Art and Design*. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	30% exceed expectations 50% meet expectations 80% overall meet or exceed expectations	Faculty will need to discuss exact target values. This class tends to be a bit of a weeder course within our program as students begin to understand exactly what is required in studying art at the collegiate level.	
Demonstrate proficiency with 2D design concepts, tools, and materials through artworks and analysis.	Final portfolio of work from *ARTF 136 Foundation 2D Design*. Students will be required to submit a PDF of their final portfolio for review. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency with 3D design concepts, tools, and materials through artworks and analysis.	Final portfolio of work from *ARTF 189 Foundation 3D Design*. Students will be required to submit a PDF of their final portfolio for review. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency in perceptual and schematic drawing and familiarity with drawing tools and media through artworks and analysis.	Final portfolio of work from *ARTF 145 Foundation Drawing*. Students will be required to submit a PDF of their final portfolio for review. Area faculty will	30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		

	establish a rubric to assess this outcome.			
Demonstrate familiarity with basic digital tools through artworks and analysis.	Final portfolio of work from digital coursework (*ARTG 110 Vector Applications*, *ARTG 111 Pixel-Based Applications*, and *ARTG 112 Layout Applications* for graphic design majors, *ARTS 245 Digital Studio* for studio art majors). Students will be required to submit a PDF of their final portfolio for review. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate attention to detail and craft through artworks and presentation of artworks.	Final portfolio hung for *ARTF 202 Mid-Program Review.* Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	40% exceed expectations 50% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate familiarity and basic ability to express ideas through a range of media through artworks and presentations.	Final portfolio hung for *ARTF 202 Mid-Program Review.* Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate familiarity with issues in art history through analysis.	Written assignments and exams through *ARTH125_ Introduction to Visual and Material Culture* in the Art History curriculum. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		

Definitions:

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Provide assessment here:

While the Foundation Program does not lead to a degree in and of itself, it is an integral part of each of our degree sequences and has specific outcomes. It serves as a gateway by which students enter our various degree sequences. While *ARTF 202 Mid-Program Review* has been the final assessment of student learning in this program, there are a number of other learning outcomes in the classes leading up to this "capstone" course. To date, these individual learning outcomes have not been independently evaluated, nor has consistent data been collected for each of them. The chart above outlines the plans we have to implement an assessment strategy going forward.

While the percentages of students being accepted into the program of their choice is high (96-98% over the past three years) this is not a good assessment of whether or not they have met the desired learning outcomes. Each of the learning outcomes outlined above needs to be individually assessed in the future to ensure that students are meeting them and to give the faculty insight into how to improve specific courses. It should also be noted that there has been a decline in the number of students in the program over the past few years with a high of 70 students in 2014. In the past, not all students were accepted into specific programs based on space availability within that program. The lower number of students in the program over the past three years have allowed a larger percentage into the program of their choice.

Learner Outcomes (e.g. capstone, licensing/certification exam pass rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				
2017-18				

BA in Art, Art Concentration

The B.A. in Art, Art Concentration is designed to be a liberal arts option for students who do not want to focus exclusively in one area of art. This gives students freedom, encouraging a breadth of experience. The approach for planning the degree is to develop a link between the liberal arts or a related discipline to the studio or design focus, encouraging the relationship of non-art interest into their art careers. Students formulate a plan of study with specific educational goals, which will complement their art course work. The first year of study for the B.A. is completion of the Foundation Program. The second year includes a variety of Introductory Art courses. In the third year of study, the exploration of upper-level studio art courses begins. At this point the students should be investigating their studio art emphasis area and developing a plan of focused electives to reach their educational goals.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
Demonstrate proficiency in applying visual art principles emphasized in the Foundation Program.	Portfolio review of work submitted at the end of both the junior and the senior year.	Junior year: 30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 50% exceed expectations 45% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		Currently, students in the BA in Art do not turn in a portfolio of work at the end of their junior or senior year. This process will need to be developed or tied to a class.
Demonstrate proficiency in the expression of ideas through a range of media, with a specialization within one or more media.	Portfolio review of work submitted at the end of both the junior and the senior year.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 85% overall meet or exceed expectations		See note above.
Demonstrate familiarity with issues in art history and contemporary methods in art practice.	Written assignments and exams through 300+ level Art History curriculum. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency in producing work with attention to detail and resolution of both the content and formal concerns.	Portfolio review of work submitted at the end of both the junior and the senior year.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations		See note above.

		90% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate familiarity and basic understanding of the considerations in communicating creative ideas and presenting work to others both verbally and visually.	Demonstrated critique and presentation in 300+ level studio coursework. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate familiarity and basic understanding of what is required to create and exhibit artwork in a professional manner.	Demonstrated through successful exhibition/ portfolio presentation of work at the end of the senior year.	Senior year: 40% exceed expectations 50% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		Currently, students in the BA in Art do not have a final exhibition or turn in a portfolio of work at the end of their senior year. This process will need to be developed or tied to a class.
Demonstrate proficiency in creatively solving, and critically considering visual problems through a process of research, observation, analysis, and evaluation to generate unique solutions on a wide range of ideas.	Demonstrated through successful exhibition/ portfolio presentation of work at the end of the senior year.	Senior year: 40% exceed expectations 50% meet expectations 90% overall meet or exceed expectations		Currently, students in the BA in Art do not have a final exhibition or turn in a portfolio of work at the end of their senior year. This process will need to be developed or tied to a class.

Definitions:

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Provide assessment here:

Nearly all assessments of learning outcomes in visual art need to come through the review of a portfolio of work. In the BA in Art degree, there is not currently a portfolio review requirement. This is one of the things that separate this degree from the BFA in Art, the professional version of the degree. A mechanism to require a portfolio of work to be turned in will need to be developed by the faculty. It would be best if this were tied to a specific class to ensure that it is completed by all students in the degree program. Processes for a wide range of faculty to review this work will also need to be developed.

Since some of the skills/competencies will not be fully developed until the student is near the end of the program, junior- and senior-level targets should be established to ensure students are moving in the right direction.

Learner Outcomes (e.g. capstone, licensing/certification exam pass rates) by year, for the last three years

Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				
2017-18				

BA in Art, Art History Concentration

The B.A. in Art, Art History Concentrations has a liberal arts perspective and is the initial professional degree that prepares students for graduate study in Art History. The first year of study for the Art History Concentration is completion of a modified Foundation Program with fewer studio-intensive practices. Students are required to gain a non-english language proficiency. With the remaining elective hours students should develop a plan of focused electives to reach their educational goals.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
Thorough grounding in formal analysis and visual literacy: e.g., compositional analysis, types of spatial representation, repertoire, modes of production, etc. Develop the vocabularies and tools required of students and scholars of art and design.	Written assignments and exams through the Art History curriculum. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 85% overall meet or exceed expectations		Currently, students in the Art History Concentration do not have a specific capstone course to tie this assessment to. This process will need to be developed or tied to a class.
Thorough grounding in historical, cross-cultural and stylistic frameworks for understanding art in its context and from multiple points of view: e.g., style and stylistic development, typological studies, seriation, corpus of information, etc.	Written assignments and exams through the Art History curriculum. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 85% overall meet or exceed expectations		See note above.
Thorough grounding in concepts that place the production and interpretation of art in a social context: e.g., convention, iconography, patronage, genres, classes of society, etc.	Written assignments and exams through 300+ level Art History curriculum. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 85% overall meet or exceed expectations		See note above.
Thorough grounding in concepts of critical thinking: objectivity, use of evidence, fair-mindedness, results and procedures, etc.	Written assignments and exams through 300+ level Art History curriculum. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 85% overall meet or exceed expectations		See note above.

