November 23, 2015

ART HISTORY DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO CONCERNS RAISED IN ITS TEN-YEAR REVIEW

Initiatives to Address Curricular Best Practices Concerns

- By a departmental vote conducted in November 2014, we decided that we will no longer allow any faculty member to teach in a prime, two-day-a-week slot more than twice in a row. This new policy mirrors the rules in the by-laws of the History Department.

- We are applying more discipline to class scheduling. Our process had been for faculty to submit the courses they would like to teach and preferred schedules to our associate student services coordinator and the chair of the Curriculum and Timetable Committee to work up a timetable. For many years, the process has favored faculty preferences too much. Everyone now recognizes that things have to change. The chair will participate in future meetings of the Curriculum and Timetable Committee. Along with greater scheduling flexibility, we will be requiring more serious long-range planning from faculty members.

Initiatives to Address Enrollment Concerns

- We have added course descriptions to the SOAR wiki, and have had special meetings with SOAR advisors in order to better inform them about the skill sets of the major.

- A faculty member has developed a version of our most popular course, *AH 202: History of Western Art I: Renaissance to Contemporary*, reshaping it to place greater emphasis on skills both in the course description and in actual practice. With the help of an EI grant, she has developed an online version of the course and given the regular version some online sections. The latter have increased enrollments during the regular term. *AH 202* was taught fully online last summer and was very successful (35 students), so we want to expand its online presence. Another faculty member has revised its sister course, *AH 201: History of Western Art II: Ancient and Medieval*, changing the second part of the title to *From Pyramids to Cathedrals*. This course, too, now places greater emphasis on skill building, and we would like to add online sections to it as well.

- We have developed three new 200-level courses: 227: *The Ends of Modernism*, 205: *Global Arts*, and 264: *Dimensions of Material Culture*. 227 has been taught once. It includes Comm B sections, the first in our department and the quickest to fill up. While the initial enrollments were not as high as we had hoped, this was partly due to its late inclusion in the timetable. We are confident that its enrollments will grow steadily as more students learn about it. We developed 205 with the globalization priority shared by the university and the college very much
in mind. It is currently being taught for the first time, with a total enrollment of about 80, we are very optimistic that numbers will increase considerably since word of mouth appears to be good. About half of the lectures are given by “guest” speakers (other Art History faculty and affiliates) with careful coordination by the lead faculty member. We will offer it again in Fall 2016, having learned a great deal about how best to make the course more cohesive. 264 is adapted from an established course (464), which will no longer be taught and is cross-listed by multiple departments around campus since it is a requirement for the Material Culture Program and an introduction to the field in general. The lower number and revision of the curriculum will make this much more attractive to freshmen and sophomores.

- While we have confidence in the 200-level courses, our experience has led us to believe that we should also have at least two active 100-level courses. The 200-level ones compete with each other to a higher degree for students in our core constituencies (Art History and Art Majors). Our existing 100-level course, 101: The Study of Art, Present and Past, has not been taught for many years because its TA was lost in a previous budget-reduction exercise, and we believe that fresh ideas are needed. When we met with members of the Cross College Advising Services to promote our courses for fall 2015, we took the opportunity to get their advice on 100-level course topics. Their response was that the best choices among the ones we presented were Artist as Scientist since it would attract many science-oriented students needing to satisfy requirements for humanities credits and another course that includes works by some of the most well-known artists. The latter will be the first to appear in the timetable. It will be a topics course, tentatively titled Art Matters: (specific title). As with 205, about half the lectures will be given by other faculty and affiliates. The second is indeed Artist as Scientist and tentatively scheduled to be offered in Spring 2017.

- We have updated course titles and descriptions for many courses and nearly all faculty members are making use of the “starman” link in the Course Guide. We are putting much greater emphasis in our descriptions and in reality on the skills that we help students develop.

- We are exploring the potential of courses that take better advantage of our strong relationships with Art, Religious Studies, and departments in the “Historical Humanities” group. There is the possibility of two or more of us developing a course with RS on a topic like “religious art and visual culture.” There is interest in a share historical humanities course, but that will have to wait until there is a better sense of what will happen to some of the units.

Quality of advising

- We reorganized our undergraduate advising structure to create a director of undergraduate studies and academic advisor post, held by an individual who has
already won an award (Early Career Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Advising) for his advising skills.

