



June 6, 2018

Keith Diaz Moore
Interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
205 Park Bldg.
Campus



6-7-18

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Art and Art History

Approved
R. Watkins
6-11-18

Dear Vice President Diaz Moore:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council's review of the Department of Art and Art History. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the Department Profile, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

After your approval, please forward this packet to President Ruth Watkins for her review. It will then be sent to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next Senate meeting.

Sincerely,



David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Paul L. Stout, Chair, Department of Art and Art History
John W. Scheib, Dean, College of Fine Arts

The Graduate School
201 Presidents Circle, Room 302
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9016
(801)581-7642
FAX (801)581-6749
<http://www.gradschool.utah.edu>

The Department of Art & Art History

Faculty were commended for their work as teachers, scholars, and artists, and the Department recognized for its contributions to the community, both at the University and more broadly. Preparation for accreditation is spurring positive curricular reform and will also help to underpin increased collaboration with other units on campus. These efforts complement additional tactics being taken to attract undergraduate students and increase department visibility. Challenges include facilities issues and finding resources to support gallery renovation and expansion.

The Graduate School - The University of Utah

GRADUATE COUNCIL REPORT TO THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND THE ACADEMIC SENATE

November 27, 2017

The Graduate Council has completed its review of the **Department of Art and Art History**. The External Review Committee included:

Carla Bengtson, MFA
Department Head and Ann Swindells Chair
Department of Art
University of Oregon

Dana Fritz, MFA
Professor of Photography
School of Art, Art History and Design
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Gary Setzer, MFA
Associate Professor
School of Art
University of Arizona

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Greg Hatch, MLIS
Head of Creativity and Innovation Services, Marriott Library
Adjunct Associate Professor, Department of Theatre

Prescott M. Muir, MS
Professor
School of Architecture

Katharina Gerstenberger, PhD
Professor and Chair
Department of World Languages and Cultures

This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study submitted by the Department of Art and Art History, the reports of the external and internal review committees, and the response to the external and internal reports from the department chair dated May 12, 2017. The college dean on June 21, 2017 indicated via email his agreement with the department chair's response.

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of Art and Art History is one of five academic units in the College of Fine Arts. It provides education in several arenas of visual arts and design, as well as Arts Education and Art History. The department describes its mission as "educating students to be creative leaders with the skills and knowledge to pursue a life in the arts." The department offers a BFA, a BA, and a Teacher BA, as well as MFA and MA graduate degrees and a certificate in Arts Technology. The department also teaches a significant number of courses for non-majors, some of which contribute to the university's general education requirements. The department is housed on three floors of the connected Art and Sculpture buildings, where there are spaces for meetings, teaching, studios, fabrication shops, a reading room, a small art gallery, and administrative offices.

The department's administration is run by the department chair and associate chair, with reporting lines from the director of the Art History Program, the heads of each emphasis area, the director of MA Graduate Studies, the director of MFA Graduate Studies, and a group of faculty-led advisory committees. The department awards approximately 100 degrees annually. Bachelor's degrees awarded have declined from 111 in 2013 to 88 in 2016, while master's degrees have increased from five in 2013 to 10 in 2016.

Faculty

The department has 20 tenure-line faculty (tenured and tenure-track), and 10 lecturer faculty (full-time, benefited career-line faculty). The teaching load is 2-2 for tenure-line faculty and 3-3 for career-line faculty. The department also has a group of associate instructors (part-time, non-faculty instructional personnel) teaching certain of its courses. The internal reviewers described the faculty as highly committed teachers who invest substantial time and energy into mentoring students and creating opportunities for them as artists and researchers. They further commended the faculty for finding internships for students and helping them get their work exhibited. The internal reviewers also commended the faculty for strong research and creative output, and noted that students overwhelmingly praised faculty for the time and energy they invest in students. The external reviewers described the faculty as "great citizens for the University's student body at large" in terms of teaching a broad range of courses that satisfy the university's General Education requirements. The external reviewers also commended the department for helping create a university community that can appreciate and understand art.

The department's faculty fall into two groups: studio artists and art historians. The Art History faculty has a program director; each of the studio art emphases and arts education have an area head. Both Art History and Studio Art have their own Director of Graduate Studies. The internal reviewers indicated that these two groups appear to operate with significant autonomy regarding curriculum and admissions decisions. They noted, "While there appears to be close cooperation within the Studio Art faculty, there seems to be

less collaboration among Studio Art, Arts Education, and Art History.” They also noted that both the department chair and associate chair come from Studio Art. The internal reviewers suggested that with advance planning and faculty involvement, the department might achieve a greater representative balance. The department chair’s letter indicated that faculty discussion on how to address this is ongoing. According to the external reviewers (who interviewed 15 faculty members, including several from each specialty), there appears to be a sincere desire among faculty to end the division.

