Rough recap of April 15, 2016 Curriculum Council Discussion

Art/Visual Art Action Plan – Bradley Boovey, Neil Davison, Peter Sparks (via phone with Daniel Stroud)

- Undergraduate Program Review Report – Corvallis (see Art Rev Corvallis.pdf)
- Undergraduate Program Review Report – Bend (see Art Rev Bend.pdf)
- Action Plans – Corvallis and OSU Cascades (see Art AP.pdf)

Neil – dual report – 1 day Corvallis; 1 day Bend; program had problems to be addressed. Bend – small program staffed by two who were retiring the year of the review. Corvallis – program that had been a fiefdom in department form – student retention – small number of majors, students had issues with space and access to professor, courses they felt should have been staffed by professors was staffed by instructors, advocating to another school, etc. Lack of data – programs never studied by national organizations. Hope that both programs can be restructured and successful. Review felt it was important to get the program up and running and successful.

Bradley – Aps – Corvallis AP is comprehensive- addressed points made re: advancing program and recruiting majors. Important addressed issues – unit doesn’t see a return of Graphic Design to CLA (from COB); they’re thinking of how to align arts degree with other CLA units – the bulk of the majors were in GD. Put in place plans to get accreditation from NSD and ?? (in report) –crucial to move forward. Reviewing teaching faculty and hiring teaching faculty to teach beginning courses. Outreach – JumpStart and Montage had fallen by the way; committed to bringing back on board. Advisor in Art is incredible and very familiar with majors – recentering his role via UEngage. And hiring in Sculpture and 3D – hopes to have onboard in Fall 2017. Facilities are limited for what Art needs to do. CLA SP includes a new Art facility; Snell studio renovations are underway for majors. Question now is where program is in terms of addressing issues.

Neil - lost sense of community among majors. Trying to mesh Fine Arts and Arts into Design.

Creating connections with other colleges, e.g., Renewable Wood Art

Peter – Bend – context – two art professors retired last year; had to decide whether to keep Art or not. Cascades wants a vital Art program, for students, campus and Central Oregon community for vibrant art community in and around Bend. Currently trying to expand from an 800 to a 5,000 student campus – planning and managing both is stretching resources thin. Need for re-envisioning and recreating art is in the mix programmatically and structurally

Richard – very strong comment re: moving program to Business (inexplicable was the term used in the review). Should CC invite the two parties to meet? Prem often have an addendum to the AP.

Neil – lot of history – rift between design person and chair, GD felt that their future may be better in COB, but took large number of majors to COB. Lee Ann felt that program can be meshed via coursework.

Bradley – change in leadership (leadership is no longer at OSU) Lee Ann laments move from Art to COB. Neil and Bradley felt there were other issues occurring that isn’t being addressed – she felt that it’s an Academic Affairs issue. Committee system was broken in Art.

Neil – external reviewer’s comments were vital to the review re: their Art knowledge – encourage them to have more. one will revisit campus to discuss Janine – the unit has not technically been charged with implementing the AP recommendations since it has not been reviewed yet by Curriculum Council.

Bradley – lack of leadership in Art. Jr. TT faculty, there was a sense of them carrying the program, and instructors doing too much. Lack of community structure and workload. Neil – not a lot of mentorship, senior faculty were not around much.

JT – loss of institutional knowledge, or no knowledge? Neil hard to say, unclear whether they had better committee structure when they were a department. Sr. faculty had their own things to do and Jr faculty and instructors had a heavy teaching burden.

Peter – Bend – every program has been given the task of creating a 3, 5, and 10-year plans. In Art, with retirements, no motivation to create a plan. Since then hired an instructor (not Art history, but Art) who is full of motivation. Had obligation to teach out the current students and most of them need studio design, rather than history.
• Neil – Sr. faculty felt that the university always gave them a short shrift re: spaces – students always had to work around space handicap. Part of the culture is that there has never been a real gallery, university has never supported the Arts program, Cascades Hall spaces were an afterthought.
• Richard – lack of leadership? JT – Lee Ann was hired in 2014 as an outside hire, she needs to respond to these inquiries. Neil – original plan for CLA restructuring was to hire all outside directors that had a history of successful leadership. JT felt Lee Ann is moving in the right direction.
• John – will a new building be built? No. John- numbers are low and going down. Very few Art History majors due to retirement of the star faculty member in Art History.
• Michael – separation of Graphic Design was beginning of downturn. In addendum, perhaps the CC could ask whether GD could return to Art or create a better communication with them.
• Suggested that Leanne meet with the CC prior to CC accepting. Per Janine, Lee Ann wants to meet with the CC. Addendum could occur whether Lee Ann felt it would be helpful. Janine suggested inviting Marion Rossi to discuss CLA strategies to attract students; Prem requested to wait to invite Marion until all of the CLA program reviews are completed. Vickie will invite Lee Ann to an upcoming CC meeting.
• There are no recommendations that the Action Plan doesn’t address.

Action; Jeanine will tell Leanne that the CC discussed favorably and Vickie will invite Leanne to a CC meeting. Peter will be kept in the loop of what’s happening related to the review and Action Plan.