- We continue to have a faculty advisor for undergraduates (Director of Undergraduate Studies) and another for graduates (Director of Graduate Studies), who provide deeper academic guidance.

- We have instituted a departmental major and career fair in which faculty, advisors, professionals, and others address current and potential majors on the nature of the field, its skill sets, and career possibilities.

- We have worked and will continue to work with CCAS and have met with advisors from the Art department to talk about our new curriculum.

Assessment

- We have developed a clearer set of learning outcomes for students at all levels and met the Provost’s requirements in this regard. We are currently working on the next phase regarding reporting assessments. We care deeply about this.

- We are in the process of formalizing a system for assessing those outcomes based on:
  - Performance in classes as reported by the faculty
  - Performance in the capstone course as an assessment moment
  - Website surveys just before and after graduation

Time to Degree for Graduate Students

- We have redesigned our graduate program to consist of freestanding MA and MA/PhD tracks. This removes a full year from our current MA/PhD degree program and we expect to see a dramatic impact on our time to degree.

- In the redesign, we also set up tighter guidelines for the timing of prelim exams, thereby shortening the time before students reached dissertator status.

- We have in place several mentoring frameworks.
  - For our first year students we have the Portfolio Review.
  - For MA students, we have the MA Moment, at which time MA/PHD students are carefully assessed regarding their fitness to move into the PhD stage.
  - We are considering re-implementing the Annual Review of all students at key points in their progress, but past experience does not lead us to believe this is truly effective in a practical way.

- We are encouraging students to use the IDP- “Individual Development Plan”-http://grad.wisc.edu/pd/idp-and from this are putting in place Dissertator /Mentor
Annual Reports.

- Art History is a unique field and so time to degree may well be longer for certain students, who will become better prepared for the job market with more complete training. For example, some fields require three or even more foreign languages, the acquisition of special skills, and extensive field work.

- Time to degree may also be affected by paid internships or research fellowships, which many of our students have received and which provide important opportunities to improve the quality of their work as they spend funded years at various institutes, museums, libraries, cities, or sites; these sorts of prestigious outside fellowships provide unparalleled experience through contact with primary sources and objects of study, through specialized training and networking with professionals in their fields, and through the development of their thought. All of these experiences are also highly beneficial for today’s candidates entering the job market.

- We have admittedly been lenient with students already in careers (curatorial, commercial, and academic) who wished to persist in pursuing a Ph.D. and were using virtually no campus resources. We have become stricter and a number of our long-term students have completed in the last five years (the longest completing this semester).
25 March 2015

TO: Gene Phillips, Chair, Art History

FROM: John Karl Scholz, Dean

RE: Completion of L&S Review of Art History Programs:

- BA/BS Art History
- Material Cultures Certificate Program (Undergraduate)
- MA-Art History
- Material Cultures Certificate Program (Graduate)
- Ph.D. Art History (including Option: Architectural History)

On February 3 and on March 3, 2015, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered the materials submitted in fulfillment of the mandated review of the academic programs offered in the Department of Art History. These materials included the self-study prepared by the department and the faculty involved in the sub-programs in Material Cultures and in Architectural History, the review committee report, and comments the department offered to correct errors of fact in that report.

Before I summarize the council’s discussion, I would like to thank you and everyone else who participated in the review. Though we have streamlined the L&S approach to program review, we know that it still requires considerable effort and attention to prepare the self-study and to work with the review committee. That work keeps the process of peer evaluation transparent and useful, and it’s essential to maintaining the quality of the university.

The APC noted that Art History is nationally well-regarded and has great strengths. The faculty has been creative, and has developed programs that span departments and disciplines – and, notably, UW institutions. Council members appreciated the department’s efforts to address issues identified in the last review, and saw that you have expanded the global curriculum and created more entry points into the undergraduate major. Unfortunately, despite this attention, and like arts and humanities programs nationally, enrollments are still declining, and the council discussed extensively recommendations concerning the need to update course titles and descriptions, and to address what appears to be systemic problems with planning the course schedule so courses are offered when students can take them. Council members reported that many departments (including their own) have planning processes to fairly distribute popular
teaching time slots among faculty; to avoid scheduling conflicts among required undergraduate courses, and between undergraduate courses and graduate courses taken by TAs; and to avoid scheduling long class sessions that span multiple class periods and conflict with other courses students are taking. These practical matters affect Art History enrollments, and seem particularly to affect enrollments for non-majors, who are most likely to “vote with their feet.” Council members strongly recommend that Art History think carefully about course scheduling from students’ perspectives, and not only work to lower hurdles that prevent them from seeking your courses, but also to create courses that invite them.

