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We thank you for your tireless dedication to your profession, students and the community as you’ve created, maintained and improved the outstanding quality of Studio (Fine) Art and Art History offerings. We also appreciate all that you do on your campuses and throughout the district to add to the growing collection of art at Portland Community College.

Your presentations were thoughtful, thorough, well organized and engaging.

This response contains 5 sections: 1) commendations, 2) areas for further consideration, 3) suggestions/observations, 4) response to recommendations/areas of SAC needs and 5) closing comments.

1. Commendations

*The incorporation of College Core Outcomes as an integral part of art  
*Systematic assessment of College Core Outcomes, including both direct and indirect forms of assessment  
*Use of portfolio development  
*Co-hosting the FATE conference  
*Creating Women in the Arts Lectures Series  
*Presentation of Core Outcome Mapping – Appendix 3  
*Use of Camtasia  
*The inclusion of captioning for ADA accommodations  
*Curricular changes resulting from educational initiatives  
  - Textbooks  
  - Diversity  
  - Service Learning  
  - Honors Courses  
  - Internationalization  
  - Sustainability  
*The creation of course sequences to address repeat limitations imposed by Financial Aid  
*Inclusion of Time-based Arts (Art 103 & 119)  
*New transfer agreement with The Pacific Northwest College of Art  
*Use of feedback to make curricular changes  
*The formation of important community relations with artists and donors  
*The continued addition of works of art on the campus
2. **Areas for further consideration**

You noted the work associated with the development of 72 CCOGs as a result of Financial Aid restrictions over repeatability. We acknowledge the significant investment of time and energy this has taken and commend you for taking these steps to ensure your students continue to have access to Financial Aid.

Given the rapid growth experienced across the district in Art, we recommend that your SAC discuss the consequences of this growth in an environment of increasingly limited resources in an effort to pace growth with existing resources.

We commend you for acknowledging the balance needed between offering DL sections vs face to face and urge that, as a SAC, you continue to discuss this. At the presentation, mention was made that Art studio courses support Art history courses, but this really is not the case. Highly enrolled, lecture-only courses, can provide additional income under a reimbursement system, but is dependent on many factors including enrollment, credits and cost of instruction. There must, therefore, be a balance between studio and history courses. Further, we must, through district-wide collaboration and cooperation in scheduling do our best to minimize lowly enrolled classes, especially in this time of reduced resources. We recommend that an “Art Leaders” group consisting of Faculty Department Chairs and Division Deans meet regularly, say quarterly, to discuss offerings to the end of supporting well-enrolled classes at all locations.

Given questions raised during the presentation, we ask that you look at student success and completion data in the variety of modalities you offer and that your SAC review that data and make plans on what scheduling/offering changes would increase student success. We
suggest you work with Laura Massey, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, to obtain this information.

You correctly noted that Sylvania has a new digital photography lab. It should be noted, however, that the dark room facilities were downsized, not entirely eliminated. This was intentionally done for the very reason you voiced, that it is important for students to understand the fundamentals of the dark room in order to better understand digital photography.

During your presentation the issue of student demographics was noted, in particular the difficulty it created when, at week 10, you realized a student couldn’t read. We share this concern. We noticed that ART 101, Art 102, and Art 103 all have standard prerequisites (WR 115, RD 115, and Math 20), but many courses don’t while a few have recommended prereqs. Art 256 lists Art 253 as a prereq, but Art 253, itself, has no prereqs. To the extent that the demographics you listed adversely affect student success, we recommend you consider expanding the use of prerequisites.

You commented on the importance of not making go/no go decisions for sections simply based on enrollment numbers. We agree that other factors are relevant and need to be considered as well. For example, the frequency with which low enrolled course/sections are offered is an important factor.