Definitions:

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program.   The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Provide assessment here:

Specific assessments for the Art History Concentration will need to be developed over the next few months. Since some of the skills/competencies will not be fully developed until the student is near the end of the program, junior- and senior-level targets should be established to ensure students are moving in the right direction.

Learner Outcomes (e.g. capstone, licensing/certification exam pass rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				
2017-18				

BFA in Graphic Design

The Graphic Design Program provides instruction in the arts for those interested in visual communication. This program graduates trained professional designers, most of whom work in the Greater Wichita area. The program provides a base for an active cooperative educational relationship with business and industry. Wichita has a large concentration of national corporations and graphic design firms that hire designers. The Graphic Design Program provides a continuing resource for the professional community that contributes to the economic base of the area. The program's urban location and relationship with firms in this geographic area provides a unique opportunity for both the industry and the university to work together in meeting the needs of the profession.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
Demonstrate proficiency in applying principles emphasized in the Art Foundation, Introductory Graphic Design and Introductory Art History courses	Portfolio review of work submitted at the end of both the junior and the senior year through *ARTG 354 Professional Practices in Graphic Design*.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency in visual forms and their aesthetic functions, particularly as related to visual communications	Portfolio review of work submitted at the end of both the junior and the senior year through *ARTG 354 Professional Practices in Graphic Design*.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency in the use of basic tools, techniques and processes to produce work from sketch to finished object	Portfolio review of work submitted at the end of both the junior and the senior year through *ARTG 354 Professional Practices in Graphic Design*.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency in solving communications and design problems and develop a working knowledge of such areas as semantics, information theory, and symbol theory	Portfolio review of work submitted at the end of both the junior and the senior year through *ARTG 354 Professional Practices in Graphic Design*.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		

Demonstrate familiarity in determining design priorities and alternatives; research, refine and evaluate criteria and requirements; coordinate project elements; and communicate with other personnel at all stages of the design process	Portfolio review of work submitted at the end of both the junior and the senior year through *ARTG 354 Professional Practices in Graphic Design*.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate familiarity in basic business practices and the history of graphic design	Written assignments and exams through *ARTG 354 Professional Practices in Graphic Design*. Area faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	Junior year: 15% exceed expectations 30% meet expectations 45% overall meet or exceed expectations Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		

Definitions:

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Provide assessment here:

Most assessments of the graphic design students will take place in *ARTG 354 Professional Practices in Graphic Design*. Students take this one-credit-hour course each semester they are in the graphic design program for a total of four credits. Each semester, students turn in an updated portfolio of their work, which is reviewed by faculty. The assessments in the past were not completely aligned with the listed competencies and were tied to student feedback more than assessment purposes. They have not been kept or compiled. Moving forward, the assessments will be aligned to the competencies and data will be collected and analyzed.

Learner Outcomes (e.g. capstone, licensing/certification exam pass rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				
2017-18				

BFA in Studio Art

The BFA in Studio Art seeks to engage students through a broad-based program incorporating sustained scholarship and creativity. The various concentrations in the BFA encourage professional intellectual development, critical awareness, and expressive excellence. The BFA in Studio Art degree is the initial professional degree in preparation for graduate study in studio arts. In this intense program, the student becomes familiar with every aspect, technique and direction of the chosen concentration. These include Applied Drawing, Ceramics, Community & Social Practices, Electronic Media, Painting, Photo Media, Print Media and Sculpture.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
Demonstrate proficiency in applying principles emphasized in the Art Foundation studies, Art Distribution studios, and Introductory Survey Art History courses	Review of work exhibited at the end of the senior year through *ARTS 599 Senior Exhibition*.	Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		Senior students in Studio Art currently take *ARTS 599* in their final semester, but competencies are not being formally assessed. Area faculty will develop rubrics and apply them in future semesters.
Demonstrate proficiency in applying principles of visual and spatial organization to various media or creative processes	Review of work exhibited at the end of the senior year through *ARTS 599 Senior Exhibition*.	Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency in expressing ideas through a range of media and specialization within one or more media	Review of work exhibited at the end of the senior year through *ARTS 599 Senior Exhibition*.	Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate capacity to generate work that reflects professional sensibilities and creative content	Review of work exhibited at the end of the senior year through *ARTS 599 Senior Exhibition*.	Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency, knowledge and historical awareness of at least two methods of creative practices related to the chosen BFA concentration	Review of work exhibited at the end of the senior year through *ARTS 599 Senior Exhibition*.	Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate advanced knowledge of issues in contemporary art history,	Written assignments and exams through *ARTS 599 Senior Exhibition*. Area	Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations		

criticism, and theory related to the BFA concentration	faculty will establish a rubric to assess this outcome.	95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency in the abilities required to exhibit, compete and participate in creative venues on the local, national and international level	Review of work exhibited at the end of the senior year through *ARTS 599 Senior Exhibition*.	Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		
Demonstrate proficiency in presenting creative research in visual, written and oral contexts. Including workshop presentations, artist talks etc.	Review of work exhibited at the end of the senior year through *ARTS 599 Senior Exhibition*.	Senior year: 30% exceed expectations 55% meet expectations 95% overall meet or exceed expectations		

Definitions:

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Provide assessment here:

Most assessments of the studio art students will take place in *ARTS 599 Senior Exhibition*. Moving forward, assessments for the studio art students will be tied to this course.

Learner Outcomes (e.g. capstone, licensing/certification exam pass rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				
2017-18				

BFA Art Education

Although Art Education is a concentration of the BFA in Art, it has a different set of learning outcomes and assessments. The Art Education Program has seven state standards for the preparation of art teachers with the assessments embedded in the coursework. The standards are represented in the national PRAXIS Exam, the Teacher Work Sample, and the art teacher candidate student teacher Supervisor Evaluation Form.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
Demonstrate proficiency in applying principles emphasized in the Pre-Art and Design curriculum; Art Foundation studies, Art Distribution studios, and Introductory Survey Art History courses	Mid-Program Portfolio	Minimum of 80% pass rate is the target	100% exceed expectations	The vast majority of learning outcomes for the Art Education program are assessed and on target.
	Senior Portfolio and Teacher website – ARTE 517		100% meet expectations	
The teacher of art demonstrates a strong scholarly foundation in art education and has a clear conception of how art links students to the broad experiences of life.	History of Art Education Artifact – ARTE 410	Minimum of 80% pass rate is the target	93% exceed expectations 17% fail	
	Kansas Professional Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) - ARTE 410 and ARTE 459 (student teaching internship)		100% exceed expectations	
	KEEP Evaluation conducted by University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher – ARTE 410, 459, 462 (student teaching internship)		100% meet expectations	
The teacher of art demonstrates knowledge, competency and teaching ability in the content of art, including aesthetics, art history, art criticism, and studio performance.	Kansas Professional Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) - ARTE 410 and ARTE 459 (student teaching experience)	Minimum of 80% pass rate is the target	100% meet expectations	
	KEEP Evaluation conducted by University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher during student teaching		100% meet expectations	
The teacher of art creates an environment where individuals, art content, and inquiry are held in high regard and where students can actively learn and create.	Kansas Professional Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) - ARTE 410 and ARTE 459 (student teaching internship)	Minimum of 80% pass rate is the target	100% meet expectations	
	KEEP Evaluation conducted by University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher – ARTE 410, 459, 462 (student teaching internship)		100% meet expectations	