At the graduate level, different issues were identified. The challenge of inadequate graduate funding is common to all UW-Madison programs, and though it can affect time to degree, it is not usually the only factor. The APC expressed concern about the average time to degree in the graduate program. It encourages you and your colleagues to identify, as best you can, the various issues that may be slowing your students’ pace through the program.

Assessment of Student Learning

Members noted that the 2013 assessment report indicated the intention to update the department’s plan for assessing student learning, but that an assessment plan was not included among materials. It appears, nevertheless, that the department has identified core skills that will provide the foundation for undergraduate learning outcomes, and had adopted a strategy to survey students about their perceptions of learning relative to these outcomes. We encourage you to pull together information on assessment in a format that will make these efforts more clear both within and external to the department. The Provost’s Office has developed a template for a “Basic Assessment Plan,” and offers guidance on describing learning outcomes (http://provost.wisc.edu/assessment/). You will see that the university expects that every program will have learning outcomes articulated, and that assessment strategies should include both indirect measures (like the surveys Art History proposes to field) as well as direct measures (such as examination of student projects). Monitoring student awards and placement can also play a role in assessment, assuming that these achievements relate to the learning outcomes you have identified. Graduate programs should articulate learning outcomes that align with the set of general outcomes developed by the Graduate Faculty Executive committee, and we encourage departments to discuss the strategies they use to evaluate graduate students’ attainment of those outcomes (often, at major milestones, through comprehensive exams, review of dissertation proposals, and defense).

Certificates in Material Culture

The scholarly program in Material Culture has achieved notable recognition, though the department is right to be concerned about the extent to which a small faculty can field two programs in this area. The review committee noted that the program, though small, makes a “vibrant” contribution to undergraduate education, and offered no comment on the graduate program. With no awards in the past three years, and very limited resources, we would suggest that the faculty consider carefully whether to continue to offer this program. Also, like the programs discussed above, both certificates require that attention be paid to formalizing the
assessment of student learning; they should be included in the assessment plan you develop for the department’s programs.

Option in Architectural History (Buildings-Landscape-Culture)

The Ph.D. “named option” in Architectural History, known colloquially as the “BLC” program, is unique among L&S programs due to the extent to which the program is truly shared by faculty at UW-Madison and UW-Milwaukee. The program is small, but has been able to produce its first graduates only four years after being established. The self-study and review committee report note the challenges presented by the need to share courses across campuses, and the desire that students might sample courses beyond the narrow constraints of the well-defined, carefully managed curriculum. This review affords us an opportunity to ask the institutions to revisit the MOU that sets these limits. Finally, we noted that here, too, the distinct educational goals of the BLC option should likely be reflected in the department’s assessment plan and reporting.

With regard to the overall program review, the APC and I make the following specific requests:

- Given the strong decline in Art History enrollments, the APC has requested that the department respond to concerns about course and curricular planning processes. Please send me a report, by April 24, 2015, describing your department’s process for scheduling courses to serve the interests of students (including, but not limited to, majors). It would also be useful to know the department’s plans, if any, to develop or expand “general” courses designed to serve students who are not pursuing any of the Art History programs.
- Throughout the documentation provided, reference was made to “the Asian Option.” According to the Registrar’s list of approved programs, there is no such option; if you and your colleagues wish to advertise this as a formal program, please consult Assistant Dean Elaine Klein about the process for seeking formal approval.
- The review committee and APC both noted the long time to degree for completion of the doctoral program. We will defer to the authority of the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee to require that you identify potential causes and develop a plan to address this issue, but if they do not, I ask that you submit a report on this topic to your Associate Dean.
- Finally, as noted above, the department has work to do on the assessment of student learning. At a minimum, we will expect the department to respond to the Provost’s recent call for learning outcomes (to be submitted by June 1 in the form of a survey); you may anticipate that complete assessment plans for each program will be required next year, and that reports on your assessment activities will follow.