The internal reviewers indicated that faculty expressed frustration about lack of transparency and timely sharing of information, particularly regarding graduate funding, development, and allocation of faculty lines. The internal reviewers recommended that faculty develop “priorities for hiring that reflect the justifiable needs of the Department as a whole and present those to the Dean, who will then hopefully be transparent about her or his decision-making process.” The internal reviewers also suggested that the department “develop clear and shared priorities, with greater transparency and full faculty participation, to increase collaboration while avoiding straining its limited human and financial resources.”

Faculty frustration with the service load was a common theme of the review. The internal reviewers noted that, while the relatively large number of section heads results from having diverse areas of emphasis, reorganizing this structure might reduce service burden and facilitate cooperation. The internal and external reviewers suggested that the department continue to work on bylaws that could help to clarify concern over the amount and distribution of service. The external reviewers suggest that the department chair consider appointing faculty to committees on a rotating basis, making the service workload more equitable among the faculty.

The internal reviewers noted that low salaries and salary compression continue to be problematic in the department, and may impact faculty morale. The external reviewers also noted that there appear to be a lack of promotion opportunities for career-line faculty, lack of clarity regarding their duties, and lack of clarity regarding voting rights. Having clear departmental bylaws may clarify some of these issues.

With regard to faculty diversity, the external reviewers observed that while faculty gender balance is good, minority faculty are significantly underrepresented. Their report noted that having more diverse faculty members may help recruit a more diverse student body. The internal reviewers suggested that targeted faculty searches may be needed in the push toward increased faculty diversity. They further suggested that the department make use of additional funds available from university administration for diversity candidates.

Students

The total number of undergraduate students served in the department (including non-majors) was 1,645 in 2016, which is fewer than the 2,025 served in 2011. Majors in Studio Art and Art History have also declined. As of Fall 2016, there were 369 Studio Art majors and 44 Art History majors, a decline of 36% and 40%, respectively, since 2011. Since the last review, total numbers of graduate students (MA and MFA) have ranged between 15 (Fall 2016) and 23 (Fall 2014). The internal reviewers suggested that the downturn in undergraduate enrollment may follow national trends as fine arts-inclined students turn to video games, digital media, and graphic design and away from material and analog-based arts. The internal reviewers also noted that Graphic Design major graduation rates in the department are trending upward, from 15 in 2010 to 33 in 2015. The decline in enrollments has put a financial strain on the department and impacted learning, according to the external reviewers.

Despite the decline in enrollments, the self-study reported survey data indicating a very high level of student satisfaction with their coursework. Students meeting with both the internal and external review teams also reported high levels of satisfaction. The internal reviewers noted the department's achievements in terms of placing graduates in graduate programs and careers at leading art institutions.

The internal reviewers noted that, in terms of student diversity, enrollment of women compares favorably to national norms while the level of racial minority representation in the undergraduate student body lagged. In 2016, the undergraduate student body in Studio BFA was 77% White, 11% Hispanic/Latino, 1% American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.5% African American, 5% Asian, and 3% Two or More Races. The student body in the Art History BA program was 79% White, 11% Hispanic/Latino, and 5% Two or More Races. Although the external review team identified similar diversity issues with the graduate student body, the statistics suggest that the department's graduate students reflect significantly more racial diversity. The MFA program has a population that is 69% White and 23% Hispanic/Latino. The MA program has a population that is 60% White and 40% Hispanic/Latino.

Both review teams offered productive suggestions for improving undergraduate student diversity. For example, the external team noted that the lack of racial diversity is reflective of the state's demographics (the state provides on average 92% of the enrollment in the program), and suggested "a dramatic move toward recruiting out-of-state students." The internal team agreed that "improved recruitment seems of paramount importance" and suggested several possible avenues on that front, including "reexamining" the department's LEAP program to better target underserved students and "shepherd them well into their undergraduate major;" shifting curricular offerings from pre-major and general education classes to the upper-division offerings, so as to avoid competing with junior colleges; and pursuing national accreditation to enable a more national profile and thereby attract an expanded applicant pool. Despite the challenges with regard to diversity, the external reviewers noted that "the faculty and staff work to support an inclusive environment where everyone feels welcome."