The teacher of art selects and adapts a variety of appropriate resources, materials and technologies in order to design a curriculum, which enables students to learn, make, and respond to art.	Kansas Professional Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) - ARTE 410 and ARTE 459 (student teaching internship)	Minimum of 80% pass rate is the target	100% meet expectations	
	KEEP Evaluation conducted by University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher – ARTE 410, 459, 462 (student teaching internship)		100% meet expectations	
The teacher of art demonstrates knowledge of collaborative and promotional strategies for working with colleagues, families and community groups to achieve common goals for enriching the art program enhancing students' learning and improving schools.	School Promotional Artifact - ARTE 410	Minimum of 80% pass rate is the target	93% exceed expectations 17% fail	
	Community / School Collaboration Project – ARTE 514		100% meet expectations	
The teacher of art understands the purposes, principles and design of assessments, as well as the importance of regular monitoring, analysis and evaluation for assessing student and program improvement.	Kansas Professional Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) - ARTE 410, 459, 462 (student teaching internship)	Minimum of 80% pass rate is the target	100% meet expectations	
	KEEP Evaluation conducted by University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher – ARTE 410, 459, 462		100% meet expectations	
The teacher of art demonstrates knowledge of professional art organizations, continues professional development, and shows responsibility to the field of art.	Professional Goals & Resources Artifact and Reflection – ARTE 41	Minimum of 80% pass rate is the target	100% meet expectations	
	Student Teaching Visual Journaling, Self-Evaluation, and Teacher Website – ARTE 517		100% meet expectations	
	Participation and Reflection of a Teacher In-service/professional conference experience and/or Parent Teacher Conferencing – ARTE 517		100% meet expectations	

Definitions:

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Provide assessment here:

The Art Education program has regular assessments of their students. They are currently using the PASS system through the College of Applied Studies. Students seem to be exceeding expectations for the program.

Learner Outcomes (e.g. capstone, licensing/certification exam pass rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				
2017-18		Art Content Praxis	73.67% passed	71.42% passed

MFA in Art

The Master of Fine Arts in Art (MFA) degree is the terminal degree for studio art. It is offered for qualified students planning careers as professional artists, either working independently or as artist-teachers on the college or art school level. The MFA program competency expectations, degree structure, and procedures reflect the professional intensity and high standards expected of all terminal degree programs. Degree requirements, course distribution, content and evaluation are designed to meet or exceed program expectations, Graduate School requirements, NASAD guidelines and College Art Association standards.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
Advanced competence in the studio emphasis demonstrated through an original and inventive vision in approach to studio practice, form and content as preparation for a professional artist career.	Assessed through Terminal Project Review Exhibition at the end of the program.	20% exceed expectations 80% meet expectations		
Additional competence in the studio minor or minors that enhance the studio emphasis and encourage inter-disciplinary studio practice, dialogue and critical thinking.	Assessed through Terminal Project Review Exhibition at the end of the program.	20% exceed expectations 60% meet expectations		
Awareness of major historical and contemporary developments and issues in art practice, theory and criticism, with particular awareness of information that is most relevant to the student's own work.	Assessed through Oral Defense with Terminal Project Committee during Terminal Project Review as well as written statement.	30% exceed expectations 70% meet expectations		
Developed facility in informed and meaningful written and oral presentation of ideas, issues and critical assessment.	Assessed through Oral Defense with Terminal Project Committee during Terminal Project Review as well as written statement.	20% exceed expectations 70% meet expectations		
Ability to conduct meaningful creative research in visual, written and oral formats, and ability to utilize current technologies in the creation (as applicable), documentation, promotion and presentation of such research.	Assessed through Oral Defense with Terminal Project Committee during Terminal Project Review as well as written statement.	20% exceed expectations 80% meet expectations		

Demonstration of engagement, self-discipline and motivation appropriate for a terminal academic degree.	Assessed each year through meeting degree requirement deadlines for materials and demonstrated involvement with area faculty through required critiques.	20% exceed expectations 80% meet expectations		
Evidence of ability to successfully engage in the profession through the exhibition of work, professional conference participation, presentation of research, grant or fellowship activity, artist residencies, etc.	Assessed through Resume/CV turned in at Terminal project Review.	20% exceed expectations 80% meet expectations		
Trained, supervised and assessed graduate teaching experience as preparation for a professional artist educator career.	Assessed through GA and GTA evaluations completed by supervising faculty member.	20% exceed expectations 70% meet expectations		
Professional presentation of a cohesive body of work culminating in the terminal project exhibition and oral defense.	Assessed through Terminal Project Review Exhibition at the end of the program.	30% exceed expectations 70% meet expectations		

Definitions:

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Provide assessment here:

There are regular assessment points in the graduate program. Moving forward, the assessments will be aligned to the competencies and data will be collected and analyzed.

Learner Outcomes (e.g. capstone, licensing/certification exam pass rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				
2017-18				

d. **Narrative:** Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results (if applicable), employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the outcomes of the program as listed in 3c). Evaluate table 10 from the Office of Planning and Analysis regarding student satisfaction data.

Provide assessment here:

Table 10: Satisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit – STUDIO ART										
	Academic Year (fall-spring-summer sequence)							Rolling 5 AY average		
Student level:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017
University **Undergraduate** level	n/a	79.5%	82.9%	81.4%	80.9%	80.7%	82.3%	n/a	81.3%	81.6%
College Division Undergraduate level	n/a	75.0%	79.3%	72.9%	81.4%	78.6%	86.1%	n/a	78.9%	79.6%
Program Undergraduate majors:										
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	61.5%	81.1%	56.3%	75.0%	79.3%	70.6%	n/a	70.6%	72.4%
mean	n/a	3.7	4.2	3.6	3.7	4.0	3.9	n/a	3.9	3.9
median	n/a	4	4	4.0	4	4	4	n/a	4	4
count	n/a	26	37	32	20	29	34	n/a	28.8	30.4
University **Graduate** level	n/a	80.0%	82.6%	82.1%	84.9%	85.4%	82.9%	n/a	83.0%	83.6%
College Division Graduates level	n/a	78.6%	91.7%	77.8%	81.5%	76.1%	87.1%	n/a	81.1%	82.8%
Program Graduate majors:										
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	75.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	n/a	88.3%	93.3%
mean	n/a	3.8	5.0	4.0	4.8	4.5	4.2	n/a	4.4	22.5
median	n/a	4	5	4.5	5	4.5	4	n/a	4.6	23.0
count	n/a	4	1	6	4	4	5	n/a	3.8	20.0

note: primary majors only; data from the Application For Degree Exit Survey; scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high (very satisfied).

In the studio art program (which includes all undergraduate degrees within the school except the BFA in Graphic Design), there is a wide swing in the satisfied/very satisfied numbers over the past five years ranging from a low of 56.3% in 2014 to a high of 81.1% in 2013. The current trend is moving slightly upward when looking at the rolling five-year averages. However, in the studio art areas, the numbers are significantly lower when compared to the college and university numbers. While data does not exist to pinpoint the exact reason for this lower satisfaction, it could be assumed that they are tied in part to ADCI equipment and facilities. Given the level of funding within the school, equipment and facilities in McKnight and Henrion Hall have not seen many upgrades over the years. With the recent change in fee structure, the school has had the ability to begin to upgrade furniture, equipment and classrooms, but this will be a slow process. This issue is most pressing and apparent in Henrion. Again, with current the current fee structure, we are finally seeing a little bit of movement. Recent plans to begin repairs of Henrion will hopefully see these numbers rise over the next few years.