The L&S Academic Planning Council considers this review complete, though there is other work deriving from the process still to be done. Thank you for your continued attention to the effort to consider your department’s priorities and to candidly evaluate its programs.

xc:
Marty Gustafson, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning and Assessment, Graduate School
Elaine M. Klein, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
Daniel Kleinman, Associate Dean, Graduate School
Jocelyn Milner, Director of Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for the Arts and Humanities, L&S
The Art History Department review committee was composed of (in alphabetical order) Lester Hunt (Philosophy), Christa Olson (English) and Kirsten Wolf (Scandinavian Studies). The committee met on nine separate occasions for a total of approximately eight hours. We interviewed the following people: department chair Gene Phillips, Thomas Dale (recent department chair and co-author of the department’s self-study report submitted last semester), director of the Buildings-Lands-Communities Ph. D. Companion Program Anna Andrzejewski, Ann Smart-Martin of the Material Culture Certificate Programs, Student Services Associate Teddy Kaul, and Director Russell Panczenko of the Chazen Museum. We also met with two undergraduate majors and, on a separate occasion, four graduate students. In addition, we studied and discussed the self-study report and documents detailing course offerings, course descriptions and titles, and requirements for the major and other programs.

The Department of Art History, though much smaller than some departments at this university, has a distinguished faculty that continues to bring respect to the university in its field. In addition, we are very impressed by the changes that the department has made in response to the previous review (in 2005-2006). The requirements for the undergraduate major have changed dramatically, from requiring one course in the Asian/African category to requiring courses from at least three of five different geographically-defined categories. The “history” in the art history major is now much more a matter of world history, with a significantly less narrow focus on Western traditions and cultures. New faculty positions been added to support this broadening of emphasis. They have hired a specialist in Islamic art and another faculty member, whose focus is Indian architecture and urban design (part of a visual cultures cluster) has transferred from Languages and Cultures of Asia. The department has also replaced its recently departed specialist in Chinese art. They also hired a specialist in Native American art as part of the American Indian Studies Cluster. Unfortunately, she has recently left the university, but the department is developing plans to replace her.

Adding a full-time staff position has made undergraduate advising more consistent and clear than it was. The student reactions to this change that we observed were very positive.

During that same period the department has, like other humanities disciplines, suffered a significant decline in enrollments and in the number of majors. As noted in the self-study, majors in the past eight years went from a peak of around 130 to a low of between 50 and 75 during the period of 2011 through 2013, to over 90 at the time of that report. We find that now, one semester later, the number is just below 80, a difference that can probably be accounted for by the fact that over 20 majors graduated at the end of last semester. We also find that the numbers for undergraduate enrollments follow a trajectory that to some extent is similar to those for the major, falling from a peak of around 1200 to a low in the lower 800s. The decline in enrollments ended earlier than that in majors (as one would expect). Since then, it has been more difficult to discern a consistent trend, partly no doubt due to an artificial dip in enrollments last semester, caused by complications due to curriculum restructuring. Currently enrollments are in the lower 800s. The department is making important changes aimed at enhancing enrollments and plans to make more. Discussion of these changes, with our suggestions, can be found below.
Undergraduate Education

Structure and administration
The department offers the B.A. in Art History through a standard track, an honors track, an Asian option, and a certificate in Material Culture. It is embarking on a Curatorial Studies certificate.

Curriculum and enrollments
Over the past six years, the Art History department has made significant changes in its curriculum and its approach to undergraduate education. Those changes came largely in response to the previous program review, but also to a sudden decline in majors and enrollments mentioned above. The effects of those changes are just beginning to be visible, but they show promise both in terms of the intellectual breadth they provide and the student populations they engage. There is likely still work to be done to return enrollments to near 2007-2008 levels. The department’s self-study offers a thorough overview of that revision process and of the department’s learning goals and expected outcomes for undergraduate majors.

We heard a great deal from students and faculty about the recent curricular revision that allows Art History majors to enter the program through any two of a selection of 200-level gateway courses that represent a spectrum of regions, time periods, and methodological orientations for Art History. Reactions to the revision were consistently positive, highlighting students’ ability to specialize and their increased opportunity to look beyond European traditions. Because these new 200-level courses were introduced this year, the department has not had time to evaluate the long-term impact of this curricular change on student learning or interest in the major.

The undergraduate students who met with the committee admitted to some confusion with juggling the geographic, temporal, and level requirements of the revised major and mentioned that it was sometimes unclear how new courses would count toward those requirements. However, they saw the new major as an overall net gain because of how it pushed them to engage with a wider array of materials and regions than they might otherwise have considered (Professor Pruitt’s course on Islamic Art received special mention here).

