

2017-18 Department Student Success Plan Update

Art and Design

Please complete this plan update and submit to your Dean by November 3. Your Dean will offer you feedback by November 17 and advance final version¹ to Academic Affairs by November 21. Previous report and plans can be found at this website: <http://irt2.indstate.edu/cms7/sp16/index.cfm/department-plans/>.

Person Primarily Responsible for Preparing this Report: [Click here to enter text.](#)

1. Department goals to facilitate persistence to degree (include action steps, dates, and person(s) responsible underneath each goal):

The department is currently working with university and contract architects, ARC Design, on the reprogramming and refurbishing of the Fine Arts building. It was noted in the NASAD accreditation feedback from 2014 that the current facility is adequate but unattractive and that there are few spaces for students to interact outside of the classroom. Moreover, the HVAC has been so inconsistent that teachers and students want to leave excessively hot or cold spaces as soon as they can. The HVAC can be so loud that it is often impossible for students and instructors to hear one another. We understand that these HVAC issues are to be addressed by new equipment and the reconfiguration of the entire system.

In the reprogramming process, we have worked with architects to create social spaces, pin-up and critique spaces, reconfigurable classrooms and special-needs facilities. There are goals to design the building as a place where students will want to stay, and that will foster interactions among students, faculty and staff.

We are keenly aware that a sense of place and belonging is important to retention and we plan to leverage an attractive, comfortable building towards retention efforts. Specific goals include creating classroom spaces for art history so that students will have most of their classes in the same building as the their professors' offices and the department's office. We plan to have spaces set aside for digital arts courses—despite the popularity of this growing program, digital arts course have heretofore been nomadic, taking place in OIT-run labs and ad-hoc work environments. Lastly, the Community School of the Arts will finally have a home and dedicated classroom spaces—because Art Education students already work so much with CSA, the new building programming puts these programs in adjacent spaces and the academic programs will share some resources.

Chairperson, William Ganis is undertaking this programming effort—he is working on the Art and Design components of the building with CAS Dean, Chris Olsen and ARC Architects. Several meetings have occurred thus far and ARC Design has created floor plans and general programming for the entire building. William Ganis is working with Associate Professor Sala Wong to coordinate with all building stakeholders. Sala Wong heads an ad hoc Fine Arts stakeholder committee and in this role gathers information and is a point person between the department chairperson and the department's Fine Arts Building users.

We expect that by December 2017 the floor plans will be set, and that we will continue work with ARC Design's architects on finishes, furnishings and other needs. Work on the Fine Arts Building is scheduled for May 2018 through July 2019 and we expect that the building will begin to serve students in the fall 2019 semester.

¹ Dean will request a refinement to plan if it is not suitably addressing the questions. Plan will be shared with Trustees.

2. Department goals to enhance student performance and/or learning outcome achievement² (include action steps, dates, and person(s) responsible for each goal):

The department has hired human-centered design group, Collabo Creative, to help the department with its strategic planning including matters related to student performance. We had our first design-thinking workshop in August of 2017 and will have a second in February of 2018 that will focus on career-readiness. The Department of Art and Design was nearly double its present faculty size a little more than a decade ago and has shed faculty through retirements that were not replaced. Despite this, many curricula and governing documents still in use reflect this faculty body from the past. The department has not taken an opportunity to think about or plan for its long-term future. This design-thinking process is intended to help the department imagine its direction whether in terms of course and program offerings, messaging or advising. Career Readiness is an especially important item in this planning, because art and art history (and sometimes design) are often perceived as “elite” or “worthless” disciplines that will not prepare students for careers. We know that part of career readiness is making students aware of the many careers related to the arts and visual culture that they might pursue; helping students to understand that they are learning skills relevant for these visual disciplines; and making sure they have some skills germane to entry-level arts workplaces. In short, we expect that when students are able to make realistic career goals that they will persist in their studies.

A sophomore-portfolio requirement was executed in its first iteration in S17. This requirement (in the form of a one-credit course) was instituted to remain in-compliance with NASAD accreditors. The S17 review was but a pilot to create a far more inclusive review of all future 4th-semester students. The review is valuable as a way to give students feedback on the sum of their foundational artworks (from their introductory drawing, art history, 2D-design and 3D-design courses) and help them identify strengths and potential paths of study in order to foster each student’s performance as well as completion. This review is also a way to gauge potential success in the department’s BFA program and only students who show hard work, ability, and academic achievement will be eligible for this longer plan of study. Students who demonstrate hard work, dedication to their art studies and technical achievement are eligible for substantial Performing and Creative Arts scholarships. We purposefully made some of these scholarships available to sophomores so that we could identify “late bloomers” and encourage their completion.

The next iteration of the review will occur in S18. Nancy-Nichols-Pethick continues to facilitate the review process, Brad Venable collects data germane to assessment and all of the department’s faculty members give input about the portfolios and (potentially) related scholarships.

Benchmark Metrics

Metric	2016-17 FTFT-BDS Cohort Actual	2017-18 Target	3 Year Target (2019-20)
Freshmen Retention ³ (by <i>latest department</i>)	63.75%	66%	70%
4-Year Grad Rate (by <i>latest department</i>)	24.59%	26%	28%
	Source data for 2016-17 actual	2017-18 Target	3 Year Target (2019-20)
Other Metric #1 ⁴			

² Department/Program Student Learning Summary Form report may inform what is noted here.

³ In a very few cases, such as with departments with very small numbers of majors or who have few or no new freshmen who enroll in their program, this metric and a grad rate may not be applicable. Other appropriate metrics should be used instead (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, etc.).

⁴ Departments may wish to also focus on key metrics for sub-populations (e.g., transfer students, distance students, minority students, students at a particular class year or years where bottlenecks/movement out of the major/drop out from ISU appear to be a concern) or metrics such as credit hour productivity or D/F/drop rates. See Blue Reports or Institutional Research for ideas.