That being said, the faculty in the school still need to look at the program and talk with students about other possible issues. It would be a mistake to assume that the low satisfaction numbers are solely related to equipment and facilities. This becomes apparent when considering the undergraduate satisfaction numbers along side the graduate numbers, which are extremely high for most of the years listed in the chart. If the problems with program satisfaction were completely tied to the facilities, one would expect that it would also show in the graduate satisfaction numbers as they work mainly in the Henrion facility.

Table 10: Satisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit – GRAPHIC DESIGN

		Academic Year (fall-spring-summer sequence)						Rolling 5 AY average		
Student level:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017
University **Undergraduate** level	n/a	79.5%	82.9%	81.4%	80.9%	80.7%	82.3%	n/a	81.3%	81.6%
College Division Undergraduate level	n/a	75.0%	79.3%	72.9%	81.4%	78.6%	86.1%	n/a	78.9%	79.6%
Program Undergraduate majors:										
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	66.7%	76.2%	71.4%	81.3%	81.0%	94.4%	n/a	75.3%	80.9%
mean	n/a	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.2	4.3	n/a	4.0	4.1
median	n/a	4	4	4.0	4	4	4	n/a	4	4
count	n/a	24	21	21	16	21	18	n/a	20.6	19.4
University **Graduate** level	n/a	80.0%	82.6%	82.1%	84.9%	85.4%	82.9%	n/a	83.0%	83.6%
College Division Graduates level	n/a	78.6%	91.7%	77.8%	81.5%	76.1%	87.1%	n/a	81.1%	82.8%
Program Graduate majors: n/a										

note: primary majors only; data from the Application For Degree Exit Survey; scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high (very satisfied).

In the graphic design program, the satisfied/very satisfied numbers have seen a fairly steady rise over the past few years from a low of 66.7% in 2012 to a high of 94.4% in 2017. The rolling five-year averages have been trending up and are in line with College and University numbers.

e. **Does your program support the university General Education program?** ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please complete the table below and respond to the narrative prompt. If no, skip to the next.

Outcomes:		
• Have acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences • Think critically and independently • Write and speak effectively • Employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques	Results	
	Majors	Non-Majors
All course listed below engage students to acquire knowledge in the arts	Outcome not assessed separately	
All courses listed below encourage students to think critically and independently	Outcome not assessed separately	
Most of the Art History courses encourage students to write effectively	Outcome not assessed separately	
Most courses listed below encourage students to employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques	Outcome not assessed separately	

Note: Not all programs evaluate every goal/skill. Programs may choose to use assessment rubrics for this purpose. Sample forms available at: http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/

Narrative Provide aggregate data on how the goals of the *WSU General Education Program* and *KBOR 2020 Foundation Skills* are assessed in undergraduate programs (optional for graduate programs).

Provide assessment here:

ADCI offers the following classes in the General Education Program:

Introductory Courses
ARTH 103. Art Appreciation
ARTH 125. Introduction to Visual and Material Culture
ARTS 211. Introduction to Community & Social Practice
ARTS 270. Introduction to Ceramics

Advanced Further Studies courses
ARTH 346. Modernisms I
ARTH 347. Themes in Contemporary Art and Design I
ARTH 349. Architecture and the Built Environment
ARTH 387. Theories of Art History and Culture

Advanced Issues and Perspectives courses
ARTE 303. Stimulating Creative Behavior
ARTS 312. Community Arts Engagement
ARTS 322. Video, Sound & Performance

All of these courses seek to educate the general WSU student about the arts. I am not aware of a requirement to assess the general education learning outcomes for these classes. Do rubrics need to be developed for each of these classes to assess the learning outcomes and report back for the next program review cycle?

f. **Concurrent Enrollment — Does the program offer concurrent enrollment courses?** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If no, skip to next question.

Narrative: For programs/departments with concurrent enrollment courses (per KBOR policy), provide the assessment of such courses over the last three years (disaggregated by each year) that assures grading standards (e.g., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) course management, instructional delivery, and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.

Provide assessment here: Not Applicable

g. **Accreditation – Is the program accredited by a specialty accreditation body?** ☒ Yes ☐ No

Narrative: If yes, please note the name of the body, the next review date and concerns from the last review.

Provide assessment here:

Our accrediting body is the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). We are currently going through the review process. The accreditation team will be on campus in early April and final action by the commission will be taken in

October. The last review happened in 2009. There have been two directors since that review and the records are not complete, but I believe all the issues identified have been addressed.

h. **Credit hour determination – How does the department assign credit hours to courses?**

Narrative*:* Provide the process the department uses to assure assignment of credit hours (per WSU policy 2.18) to all courses has been reviewed over the last three years.

Provide assessment here:

Five years ago, all courses within ADCI were reviewed by area faculty and Credit Hour statements were added to syllabi based on HLC accreditation requirements. With each Curriculum Change Form submitted, the curriculum committee of the school and the school director reviews the content to ensure that it meets the minimum requirements for credit hour assignment.

ADCI courses follow the policy as outlined in WSU Policy 4.08. ADCI delivers three types of courses – lectures, studios and internships. Per university policy, lecture courses meet for three hours per week in person and have a work expectation of six hours per week outside of class. Studios meet for six hours a week in person and have a work expectation of at least three hours per week outside of class. Internships are a little different since there are no in-class meetings, but they are required to be spending at least three times the credit hours given engaged in the internship activities per week.

A review of all courses has not taken place over the past three years. In reviewing Policies and Procedures, I am unsure of the mechanism and process that is supposed to trigger this review. This document references Policy 2.18, which doesn't exist. I think the policy has been changed to Policy 4.08. This policy makes no mention of a three-year review of credit hour assignment. ADCI is happy to do a periodic review of credit hour assignment, but is unsure of the trigger for the review to occur.

Overall Assessment – Define the Overall quality of the academic program.

Provide assessment here:

While ADCI has clearly not been following the assessment standards desired by the university, steps are currently underway to implement them going forward. A new system should be in place during the fall 2019 semester and ADCI will develop the necessary rubrics for our spring 2020 courses. A full set of data should be available for the next Program Review cycle.

Even without the assessment system in place, evidence shows that overall the academic quality of our program is high. Students are receiving a good education in the visual arts area of their choice. Satisfaction overall among undergraduates and graduates in all programs are trending up when considering the rolling five year averages. Students in the graphic design and art education areas are finding jobs in large numbers in the local job market. Many of our studio art students are finding jobs and considering graduate education.

Part 5: Student Need and Employer Demand

Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program/certificate. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.

Employment of Majors* – STUDIO ART							
	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS** Current year only.
2013-14	$52,710	81.3%	56.3%	6.3%	18.8%	12.5%	
2014-15	$47,780	91.7%	58.3%	25.0%	8.3%	8.3%	
2015-16	$43,690	78.6%	21.4%	28.6%	35.7%	14.3%	
2016-17	$49,200	58.3%	16.7%	8.3%	41.7%	33.3%	NA KS / 5.5% National

Employment of Majors* – GRAPHIC DESIGN							
	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS** Current year only.
2013-14	$39,470	100.0%	83.3%	5.6%	11.1%	0.0%	
2014-15	$45,010	100.0%	86.7%	6.7%	6.7%	0.0%	
2015-16	$44,540	82.4%	70.6%	5.9%	23.5%	0.0%	
2016-17	$46,520	91.7%	91.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	-0.8% KS / 4.2% National

* May not be collected every year

** Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: http://www.bls.gov/oco/ and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

ADCI has not actively collected the data in the tables above from graduates in the past. The information that has been filled in is based on faculty knowledge of student employment within the first six months after graduation for the most part. Percentages do not include students whose occupational information is unknown.