Curriculum

The department offers a curriculum that supports six undergraduate and graduate degrees. These are: BA and MA in Art History, BFA in Art (with emphases in Ceramics, Graphic Design, Painting/Drawing, Photography/Digital Imaging, Printmaking, Sculpture/Intermedia, and Cross-3D Ceramics and Sculpture), BFA in Art Teaching (with specializations in Ceramics, Digital Intermedia, Painting/Drawing, Photography/Digital Imaging, as well as a Generalist Specialization), MFA in Art with an emphasis on Community-Based Art Education, and MFA in Art. The department also offers Certificates in Arts Technology and Book Arts and Minors in Arts Technology, Book Arts, Ceramics, Drawing, Printmaking, and Sculpture/Intermedia. The department does not offer a PhD degree.

The internal reviewers noted that Studio Art students are required to take classes in Art History but Art History students are not required to take classes in Studio Art, and the external reviewers echoed concern about the lack of integration of the Studio Art and Art History curriculum. They noted as well that Studio Art students are required to take only 2-3 Art History courses, while students in similar programs at other universities generally take 4-5 Art History courses. Art History students are not required to take any classes in Studio Art, even though the National Association of Schools of Art and Design accreditation requires that Art History courses comprise at least 10% of the credit hours in the BFA degree. Accreditation standards also require that Art History majors acquire "functional knowledge of the creative process...through one or

more foundation or other studio courses.” The internal reviewers agreed that “greater collaboration between Art History, Arts Teaching and Studio Art students should be sought.”

The external reviewers noted a concern about the need for more flexibility in the undergraduate studio emphasis, given the lack of crossover in each subspecialty’s requirements. They indicated, however, that this is being partly addressed through a recent reduction of the studio classes from four to three credits. The internal reviewers also commended this development. The change, which goes online this year, has many potential benefits. It provides more flexibility to Studio Art majors, allowing them, for example, to add a Studio Art minor or another minor across campus. It also may allow students to graduate more easily in four years, ease the ability of students to transfer from other colleges and universities, and bring the department in line with peer institutions’ programs. In turn, the change should help attract, retain, and graduate students, and therefore improve the department’s financial situation given the university’s budget model.

Both review teams recommended that the department consider pursuing national accreditation, which would elevate the department’s national reputation and assist with recruiting a strong, diverse student body. The external reviewers also recommended that the department first schedule a preliminary visit from the accrediting body, the National Association of Schools of Art and Design. This visit may provide clarity in prioritizing the department’s steps forward and help the department articulate and frame requests from the college. The department chair’s letter in May indicated his intention to follow through with scheduling this preliminary visit.

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

The department appears to have and to be developing adequate systems of outcomes and program effectiveness assessment. The internal reviewers noted that while the department does not have a holistic outcomes assessment of program effectiveness, it has individual methods for identifying student and faculty success, curricular impact, and student satisfaction. The internal reviewers noted that the department’s executive committee is working on implementation of department-wide assessment processes as designated by department bylaws. They noted that the department’s curriculum committee currently defers curricular assessment responsibilities to individual area heads. They reported that the faculty in each departmental area has written a program purpose that articulates learning outcomes and assessment benchmarks. Student course feedback reports are provided to teaching faculty. Additionally, the university’s Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence conducts an in-class review of each tenure-line faculty member, and this review is included in RPT files.

Facilities and Resources

Both the internal and external committees cited significant concerns regarding facilities and resources. The external reviewers described the facilities as “inadequate” and “a little chaotic, probably due to a combination of overcrowding and lack of technical support.” They also noted that facilities “do not meet national standards for space, equipment, and technology” and cited concerns that health and safety standards remained unmet. However, in his response letter, the department chair noted that the facilities manager “works with Occupational Health and Safety and other campus entities to keep the facilities safe.” The department chair’s letter also indicated that the department is hiring a three-quarter-time shop technician to address maintenance and shop management issues.

The external reviewers noted that graduate students also raised issues about departmental resources, with the primary concerns being inadequate financial support, poor access to video equipment, and a department gallery schedule that appeared not to prioritize MFA thesis exhibitions.

