



# Comprehensive Program Review

University System of Georgia

## CPR Report Submitted!

**Thank you for submitting a Comprehensive Program Review Report.** Below is the information you sent on June 30, 2003. *Please note* this is a temporary web page and cannot be bookmarked. You may wish to print this page for your records. You will also receive confirmation via email.

- 1                   **Name:** Edwin A. Rugg
- 2                   **Title:** Director, Center for Institutional Effectiveness
- 3    **Daytime phone:** 770 499 3609
- 4                   **Email:** erugg@kennesaw.edu
- 5                   **Institution:** Kennesaw State University
- 6    **Review Status:** Triggered Review
- 7    **Degree level:** Bachelors
- 8    **Degree acronym:** BS
- 9    **Degree/Major:** BS with a major in Art Education
- 10                  **CIP Code:** 13130200
- 11                  **College,** School of the Arts  
**School/Division:**
- 12                  **Department:** Department of Visual Arts
- 13                  **CPR Plan** Yes  
**followed:**
- 14 **Future institutional** Maintain at present level  
**plans for program:**
- 15 **Plan for resources** maintain  
**in this program:**
- 16 **Supplemental file:** CPR FINDINGS to BOR - Art Education.doc
- 17                  **File Type:** MS Word
- 18 **CPR Web Addr.:** www.kennesaw.edu/ie

< < [Submit Another CPR](#)

---

**CPR FINDINGS AND PLANS  
FOR THE  
B.S. WITH A MAJOR IN ART EDUCATION  
AT KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY**

**MAJOR FINDINGS ON THE PROGRAM'S QUALITY, PRODUCTIVITY, &  
VIABILITY**

Statewide school reform initiatives and budget cutbacks have taken a notable toll on support for art teachers in the public schools, which in turn has dampened student interest and enrollment in KSU's B.S. program in art education. About one-fourth of the students pursuing a degree in art are preparing for K-12 teacher certification through the B.S. in Art Education (72 declared majors in Fall 2002). This B.S. program is a companion program to the B.F.A., and the two share many of the same upper division art courses for degree completion. The combined enrollments of the two programs (equaling 322 declared majors in Fall 2002) reflect a context for undergraduate study in art that is strong and attractive.

Generally, the self-study rated the program's quality and productivity higher than did the University Program Review Council. The Council judged the program's overall quality to be strong, the program's overall productivity to be satisfactory, and the program to be viable. About half of the quality indicators (8 of 15) were rated as strong or very strong by the UPRC, including adherence to national standards (the program is PSC approved and NCATE accredited), the faculty, facilities and equipment (currently housed in a new \$5 million studio art building with state-of-the-art electronic classrooms and labs), operational funding, use of advanced instructional technology, preparation of graduates, student honors, and success of graduates. Opportunities cited for quality improvement included rectifying advisement concerning course sequencing for degree completion, enhancing faculty diversity and multicultural perspectives in the curriculum, increasing scholarships, gifts and grants, strengthening program recognition, strengthening follow-up of graduates, and increasing responsiveness to needed change. Most of the program's productivity indicators were rated as satisfactory or weak (8 of 12). The precipitous drop in degree completions was cited as a significant concern by the Council (an average of 15 graduates per year in FY98, FY99 and FY00, which dropped to 4 in FY01 and an average of 10 per year in FY00, FY01 and FY02), as was the exceptionally low graduation rate of the program. The number of declared majors had fallen from 59 in Fall 1998 to 45 by Fall 2000, but has since rebounded to 72 in Fall 2002. Other opportunities cited for productivity improvements included enhanced course scheduling and sequencing and increasing student diversity. The Council also called for more specific action plans and timetables for program improvement. Both the NASAD accreditation team and the UPRC recommended that the Art Department not move too quickly to establish a new master's degree program in art education until the baccalaureate program is strengthened and the need for such a graduate degree can be articulated and justified.

## **PLANS FOR IMPROVING THE PROGRAM'S QUALITY, PRODUCTIVITY, & VIABILITY**

Some of the more notable plans for improvement include: strengthening performance-based program assessments and follow-up of graduates; increasing faculty diversity; increasing the visibility and recognition of the program's achievements -- especially those involving progressive partnerships with the public schools; clarifying the program's commitment to multicultural and global perspectives; preparing for NCATE reaccreditation; monitoring and facilitating graduation rates; developing new strategies for recruiting and retaining a diverse student body; participating in the department's efforts to develop a five-year strategic plan; and contributing to PTEU-wide preparations for NCATE reaccreditation in 2004.

## **NEW RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Kennesaw State's funding and expenditures per FTE student have been substantially below average throughout the university's relatively brief history. New funding and facilities have lagged KSU's exceptional rate of growth over the years. Consequently, the student/faculty ratio at KSU is exceptionally high, and the institution would need another 150 full-time faculty to reach the average of the other state and regional universities in the USG. In that context, there is substantial justification for enhancing most degree programs with additional investments in full-time faculty support. However, this review and its recommendations were completed in the context of a statewide and national economic downturn, significant budget cutbacks in the State's, the University System's, and KSU's operating budgets, and little prospect of KSU receiving special catch-up funding from state appropriations in the near term.

Until substantial improvements in the program's productivity are underway, the Council recommended maintaining current resource levels for this program with no additional allocation of faculty positions or funding for operations.

## **PLANS FOR INCREASING PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY ABOVE THRESHOLD**

This program was not originally triggered for special review by the System Office in 2001. At that time, the annual number of degree completions averaged 15 graduates per year for FY98, FY99, and FY00. Since then, annual degree completions in art education dropped below the Regents' threshold of 10 per year in FY01 and FY02. Consequently, the recent update of the threshold report from the System Office triggered this program for special review. The most recent three-year average for FY00, FY01, and FY02 as

reported in the update was 9 graduates per year which is slightly below the Regents' threshold. These trends are being monitored closely, and efforts are underway to maintain the strength and viability of this program and restore its degree productivity above the Regents' threshold in the near future.