The Average Salary data is for the state of Kansas and collected from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics page at https://www.bls.gov/oes/tables.htm. It is not a reflection of that average salary of our students.

The Projected Growth from BLS link provided did not work, so the data provided is from Projections Central, Long Term Occupational Projects site at http://www.projectionscentral.com/Projections/LongTerm. Projections for Kansas then national are provided. All other data in the chart is based on faculty knowledge of student employment.

Narrative: Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from tables 11-15 ==from the Office of Planning Analysis for number of applicants, admits, and enrollments and percent URM students by student level and degrees conferred==. AND provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis and from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find.

Provide assessment here:

Table 11: Applications, Admits and Enrollment for Undergraduate and Graduate Applicants – STUDIO ART and GRAPHIC DESIGN										
	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)							Rolling 5 FY average		
Student level:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017
Undergraduates:										
Applicants	71	85	117	96	153	171	169	104	124	141
Admitted	69	81	110	90	143	155	161	99	116	132
Census day	43	48	66	52	77	74	73	57	63	68
Graduates:										
Applicants	15	16	19	16	14	11	7	16	15	13
Admitted	8	11	12	9	9	7	5	10	10	8
Census day	5	7	6	4	5	5	5	5	5	5

note: unduplicated count as last record of FY; applicants exclude incomplete or cancelled applications; applications include pre-Art & Design.

All undergraduate students entering ADCI come in as BA in Art students (use of the Pre-Art & Design code was discontinued in 2018). Students must apply to the degree program they want to pursue through *ARTF 202 Mid-Program Review* in the spring of their sophomore year. Therefore, there is no distinction between students entering the school with the intention of pursuing graphic design or studio art. The data shows that there is a growing level of interest in the program over the years shown. Applications have grown 238% from 2011 to 2017. The vast majority of the students that apply are also admitted, averaging 94.2% during the reported years. Of concern is the number of students who attend ADCI once admitted. In 2011, 62.3% of the admitted students followed through and actually came to WSU. That percentage has been in steady decline to a low of 45.3% in 2017. These numbers would tend to indicate that there is plenty of demand for the programs we offer in the school, students are expressing their interest and applying, but we are not "closing the deal," so to speak. The school needs to step up efforts to convert admitted students into actual students. Over the summer of 2019, the ADCI office will be working on a mailing campaign targeting admitted students who have shown interest in the school with the hope of convincing them to choose WSU.

The school's graduate program, the MFA in Art, is triggered due to lower then required enrollment. To maintain a three-year masters program, around seven students need to be admitted each year. While the number of applicants have declined over the past few years (rolling five-year average of 16 down to 13), there are still enough qualified students being admitted to get the number of students up to the requisite 20. However, the number of students that actually enter the program has remained steady at five (according to the rolling five-year average). There are a number of possible reasons for this fact that will be addressed in Part 7: Graduate Enrollment Management.

When considering employment opportunities for ADCI undergraduates, we cater to four main areas or vocations.

Students pursuing the BFA in Art, Art Education Concentration are working towards licensure to become a K-12 art teacher in the public schools. The students tend to be very well prepared for this career path and nearly all students become licensed in the state and find jobs. In fact, in recent years, representatives of USD 259 have lamented the fact that WSU does not produce more Art Education teachers.

Students pursuing the BA in Art, Art History Concentration tend to look at graduate school after graduation. Typical jobs would include curator, preparator or possibly a faculty position teaching art history.

Students pursuing the BFA in Graphic Design tend to look for jobs as graphic designers. Work environments range from small design firms, to advertising agencies, to in-house design departments. Some students work in more production- or service-oriented jobs for printing companies, paper companies and specialty advertising companies. Students have also become freelancers, working for small clients and providing contract design for larger firms.

Students pursuing the BA in Art, Art Concentration and one of the concentrations in the BFA in Art tend to look for jobs with a studio art focus. These can be in museums, galleries, community arts organizations, etc. Some work as independent artists or pursue graduate education. A number of recent graduates have started small businesses of their own, creating and selling art, painting murals or publishing their own work through books and zines. Jobs that studio art students might pursue are preparator, art handler, art framer, community arts organizer, muralist, artist, fabricator, etc. In an effort to help students see the possibilities for their career, the school has put together a poster and brochure called 275 Art Jobs. These are discussed briefly in Part 8 of this report.

Table 12: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) on Fall Census Day

Student level:	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
University level:										
Freshmen & Sophomores	17.0%	17.9%	18.5%	18.5%	19.3%	19.2%	20.0%	18.2%	18.7%	19.1%
Juniors & Seniors	14.0%	14.8%	15.4%	14.9%	15.7%	15.9%	16.6%	15.0%	15.3%	15.7%
Masters	8.2%	9.8%	11.3%	9.7%	9.9%	10.2%	10.7%	9.8%	10.2%	10.4%
Doctoral	6.6%	5.4%	6.7%	6.5%	7.0%	9.0%	11.5%	6.4%	6.9%	8.1%
College division level:										
Freshmen & Sophomores	15.0%	16.9%	16.9%	18.2%	16.7%	11.3%	16.6%	16.7%	16.0%	16.0%
Juniors & Seniors	13.6%	14.4%	15.3%	15.9%	16.2%	18.0%	15.7%	15.1%	16.0%	16.2%
Masters	5.5%	7.2%	7.8%	8.7%	14.8%	13.3%	14.6%	8.8%	10.3%	11.8%
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
STUDIO ART Program level:										
Freshmen & Sophomores	16.5%	22.0%	17.8%	18.7%	20.8%	11.7%	15.8%	19.2%	18.2%	16.9%
Juniors & Seniors	15.0%	20.6%	21.2%	19.1%	15.3%	15.9%	16.8%	18.3%	18.4%	17.7%
Masters	12.5%	7.1%	0.0%	12.5%	21.4%	28.6%	26.7%	10.7%	13.9%	17.8%
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GRAPHIC DESIGN Program level:										
Freshmen & Sophomores	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%	5.0%	5.0%
Juniors & Seniors	13.7%	13.2%	6.8%	19.4%	23.7%	26.2%	23.7%	15.4%	17.9%	20.0%
Masters *	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; URM includes black non-hispanic, Hawaiian, Hawaiian indian/Hawaiia native & Hawaiian. * The data provided is incorrect and has been changed here. Graphic design does not have a Masters program.