Tenure-line faculty members have university-provided studios that also serve as offices, but external reviewers noted that these spaces are not adequately sized to function as studios. They observed that faculty typically use these spaces as offices and to store art work and supplies, which forces them to self-fund studio space off campus. The external reviewers suggested that the faculty, as artists, need functioning studio space in order to fulfill their research obligations. They recommended that the university consider providing off-campus studio space for faculty. They also recommended that the department could utilize its existing space more efficiently to serve teaching and learning, and suggested that the administration consider hiring an architect for a space feasibility study.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The department's faculty are commended for their strong work as teachers, scholars and artists, with notable national impact and reputation. The faculty are also commended for their generous mentoring of students, who report strong and supportive relationships with faculty.
2. The department offers a broad range of courses for both majors and non-majors, which contributes significantly to the university community. These course offerings are particularly notable given the diversity of the curriculum, tight fiscal limits, and space limitations.
3. The department faculty and students engage in active outreach with the broader community to promote community-engaged learning opportunities.
4. The department is taking steps to increase program flexibility in ways that are likely to benefit current and future students.
5. The small size of the graduate program facilitates individual attention and mentorship of students. Graduate student outcomes are also strong.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The department is advised to build connections between the Art History Program and the Studio Art Program. Both the internal and external review teams suggested requiring students from each program take courses in the other. The department administration is encouraged to engage faculty in ways to address this issue.
2. The department should address low faculty morale due to salary compression, low salaries, and apparent inequity in service loads for all faculty, as well as lack of clarity regarding promotion opportunities, duties, and voting rights for career-line faculty. The department should prioritize the creation of bylaws to provide clarity on these and other fundamental governance issues.

3. The department should enhance efforts to attract undergraduate students. Achieving National Schools of Art and Design accreditation would be one step toward this end. In addition, increasing the visibility of innovative programs and ensuring the curriculum appeals to students, such as by building on themes of digital media and graphic design, may help boost student recruitment.
4. The department needs to address the spatial constraints and safety issues in the buildings it uses. The department should plan strategically, in a manner that is transparent and inclusive of faculty input, about the steps required to improve space and building issues, including fundraising. Budgets need to include resources for equipment maintenance as well as gallery renovation and expansion.
5. The department should take steps to ensure that future faculty searches access a culturally and racially diverse candidate pool. The department should consider a targeted hire for a racial minority faculty member. In their efforts in student recruitment, the department should focus on increasing diversity here, as well.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

Joanna Bettmann Schaefer (Chair)
Associate Professor, College of Social Work

Laura T. Kessler
Professor, S.J. Quinney College of Law

Jeffrey R. Moore
Assistant Professor, Department of Geology and Geophysics

Dean McGovern (Undergraduate Council Representative)
Executive Director, Bennion Community Service Center

College Name
College of Fine Arts

Department Name
Art & Art History

Program
All

Faculty Headcount

		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
With Doctoral Degrees Including MFA and Other Terminal Degrees	Full-Time Tenured Faculty	10	10	10	10	11	13	13
	Full-Time Tenure Track	7	5	7	7	6	4	3
	Full-Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	4	4	5	8	9	7	11
	Part-Time Tenure/Tenure Track							
	Part-Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	0	0	0	14	11	11	2
	Total	21	19	22	39	37	35	29
With Masters Degrees	Full-Time Tenured Faculty	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
	Full-Time Tenure Track	0	1	1	1	1	1	3
	Full-Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	0	1	1	1	0	2	2
	Part-Time Tenure/Tenure Track	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Part-Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty							
	Total	2	3	3	3	1	3	5
With Bachelor Degrees	Full-Time Tenured Faculty	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
	Full-Time Tenure Track							
	Full-Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty							
	Part-Time Tenure/Tenure Track							
	Part-Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	0	0	0	4	2	2	2
	Total	0	0	1	5	3	2	2
Total Headcount Faculty	Full-Time Tenured Faculty	11	11	12	12	12	13	13
	Full-Time Tenure Track	7	6	8	8	7	5	6
	Full-Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	4	5	6	9	9	9	13
	Part-Time Tenure/Tenure Track	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Part-Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	0	0	0	18	13	13	4
	Total	23	22	26	47	41	40	36

Cost Study

	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Direct Instructional Expenditures	2,790,362	3,072,558	3,235,256	3,218,951	3,148,026	3,035,934	3,298,869
Cost Per Student FTE	4,470	5,018	5,441	5,835	7,196	6,349	7,621

FTE from Cost Study

	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Full-Time	47	56	67	35	33	24	25
Part-Time	8	19	8	7	7	8	6
Teaching Assistants	5	4	3	4	4	4	4