Starting with Art History 202, the survey of Renaissance to Modern Art and one of the entry points to the major, Art History has committed to revising the content and format of some of its core courses. The revised version of 202 is being offered for the first time this semester. With the help of an Educational Innovations grant, Professor Anna Andrzejewski has added online discussion sessions to Art History 202 and is preparing an entirely online version of the course for Summer 2015. In addition, the EI grant offered Professor Andrzejewski the opportunity to work with a teaching and learning consultant to revise the content and delivery of the course. She reports that the adjustments she has made to lecture have resulted in significantly increased student engagement and seem to have positive effects on their learning. Professor Andrzejewski and others also mentioned the vital role that the Visual Recourses Collection headed by curator Jacob Esselstrom has and will continue to play in the department’s educational innovations.

Program climate
The undergraduate students who met with the committee were enthusiastic about the major and the faculty. They appreciate the one-on-one mentorship that faculty provide and felt that faculty were attentive to their particular needs and interests—guiding them toward appropriate courses and career opportunities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on what we heard from faculty, staff, and students, we offer the following recommendations in service of both current undergraduate majors and the need to increase enrollments in undergraduate courses:

1) Update course titles and descriptions to communicate content in clearer and more engaging ways for undergraduate students
2) Make course information (including clear descriptions of the specific version of the class that will be taught) more readily available to students online through the Art History website and UW-Madison course guide. Ideally, these descriptions would include information for students about which major requirements each course fulfills. Also, be sure that course information is up to date in DARS.
3) Offer a greater variety of 2x per week and 3x per week classes to make more class times available to students.
4) As appropriate, consider adding 100 and 200-level courses that are organized around themes that are of interest to non-majors.
5) Review requirements (reading load, assignments, expectations, etc.) in the 200-level gateway courses to ensure consistency across course numbers and semesters so that even as students take different routes into the major, they can assume equality of rigor and depth of learning opportunities.

Graduate Education

Structure and administration

The department offers M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in six tracts: a standard M.A. degree, the Asian Option M.A., a double M.A. in Art History and Library and Information Science, a standard Ph.D. degree, an Architectural Option in the Ph.D., and a certificate in Material Culture. Recently, the department has modified the standard M.A. program to create a terminal M.A. degree open to self-funded students. A Director of Graduate Studies oversees graduate education.

Admissions and enrollment

Admission to the graduate programs is highly selective. The admitted students are invited to visit campus during a designated recruiting event in February/March. There is a welcoming reception where prospective graduate students have the opportunity to meet current graduate students, Art History faculty and staff, and Chazen Museum staff as well as to familiarize themselves with department resources, the Chazen Museum, and the Kohler Art Library. The annual enrollment is healthy with approximately 40 students consistently enrolled.
Funding

Graduate students are funded with the exception of the students in the terminal M.A. degree. Faculty who met with the committee noted that there were problems with funding and time to degree, and that even the best funding packages fall short of what the best art history departments in the country are able to offer. Graduate students who met with the committee called for more transparency in terms of awards. They voiced concerns that the standards for fellowships differed among the various tracks, and that some advisors were better advocates for their students than others. Graduate students felt that fast progression was rewarded and would like steady progression to be rewarded instead. The graduate chair interviewed by a member of the committee argued that the complaint about awards and fellowships was not pertinent, and mentioned that recently two awards were given to medievalists (not exactly an example of rewarding fast progression). Nonetheless, the committee feels that these issues should be addressed and, at the very least, discussed in a manner that will alleviate student frustration.

Advising and curriculum

Students are advised by their major professors and are referred to Director of Graduate Studies when questions arise. Graduate students who met with the committee voiced concerns about inconsistencies in requirements or expectations in terms of course work, especially basic course requirements and basic language requirements. Students claimed that the department was inconsistent in terms of expectations for prelims and would like more standardization. The committee recognizes that creating standardized expectations across the various tracks may be difficult, if not impossible. Students acknowledged that there was an on-line graduate student handbook, but claimed that the handbook was unclear, and that they were not kept informed about changes made in the handbook. The graduate chair agreed that the website was a little problematic, and that the department was moving toward a new one. Students also pointed out that sometime their advisors were unsure about the specific requirements.