Table 14: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) of Degreed Conferred Students by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017
University level:										
Doctoral	7.6%	6.5%	7.8%	4.7%	6.9%	6.7%	10.0%	6.7%	6.5%	7.2%
Masters	6.4%	9.0%	10.8%	10.0%	8.6%	9.9%	9.7%	9.0%	9.6%	9.8%
Bachelor	12.0%	12.8%	12.7%	13.6%	14.4%	15.1%	14.1%	13.1%	13.7%	14.0%
Associate	18.8%	18.4%	21.2%	26.7%	20.8%	26.4%	16.2%	21.2%	22.7%	22.3%
College division level:										
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Masters	10.0%	7.1%	7.7%	6.5%	3.7%	9.5%	12.1%	7.0%	6.9%	7.9%
Bachelor	16.3%	7.1%	10.9%	11.5%	14.1%	21.2%	12.6%	12.0%	13.0%	14.1%
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
STUDIO ART Program level:										
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Masters	25.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	11.7%	6.7%	4.0%
Bachelor	17.2%	4.2%	22.6%	20.0%	21.1%	11.1%	16.7%	17.0%	15.8%	18.3%
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GRAPHIC DESIGN Program level:										
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Masters	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bachelor	18.8%	9.5%	0.0%	12.5%	10.0%	28.0%	20.0%	10.2%	12.0%	14.1%
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

Numbers of under-represented minorities within the school seem to be in line with the university overall and in the case of juniors and seniors are slightly higher than the university overall. Making art can be a very personal experience where artists express their deep feelings and concerns. Some students work through previous personal trauma in their artwork, and the results can be quite sensitive and personal. Overall, the faculty go to great lengths to make everyone feel welcome and valued in our curriculum, allowing students to explore a wide range of viewpoints and backgrounds. Conscious efforts have been made to align the make-up of our faculty with our student population so that all students can find mentors and role models in the faculty. When considering conferred degrees, the school meets the university average or exceeds it in many cases. As the Shocker Cities program ramps up with more urban areas, it would be expected that the numbers of URM students would rise.

Part 6: Program and Faculty Service

Analyze the service the Program/certificate provides to the **discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond**. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Narrative: Provide a brief assessment of the service the Program provides. Comment on percentage of SCH taken by majors and non-majors (using table 16 from the Office of Planning Analysis for SCH by student department affiliation on fall census day), nature of Program in terms of the service it provides to other University programs, faculty service to the institution, and beyond.

Provide assessment here:

In looking at the charts provided by OPA (reproduced below) I am not sure that the data is completely clear across the two majors the charts indicate. The Studio Art charts throughout the data set are, to the best of my understanding, a compilation of the number of students in the BA in Art and the BFA in Studio Art. The BA in Art includes two concentrations, one in Art and one in Art History. The Art History concentration is a relatively small number of the majors within the school. However, all freshman and sophomore students are required to be in the BA in Art degree code until after Mid-Program Review at the end of their sophomore year. This would include both the students who eventually want to study studio art and graphic design. These charts also include all the concentrations within the BFA in Studio Art, one of which is the Art Education degree, which has different requirements and different competencies.

With this in mind, the charts below seem a bit confusing. The first row including the Total number of SCH is for the school as a whole. But in the chart for Studio Art directly below, the non-program majors numbers include the graphic design students. One would assume that when we are looking at non-program majors, we are actually talking about non-ADCI majors. This would be more indicative of how much service ADCI is supplying to the rest of the university.

Table 16: Department Student Credit Hour (SCH) by Student Department Affiliation on Fall Census Day – STUDIO ART

Major & student level:	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
Total	3,380	3,510	3,337	3,200	3,551	3,310	3,346	3,396	3,382	3,349
Program UG majors	2,077	1,981	1,972	1,696	1,948	1,637	1,607	1,935	1,847	1,772
Program GR majors	152	138	136	153	130	118	151	142	135	138
Non-program majors	1,151	1,391	1,229	1,351	1,473	1,555	1,588	1,319	1,400	1,439
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Program UG major	61.4%	56.4%	59.1%	53.0%	54.9%	49.5%	48.0%	57.0%	54.6%	52.9%
Program GR major	4.5%	3.9%	4.1%	4.8%	3.7%	3.6%	4.5%	4.2%	4.0%	4.1%
Non-program majors	34.1%	39.6%	36.8%	42.2%	41.5%	47.0%	47.5%	38.8%	41.4%	43.0%

note: program majors includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

The numbers in the Graphic Design chart make it seem as if this area is providing a large number of SCH support to the rest of the university outside ADCI when considering the non-program majors row, but in actuality, most of the SCH included here is from the studio art students.

Table 16: Department Student Credit Hour (SCH) by Student Department Affiliation on Fall Census Day – GRAPHIC DESIGN

Major & student level:	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
Total	3,380	3,510	3,337	3,200	3,551	3,310	3,346	3,396	3,382	3,349
Program UG majors	366	427	385	351	322	367	317	370	370	348
Program GR majors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-program majors	3,014	3,083	2,952	2,849	3,229	2,943	3,029	3,025	3,011	3,000
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Program UG major	10.8%	12.2%	11.5%	11.0%	9.1%	11.1%	9.5%	10.9%	11.0%	10.4%
Program GR major	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-program majors	89.2%	87.8%	88.5%	89.0%	90.9%	88.9%	90.5%	89.1%	89.0%	89.6%

note: program majors includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

I think that this chart is a little clearer where all the numbers are considered in one comprehensive chart:

Table 16: Department Student Credit Hour (SCH) by Student Department Affiliation on Fall Census Day – ADCI										
	Year of Fall Census Day							Rolling 5 year average		
Major & student level:	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2010-2014	2011-2015	2012-2016
Total	3,380	3,510	3,337	3,200	3,551	3,310	3,346	3,396	3,382	3,349
Studio Art program UG majors	2,077	1,981	1,972	1,696	1,948	1,637	1,607	1,935	1,847	1,772
Studio Art program GR majors	152	138	136	153	130	118	151	142	135	138
Graphic Design program UG majors	366	427	385	351	322	367	317	370	370	348
Non-ADCI program majors	785	964	844	1,000	1,151	1,188	1,271	949	1,030	1,091
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Studio Art Program UG major	61.45	56.4%	59.1%	53.0%	54.9%	49.5%	48.0%	57.0%	54.6%	52.9%
Studio Art Program GR major	4.5%	3.9%	4.1%	4.8%	3.7%	3.6%	4.5%	4.2%	4.0%	4.1%
Graphic Design UG program majors	10.8%	12.2%	11.5%	11.0%	9.1%	11.1%	9.5%	10.1%	11.0%	10.4%
Non-ADCI program majors	23.2%	39.6%	36.8%	42.2%	41.5%	47.0%	47.5%	38.8%	41.4%	43.0%

note: program majors includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

Most of the ADCI faculty are engaged in teaching visual arts students. In this new chart configuration, we see that the number of SCH within the school taken by non-ADCI students has steadily risen over the past few years. The rolling five-year average from 2010-14 of 949 SCH has risen to 1,091 in the 1012-2016 average. This would indicate that more non-ADCI students are engaging with the visual arts more. This is probably due in part to more General Education offerings by the school. In the last few years an online Art Appreciation class and on-campus Intro to Ceramics have both been offered as Fine Arts Introductory courses. These two classes have drawn a larger number of non-art majors to our classes. Not reflected in these numbers are other general education courses in Community & Social Practices. There are also a few ADCI classes required within the new Bachelor of Applied Arts program within the college.

Part 7: Graduate Enrollment Management (GEM)

For each graduate program, summarize and reflect on the progress you have made toward your GEM plan following the (a)-(e) template.

Narrative:
   a. Program name:
   b. In 2-4 sentences, summarize the GEM plan, paying particular attention to the vision, actions, and GEM evaluation.
   c. Discuss how graduate assistantships are being used to advance the GEM goals.
   d. Provide an assessment of successes, challenges, and deficiencies with the GEM plan.
   e. Summarize how the GEM plan is being updated going forward based on the findings above.