* Funding

	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Total Grants							
State Appropriated Funds	2,195,784	2,305,720	736,380	792,061	792,070	769,258	2,815,173
Teaching Grants							
Special Legislative Appropriation							

*State appropriated funds connected with internal college transfers are not reflected for AY 2012-13 through 2015-16. Total state appropriated funds for these years are: 2012-13: \$2,497,472; 2013-14: \$2,657,039; 2014-15: \$2,738,199; 2015-16: \$2,704,703

Differential Tuition

Student Credit Hours and FTE

		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
SCH	Lower Division	9,159	8,964	8,694	7,971	6,415	7,137	7,304
	Upper Division	8,861	8,779	8,452	7,875	6,310	6,513	5,440
	Basic Graduate	473	418	462	469	266	464	161
	Advanced Graduate							
FTE	Lower Division	305	299	290	266	214	238	243
	Upper Division	295	293	282	263	210	217	181
	Basic Graduate	24	21	23	23	13	23	8
	Advanced Graduate							
FTE/FTE	LD FTE per Total Faculty FTE	5	4	4	6	5	7	7
	UD FTE per Total Faculty FTE	5	4	4	6	5	6	5
	BG FTE per Total Faculty FTE	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	AG FTE per Total Faculty FTE							

Enrolled Majors

	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Undergraduate Pre-Majors	268	228	229	221	176	102	58
Undergraduate Majors	336	336	322	300	272	333	311
Enrolled in Masters Program	10	10	12	10	12	20	6
Enrolled in Doctoral Program							
Enrolled in First-Professional Program							

Degrees Awarded

	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Undergraduate Certificate	4	10	4	6	10	6	7
Graduate Certificate							
Bachelors	79	90	88	91	85	88	59
Masters	7	2	4	2	4	10	6
Doctorate							
First-Professional							



Memorandum of Understanding Department of Art and Art History Graduate Council Review 2016-17

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on March 7, 2018, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Art and Art History. Ruth V. Watkins, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; John W. Scheib, Dean of the College of Fine Arts; Paul L. Stout, Chair of the Department of Art and Art History; David B. Kieda, Dean of the Graduate School; and Katharine S. Ullman, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the review summary report presented to the Graduate Council on November 27, 2017. The working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: The department is advised to build connections between the Art History Program and the Studio Art Program. Both the internal and external review teams suggested requiring students from each program take courses in the other. The department administration is encouraged to engage faculty in ways to address this issue.

The department is very receptive to this recommendation. As part of the preparation to seek accreditation by National Schools of Art and Design (NASAD; see below), they are consulting curricular guidelines including those related to this particular issue. While their Studio Art students already take 1-3 Art History courses, the department is determining if this is sufficient in number. They are also identifying courses in Studio Art areas that would be suitable for Art History majors. The department expects to have joint curriculum approval in place by mid-2018. This recommendation points to a broader underlying need to restructure curriculum management in the department, which is also underway. An integrated approach to curricular planning seems important to overall cohesiveness within the department. In general, a curricular management plan is meant to include: "(i) an internal curricular decision-making process, and (ii) a schedule and procedure for conducting periodic curricular review" (from University Policy 6-001).

Recommendation 2. The department should address low faculty morale due to salary compression, low salaries, and apparent inequity in service loads for all faculty, as well as lack of clarity regarding promotion opportunities, duties, and voting rights for career-line faculty. The department should prioritize the creation of bylaws to provide clarity on these and other fundamental governance issues.

Commendably, the department worked to create bylaws and ratified these in November, 2017. They are also currently auditing service activities in order to seek a more equitable distribution of tasks. The group discussed the importance of transparency. Dean Scheib specifically suggested that a spreadsheet with all committee assignments and administrative activities can both serve the purpose of transparency and also highlight important contributions that the department is making. Dean Kieda underscored the importance of aligning committees with the core goals of the University as a way to increase faculty engagement in the longer term. While correcting salary compression is still ongoing, Chair Stout expressed gratitude for the help that has been received from the institution to date.

Recommendation 3. The department should enhance efforts to attract undergraduate students. Achieving National Schools of Art and Design accreditation would be one step toward this end. In addition, increasing the visibility of innovative programs and ensuring the curriculum appeals to students, such as by building on themes of digital media and graphic design, may help boost student recruitment.