Concern was noted over the increased amount of “administrative busy work”, though acknowledgement of externally imposed requirements was noted. We hope you understand that the work is not intended to keep you busy, and is not something that administration can do for you since things like reframing the outcomes in courses or designing, conducting and evaluating assessment of student learning outcomes cannot be done by the administration. As an example, you noted receiving unclear directions, though clarification was asked for, none was provided. We understand the frustration this causes and suggest you have a conversation with your Administrative Liaison and your respective Division Deans to further discuss this, with the ultimate goal of improving communications. If your concern for lack of clarity is around how to approach the assessment work we suggest that you work with your designated assessment coach from the Learning Assessment Council.

Kurt Simonds, Division Dean for Liberal Arts and Sciences at SE, observed that SE intends to grow their art offerings. Further, he indicated their need to collaborate with art faculty throughout the district to better understand art facilities, equipment, SAC hiring practices along with the desire to not grow their program at the expense of existing programs elsewhere in the district. Though Kurt will be moving soon to Cascade, we urge that you reach out to Kathy Casto, Interim Division Dean of Liberal Arts & Science his replacement while Southeast conducts a national search for a new division dean to further discuss their needs.
3. Suggestions and Observations

In section 5.B you noted various changes to Instructor Qualifications, including the use of ‘Exceptions’ along with an approval process of “…the Art Department Chair and approved by the Division Dean and the Dean of Instruction.” We refer you to the Instructor Qualifications and the Instructor Approval Form, as they note, “Approval by the VP for Academic and Student Affairs is required for Provisional Approval and for Demonstrated Competency when criteria have not been defined in the Instructor Qualifications.” In the future, instructors approved by ‘Exception’ will need to be processed through Chris Chairsell’s office, unless Demonstrated Competency criteria have been defined in your approved Instructor Qualifications.

http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/instructor-qualifications/InstructionsforProvisionalApproval.html

Instructor Approval Form [doc]

4. Recommendations

Teaching and Learning recommendations:

A. develop an Art Transfer Degree
B. continue to expand direct transfer agreements with area art schools and transfer institutions
C. improve assignments to raise student awareness of related historical and contemporary figures and the critical discourse surrounding the disciplines being taught
D. improve assignments to enhance student critique communication skills in language and writing
E. set aside time during SAC meetings for curricular discussion among faculty on teaching-related topics

We applaud you for these insightful recommendations and, therefore, support your efforts in these areas.

It should be noted that at present, it is not possible, by state statute and rule, for community colleges to offer transfer degrees in specific content areas other than statewide degrees such as the ASOT-Business. We are also prohibited from identifying majors. As noted during the presentation, there is some hope that this may eventually change. If it does, Art would seem a good candidate for a major. However, one concern with Associate degree majors is that different receiving schools may have different specific requirements that make it hard to guarantee that a student earning an Associate degree in the major will be appropriately prepared for all schools. As you work with transfer partners, identify the core of coursework that would meet the requirement of the first two years of study as broadly as possible across a variety of transfer partners.

In the absence of an Associate degree in Art, consider the following.

- Survey, possibly once a year or every other year, students to determine their purpose for taking Art courses, e.g., pre-Art major, General Education, personal interest
• Include a SAC-specific question in Course Evaluations asking students to identify their purpose for taking the Art course for which they are completing the evaluation

• Occasional group orientations/Q&A sessions for all Art students, but especially for those who may be interested in Art as a major

Curricular Recommendations:

A. Reevaluate enrollment caps in reference to studio space, online course load and student safety. As you discuss these issues, we refer you to Articles 6.225 and 26.24 along with the Clarification of Intent – Class Size Language of the Faculty and AP Agreement

http://www.pcc.edu/hr/contracts/documents/faculty-ap-contract/article6.pdf
http://www.pcc.edu/hr/contracts/documents/faculty-ap-contract/article26.pdf
http://www.pcc.edu/hr/contracts/documents/faculty-ap-contract/coi-class-size.pdf

B. Consider changes to Assessment workload required of SAC.

i. Paperwork administered from the VP/Academic and Student Affairs has impeded both discussion of curriculum and cohesion of the department.

ii. The assessment protocol, as it exists currently, does not guarantee true assessment. SAC suggests a less quantitative and rubric-based approach.