Provide assessment here:

   a. Master of Fine Arts in Art

   b. The school does not have a GEM plan in place. In the middle of the timeline for the development of these plans, there was a change in leadership in the school and the following year, the graduate coordinator stepped down. In the transition, the plan was not developed.

   c. The graduate assistantships received by the school are used to support the graduate students that are recruited.

   d. Since there is not a GEM plan in place, the point will discuss the successes, challenges and deficiencies to the graduate program that the GEM plan could help to address.

   Successes

   The MFA in Art at Wichita State is one of the oldest programs in the country with the first student receiving the MFA degree in 1955. The program has been triggered by KBOR for the last 20 years or more because of lower than desired enrollment. Though this is a Masters program and it is evaluated by KBOR like all other Masters programs in the university, it should be pointed out that this is a 60-hour degree with a terminal thesis/project requirement. It is the recognized terminal degree for students in the visual arts. In this way, it is much more like a doctoral program than a regular masters program. Perhaps in the future it should be evaluated closer to the other doctoral programs in the university from financial, load, and enrollment standpoints.

   Successes of the program include a faculty that are recognized not only nationally, but internationally. ADCI faculty have participated in exhibitions, biennials, conferences and residencies around the world. The program draws in a diverse population of students. These students work in a wide range of media, many in an interdisciplinary manner. Many of our MFA graduates go on to teaching positions at other universities around the country. Some go on to work for museums, community arts organizations or as independent artists.

   Challenges and Deficiencies

   There are three main challenges that the program faces—facilities, load credit for faculty and stipends for students.

   Facilities is one of the top issues ADCI faces as a school and it has a definite impact on our graduate program. All graduate studios are in Herion Hall and the ceramics and sculpture classes meet in the building also. This facility has been in decline for years with little attention paid to its upkeep or health and safety issues. While the structure of the building seems solid, the interior is problematic.

   Ventilation. The ceramics and sculpture areas generate a lot of dust, some of it is known to cause serious health issues. Ventilation within these spaces has been an ongoing concern for more than 20 years. Some painting students work with paints, solvents and chemicals in their practice that also need to be ventilated. None of the graduate painting studios have proper ventilation.

   Infrastructure. While there is a lot of space within the Henrion complex, the workflow is not very good for the programs. This leads to duplication of equipment and difficulty in teaching students. Proper lighting and access to water is difficult in some areas. The HVAC systems are not connected and in many areas do not exist. Heating in the winter is not usually a problem, although there are areas within the building that get extremely hot even in the winter months. Most of the spaces do not have air conditioning and most of those that do just have old window units. The main workspaces in ceramics and sculpture can reach 90°+ for most of the summer making teaching classes or working in the space difficult. Graduate studios can also reach 90°+ temperatures in the summer months which makes working with solvents even more dangerous. High temperatures in the early fall and late spring require students to prop exterior doors open throughout the building into the evening leading to security concerns.

Upkeep. The building has not been maintained in a manner that shows any pride of ownership. Damage, whether through termites, rot or neglect has been left or repaired in a shoddy way. Floorboards that have rotted have been patched with pieces of exposed plywood. Damaged ceiling tiles have been thrown out and not replaced or left out of the ceiling grid. Paint is peeling off some walls in sheets. The building is not cleaned very well on a daily, weekly or even yearly basis. Insects and rodents are plentiful in the building.

This is not purely a Physical Plant or Facilities issue. Faculty, staff and students within the school have not always treated the building well either. The general dirtiness and disrepair of the building has led to people exacerbating the problem by letting debris and materials pile up that should be disposed of, or allowing past projects to accumulate throughout the space, taking away room from current students and their work. Likewise, faculty do not always adequately hold students accountable for keeping areas picked up or leaving their spaces in a neat and orderly fashion for the next student that will use it. Sometimes insufficient or unauthorized repairs or changes to the structure or facilities occur. While some of these are done with good intentions, the ripple effect of problems they cause are an issue we deal with every day.

Load credit for faculty in the program is another issue that has plagued the program. While there are typically 15-16 students enrolled in the program, there are five concentrations within the degree that are pretty distinct. The students are spread out across these concentrations. Because of this, it is difficult for a single faculty member to get load credit when working with students in their area. There are typically not enough of them to constitute a regular course assignment. This leads to faculty working with graduate students in an overload situation, taking time away from their own research, service to the university and their undergraduate classes. Whenever possible, graduate students meet with the advanced undergraduate students, but this does not account for all of the time faculty need to spend to maintain a quality program.

Graduate stipends for students are also an issue. The program is expected to have a rolling average of 20 students enrolled in the program, but currently only has funding for 14 positions. While there is enough interest and qualified candidates to get the program to 20 students, without funding students go to other programs. The visual arts do not have the same ability to generate outside funding of graduate students and their research as other programs within the university.

Looking Forward

The good news is that two of the challenges the program faces are beginning to be addressed.

The university has dedicated about $1 million dollars to address critical health and safety issues in Henrion beginning this summer (2019). This should address most of the dust ventilation issues and make Henrion much safer for our students, faculty and staff. An additional plan has been developed to address other portions of the infrastructure in the building, but the cost is large and funds are not currently available. The college, school and facilities are looking at ways to move forward with some of these improvements on a smaller piece-by piece basis.

Physical Plant has stepped up their efforts to address maintenance issues in the building of late and these efforts are most appreciated. Faculty, staff and students have noticed the changes.

Faculty and staff within the facilities have begun dealing with the backlog of materials and scrap that are in the building. The space is starting to look and function much better.

Hopefully these changes will make it easier to recruit graduate students to the program.

Discussions about load credit have also been taking place and hopefully some issues will be resolved beginning in the fall of 2019.

e. The Director and Graduate Coordinator will be working this summer with area faculty and the graduate school to develop a GEM plan and implement it in the Fall semester.

Part 8: Undergraduate Enrollment Management

For each undergraduate program, summarize and reflect on the progress you have made toward your colleges enrollment goals.

Narrative:
   a. Program name:
   b. In 2-4 sentences, summarize how the department and faculty have engaged in strategic enrollment management,
   c. Discuss how faculty have been engaged in recruitment and retention activities.
   d. Provide an assessment of successes, challenges, and deficiencies with departmental activities.

Provide assessment here:

Most, if not all of the efforts we have made are at the school level, so they will be addressed as a whole.

   a. BA in Art, BFA in Graphic Design, BFA in Studio Art.

   b. The school led an effort within the college to develop a database of all fine arts teachers in the state and the original Shocker Cities. This includes more than 2,500 visual arts and related teachers. Efforts to expand the database to include the new Shocker Cities is underway. Building on a very nice brochure that was developed at the end of the previous director's tenure, the school has developed a number of recruiting pieces that have been mailed in packets to all high school art teachers in the database. These pieces are also given out to students when they visit the school.

   c. The faculty have held a number of Portfolio reviews for area juniors and seniors to review portfolios and discuss educational options at WSU. Students attending the review are invited to be a part of an exhibition at our downtown location, WSU ShiftSpace Gallery, leading to public recognition of their work. ADCI has held recruiting-oriented open houses to allow people to see our facilities. We also strongly supported the first university open house with demonstrations for potential students and the public of our capabilities in printmaking and sculpture. Faculty serve as jurors for art competitions at high schools around the state. Faculty have been involved with the Midwest and Western Kansas Scholastics awards to recruit students. The Director has begun meeting with student representatives to discuss programmatic and facility needs from their perspective.

   d. Provide an assessment of successes, challenges, and deficiencies with departmental activities.