The department has already hosted the visit of a consultant on the accreditation process and needs with regard to preparation. The process of preparation itself is viewed as a very helpful, positive endeavor. Accreditation by NASAD requires broad participation as it involves programs beyond the boundaries of the department, such as Multi-Disciplinary Design and Book Arts. While some further clarification of the full scope is needed, overall this is viewed as an opportunity to spearhead a multi-college steering committee that is tasked with planning for accreditation, but also more broadly with capitalizing on synergistic opportunities and preventing redundancies. NASAD accreditation may attract students and this aspiration is well worthwhile for many reasons, but the underlying goal of promoting student success is what is truly important. In terms of other ways to enhance undergraduate recruitment, innovative and appealing programs are clearly attractive. In this regard, the group discussed Illustration as a rising area of interest, as well as seeking innovative partnerships within areas such as film, creative writing, and writing with new media and graphic novels. But also key to recruitment are the opportunities that Studio Art, Art Education, and Art History majors have at the University of Utah in terms of 1) the wider academic environment on campus, 2) direct contact with faculty driving the field forward, and 3) campus-wide resources geared toward student success. These features should be highlighted when marketing to prospective students. The department is taking a multi-faceted approach to outreach, reaching students in high school classes, via social media, and by hosting events on campus. They also conduct portfolio reviews around the state of Utah, and are considering broadening this to include sites in California.

Recommendation 4. The department needs to address the spatial constraints and safety issues in the buildings it uses. The department should plan strategically, in a manner that is transparent and inclusive of faculty input, about the steps required to improve space and building issues, including fundraising. Budgets need to include resources for equipment maintenance as well as gallery renovation and expansion.

First and foremost, SVP Watkins expressed concern about safety issues and wanted these to be brought to the attention of Capital Facilities and Remodeling (CF&R) to ensure they are addressed in an expedited manner. Chair Stout said that a security and safety audit was currently underway and they will bring issues forward from this. The operational budget requires continued careful planning. This intertwines with Recommendation 1, focused on curricular management, since being more strategic about the range of non-major courses would be one way to become more efficient. This fits with a college-wide initiative to assess the size and number of classes. Yet, increased efficiency and greater numbers of majors will not mitigate all budgetary concerns and challenges with respect to space constraints, gallery renovation, and equipment maintenance. This will require ongoing conversation with administration and additional strategic planning in the coming years.

Recommendation 5. The department should take steps to ensure that future faculty searches access a culturally and racially diverse candidate pool. The department should consider a targeted hire for a racial minority faculty member. In their efforts in student recruitment, the department should focus on increasing diversity here, as well.

Chair Stout expressed the department's commitment to expanding diversity. One mechanism the department takes advantage of to enhance faculty diversity is the Raymond C. Morales Fellowship, which funds postdoctoral or post-MFA fellows in the College of Fine Arts (and notably, was created in honor of a former Art and Art History faculty member). This is a route to bring rising stars in the arts, particularly with underrepresented perspectives, to the University of Utah. In some cases, this residency evolves to recruitment into faculty ranks, although there is not meant to be pressure to take this path. In other cases, the department has a diverse pool of applicants for particular positions, as was the case in an ongoing search with an emphasis on Photography. When opportunities arise to increase faculty diversity, the department was encouraged to bring this information to the Office for Equity and Diversity for consideration in the diverse hiring initiative program. On the student front, the department takes multiple tactics to recruit diverse students. One route is through transfer students. While an articulation agreement is in place with Snow College, such an agreement with Salt Lake Community College has been more difficult and Chair Stout felt that a route of transfer after a year at SLCC without an interwoven curriculum was more realistic. Ongoing discussion with SLCC at the department and institutional level is needed. High school outreach, campus visits, and portfolio reviews mentioned above provide other routes to connect with a diverse prospective student pool. Updates to the Graduate School should include analysis of diversity within the department, and, where possible, evaluation of how various efforts contribute in this arena.

Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Art and Art History
Graduate Council Review 2016-17
Page 4

SVP Watkins commended the work the department has accomplished and expressed her appreciation for their steady hand in steering the path ahead.

This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by regular letters of progress, upon request of the Graduate School, from the Chair of the Department of Art and Art History. Letters will be submitted until all of the actions described in the preceding paragraphs have been completed. In addition, a three-year follow-up meeting may be scheduled during AY 2019-20 to discuss progress made in addressing the review recommendations.

Ruth V. Watkins
John W. Sheib
Paul L. Stout
David B. Kieda
Katharine S. Ullman



David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School
June 6, 2018