These concerns represent larger issues that cannot be addressed individually, SAC by SAC, but rather will require broader conversations, minimally in the context of Accreditation Standards. Also, please understand that the requirement for annual reporting and the strong bias towards quantitative reporting were not determined by administration, but developed by faculty in the Learning Assessment Council (LAC) and through the assessment peer review process. LAC members understand and support the need for assessment to be faculty-driven, but are also acutely aware that our efforts in this area will be judged in accreditation, and are striving to encourage assessments that will provide evidence of both accountability and improvement that accreditation requires.

C. Improve Banner, since curriculum design and pedagogy should not be leveraged by Financial Aid's inability to track repeatable courses.

This is not a problem created by BANNER, but rather a regulation imposed by Federal Financial Aid. Sections of the same course are, or should be identical with respect to the CCOGs, numbers of credits, outcomes etc. Consequently, there is no way to distinguish them in the system.

D. Reinstate Staff Development privileges. Recent changes have made it so that instructors cannot take courses as Staff Development. As in other disciplines, many media courses require regular training to keep abreast of technical advancements in the field. This training is fundamental to the instructor's ability to train students according to the expectations of the current field.

We are not aware of any elimination of any staff development privileges. We refer you to the Staff Development web page found at: http://intranet.pcc.edu/resources/staff-dev/ If you have specific requests which are not addressed through this resource, we recommend you discuss them with your respective Division Dean.
E. Continue Administration support for bottom-up approach to developing assessment protocols that will be valuable to the Art SAC.

*Given the lack of details in this recommendation, we suggest that you work with your respective Division Dean and/or SAC Liaison to clarify the issues and then to explore a path forward. Also, we remind you that some of the assessment processes we have were developed by faculty members, including those on the LAC.*

Recommendations which require additional funding:

A. Add funding for new Full-Time faculty positions to better reflect recent FTE growth and to move closer to the College's FT/PT ratio goals.

*Given the current and near term budget environment, adding new, Full Time Faculty, with the possible exception of SE is unlikely.*

B. Add funding for new Full-time faculty positions to better accommodate increasing administrative workload due to federal and administration mandates.

*Given the current and near term budget environment, adding new, Full Time Faculty, with the possible exception of at SE is unlikely.*

C. Add funding for new Lab Tech and support positions. (e.g., RC Sculpture tech, Doorman at CAS)

*Please work with your Rock Creek leadership team to explore ways to address this need.*

D. Provide and improve support for FT and PT Professional Development, Curriculum Development, Assessment and Sabbaticals.

*We refer you to the Staff Development web page found at: [http://intranet.pcc.edu/resources/staff-dev/](http://intranet.pcc.edu/resources/staff-dev/) If you have specific requests which are not addressed through this resource, we recommend you discuss them with your respective Division Dean.*

E. Continue and increase support for Visiting Artist Lecture Series, like Women in the Arts, and Gallery Programming.

*Visiting Art Lecture series are highly valued, we know they do good things for students and staff. As these events have been supported through campus funds, individual campuses will need to make these decisions year by year based on their own availability of funds.*

F. Implement release time for SAC chair. New college and federal mandates have increased the responsibilities and workload of SAC chairs well past acceptable levels for a position without release time.
CTE Department Chairs have raised similar concerns. These concerns represent larger issues that cannot be addressed individually, SAC by SAC, but rather will require broader conversations, minimally in the context of Accreditation Standards. We suggest that you SAC Chair enter into a discussion with other SAC Chairs regarding best practices relative to managing workload.

G. Provide support from the College Administration for bottom-up approach to bond planning, implementation and improvements in classrooms and infrastructure.

Given the lack of details in this recommendation, we suggest that you work with your respective Division Dean and/or SAC Liaison to clarify this issue and then to explore a path forward.

5. Closing Comments

It was immediately obvious to us that you take great pride in your offerings and have dedicated countless hours to continuously improve them. Your enthusiasm was infectious and no doubt plays a significant role in the success of your students.

In closing, we want to thank you for a very thoughtful Program Review and engaging presentation.
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