Part 9: Program Goals from Last Review

Report on the Program's/certificate's goal (s) from the last review. List the goal (s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

(For Last 3 FYs)	Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome
	To continue the School's innovative approaches to curricular development and to use these unique teaching and learning models to attract more students to Wichita State University.	There were a number of innovative ideas added to the curriculum right before the last review cycle. These included QuickFire courses that are short, one-credit hour courses themed around current issues in the art world or events taking place in Wichita. While a good idea and a potentially exciting part of the curriculum, the mechanism for how they work and how faculty get credit for teaching them was not thought through. Another idea that was implemented was the SlowBurn course. This six-credit hour course takes place over two semesters and encourages students to stick with a creative problem over multiple semesters. Once again, a good idea that was not fully thought through. Implementation of the idea has not been fully successful. Faculty from the school were involved in developing the BAA in Media Arts degree. Faculty are also teaching courses in the curriculum. Another possible curriculum development idea is an Architectural Studies degree developed over the past year. The office needs to push forward to see if this degree sequence could be implemented here at WSU. It would have the potential to bring in additional students to the school.	There have been some very successful iterations of both QuickFire and SlowBurn courses. These have led to wonderful applied learning opportunities for our students. Brittany Lockard's *Do It* class worked with the Ulrich Museum to plan and execute an exhibition. Robert Bubp's *Artist as Administrator* SlowBurn class encouraged students to find outlets for their creative endeavors in the real world. Students worked with people in the various communities around Wichita to produce books, create murals, etc. Kristin Beal offered a successful SlowBurn with the *Jump!Star* project that will culminate this summer at the Symphony of the Flint Hills. The BAA in Media Arts has been a fairly successful program. It has grown to over 200 majors in the short two years it has been offered at WSU. The Architectural Studies degree would partner with KSU to allow students to begin their studies at WSU and then complete the Post Baccalaureate Architecture program at KSU. This has the potential to bring in new students to ADCI and fill out some of our studio areas with extra capacity.
	To continue to build relationships within and outside Wichita State University that will enhance programmatic growth and innovation, as well as increased opportunities for applied, collaborative and industry-based learning.	The Community & Social Practices curriculum has great potential to connect with a number of other programs across campus. The Jump!Star classes, both the QuickFire and the SlowBurn have brought attention to the arts from across campus. The involvement of a number of areas from art to dance to science has been a good first step in connecting with others. The involvement of an outside artist for a sustained time with our students has been very successful.	Making the C&SP classes general education classes was a good step, but faculty in other areas need to have more information about what the classes entail so they feel comfortable encouraging student outside of ADCI to take the classes. Work should be done to increase outside involvement with these courses.

	To work diligently to ensure success of the School's capital campaign project for the construction of the Ideas Lab in Henrion Hall.	Unfortunately, two and a half years ago the capital campaign for Henrion was put on hold by the administration.	Even thought the capital campaign was shelved, we were able to work with Facilities Planning to get more than $1 million dollars towards improvements in Henrion. This will go a long way towards improving the facilities as far as health and safety for students go.
		We have not given up working towards improvements for Henrion Hall. We have also pushed to have repairs and upgrades made to McKnight Art Center. The goal is to make these facilities be a great and safe environment for WSU students to work in and learn about the arts.	We are also planning on moving forward with more improvements in the spaces for our graduate students. Their studio spaces need to be updated and equipped for maximum learning.
			Working with Facilities Planning, we were able to get the leaking skylight in the atrium of McKnight replaced last year when the roof was replaced. This year, they are replacing all the skylights in the classrooms and faculty offices. All of these windows have leaked for years. Countless pieces of student and faculty work and possessions have been destroyed over the years because of these leaking windows.

Part 10: Summary

Narrative: Set forth a summary of the report including an overview evaluating the strengths and concerns. List recommendations for improvement of each Program (for departments with multiple programs) that have resulted from this report (relate recommendations back to information provided in any of the categories and to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e).

Provide assessment here:

ADCI has a strong visual arts program, but we have significant challenges to face in the next few years. Obviously, as has been pointed throughout this report, we are lacking in the area of assessment. One of the first things we need to accomplish as a school is to develop the proper assessments needed to evaluate how we are doing.

Strengths:

ADCI has a strong visual arts program.

ADCI has a strong faculty. Most of them are active in their fields.

ADCI has quite a bit of space in our facilities to accomplish our goals.

Concerns:

Lacking assessments in many of our programs.

Enrollment in undergraduate and graduate Studio Art programs is lower than it should be.

Facilities, especially Henrion, need to be updated.

Faculty needed to deliver curriculum, currently we rely on a large number of adjuncts.

Recommendations:

Obviously, as has been pointed throughout this report, we are lacking in the area of assessment. One of the first things we need to accomplish as a school is to develop the proper assessments needed to evaluate how we are doing.

Work that will be done this summer will be a good first start on taking care of Henrion. The school needs to find ways to fund improvements from within our own budget until help from the university can occur. We have made beginning steps in this direction, but need to keep up the momentum.

Recruiting over the past two years is starting to show results, but we need to capitalize on the increased interest in the school.

The BA in Art, Art Emphasis is working well for students.

The BA in Art, Art History concentration has traditionally low enrollment, but efforts should be made to increase the understanding of this degree. Perhaps new practical classes or a certificate could be developed to expand the options for students wanting to study art history.

The BFA in Graphic Design is maxed out in the number of students it can handle with its current resources, but the demand is growing. Stepped up recruiting efforts across the school will create more demand on the graphic design area.

The BFA in Art, Art Education concentration is starting to see renewed interest with a new faculty member in place. This is a growth opportunity for the school.

The BFA in Art, Studio Art concentrations needs a slightly different or stronger organization to move students through the program in a more logical progression. Currently it is difficult to tell where students are in the program. Because of the low numbers in the various concentrations, they need to progress through in a more organized fashion to fill the classes they need to graduate. Because of disparities in the numbers in each concentration, resources need to be realigned and stronger recruiting efforts need to be made.

Currently, all freshmen entering the program are placed in one degree track, even though they are typically interested in studying one of two distinct areas, graphic design or studio art. It would be helpful to develop a BA in Art, Visual Communications concentration. This would allow students who are specifically interested in eventually studying graphic design to be separated out. This would aide it advising and planning purposes.

Our current Foundation curriculum is not very friendly to transfer students coming to WSU after two years of community college. Efforts need to be made to remove road-blocks for students transferring in to the program. Also, many students coming from Community Colleges are not taking the correct classes to seamlessly transfer. More communication with the community colleges needs to take place to ensure students transfer as seamlessly as possible.

Part 11: Forward-facing goals

Narrative: Identify goal (s) for the Program to accomplish in time for the next review. Goals must be **Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time-bound (SMART).**

List goals here:

1. During the summer and fall of 2019, the faculty will develop assessments and rubrics for all learning outcomes in our programs. This includes the BA in Art, Art Concentration; the BA in Art, Art History Concentration; the BFA in Graphic Design; the BFA in Studio Art; and the MFA in Art. The faculty will be ready to begin assessing these outcomes at the end of the spring 2020 semester.

2. More recruiting materials will be developed during the summer of 2019 specifically targeted at students who are admitted to WSU. This will include a series of post cards and emails that will provide more information about the benefits of studying at WSU. The goal will be to try and increase the conversion rate of admitted students to the 20th day census by 20% by the next Program Review cycle. In 2017, the conversion was 45.3%, down from 63.5% in 2011.

3. A GEM plan for the MFA in Art will be developed and implemented by the end of the fall 2019 semester.