Graduate students who met with the committee were dissatisfied with the scheduling of classes. They mentioned instances of not being able to take required language courses because of their teaching schedule. Students requested that they be able to register for classes before getting their teaching schedules, and that the Curriculum Committee consult with the prospective TAs before scheduling teaching assignments for graduate students.

Time-to-degree

Data provided from the Graduate School indicate that the time to degree is 10 or 12 years. That is a long time. The review committee identified three possible reasons for this: 1. the language requirements in some of the tracks; 2. lack of sufficient funding; 3. problems with scheduling as outlined above.

RECOMMENDATIONS
1) Schedule classes so that these don’t conflict with the TAs’ course requirements. Giving earlier notice of their TA section assignments might be helpful here.

2) Prepare a Graduate Handbook and update the web site to clearly reflect requirements for the various tracks in terms of course work and prelims.

3) Improve overall communication to graduate students regarding fellowships and awards.

4) Focus on ways to improve time-to-degree by exploring more opportunities for dissertator support.

The BLC and Material Culture Programs

Conversations with the coordinators of the Buildings-Landscapes-Cultures program and the Material Culture Certificate Programs made clear that both programs, though small, make vibrant contributions to graduate (BLC) and undergraduate (Material Culture) education. Both programs readily enroll students and meet demand not otherwise covered at UW-Madison. In each case, the primary challenges facing the programs are structural/administrative. The collaboration between UW-Milwaukee and UW-Madison at the heart of the Buildings, Landscape, and Design program has become more difficult to navigate since Milwaukee left the CIC, raising challenges for students at each campus who would like to take electives at the other campus. The Material Cultures certificate faces similar challenges in light of its changing and widely-dispersed faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) For Buildings-Landscapes-Cultures: Ideally, structural changes would make it possible for BLC students to easily take courses across both campuses. Failing that, it would be helpful to allow graduate students to enroll in one or two electives at the partner institution as part of their degree.

2) For Material Culture: A small amount of administrative support and/or course support to allow faculty from across the university to teach classes in the certificate would make a substantial difference in the viability of the program.

Relations with the Chazen Museum

This committee regards itself as obliged to comment on the relations between the Department of Art History and the Chazen Museum of Art, if only because it is discussed rather prominently in the department’s self-study report. These relations have at times been contentious ones. It might go without saying that we cannot comment on the specific actions or personalities of the individuals involved. Even if it were within the scope of the committee’s charge (which is
doubtful) we lack the intimate acquaintance with relevant circumstances that such comments would require. However, we did discuss these matters with the current department chair as well as the immediately preceding chair and the director of the Chazen, and we would like to offer some general comments on matters of institutional principle.

As a museum, the Chazen has a mission that is quite different from that of an academic department like the Department of Art History. Though one can think of a museum as essentially an educational institution, it nonetheless carries out its mission by quite different means from those of an academic department and it is natural for its personnel to think of it as serving a quite different sector of the public. We are told that the Chazen is the second largest art museum in the state. On the other hand, it is, like the art history department, part of the College of Letters and Science. In addition, it is natural for people in the department to think the museum as serving an art history mission. After all, no other department of the university has an academic program that involves the museum in the same direct sort of way that the department’s new Curatorial Studies certificate programs do. The current arrangement, in which the museum is both autonomous and yet also serves as an educational resource for other parts of the university, and even has a special such relationship with one other department, is fraught with the sort of ambiguity that can lead to conflict if there are also personality differences or even honest difference of “philosophy” in the right places. The remedy for such institutionally supported ambiguity is institutional clarity. In light of this, we regard the recent seven-point memorandum of agreement between the department and the museum as a large step in the right direction. It guarantees the department access to museum resources that are essential for the Curatorial Studies programs and includes details such as deadlines for requests the department makes for use of museum resources. A written document, representing arrangements to which the department and the museum agree, can certainly reduce possible areas of disagreement. Perhaps further use of such written agreements can bring additional clarity and stability to relations between these two important units of the university.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Ways of adding clarity to the relations between the department and the Chazen should be sought.

2) To this end, written agreements, and even constructive feedback from outside the department and the museum might be helpful.

Chair's Comment concerning MOA between Department of Art History and Chazen Museum:
This is not an signed MOA, although it has been agreed to by both sides and copied to Assoc. Dean Zaeske and Dean Scholz.