Interim Report Form

Name of Institution: Art Center College of Design

Person Submitting the Report: Leslie Johnson, Executive Director of Academic Affairs and Co-Director, Center for Educational Effectiveness (ALO)

Report Submission Date: March 1, 2021

Statement on Report Preparation

Briefly describe in narrative form the process of report preparation, providing the names and titles of those involved. Because of the focused nature of an Interim Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of all institutional constituencies is not normally required. Faculty, administrative staff, and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the report. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and, where appropriate, the governing board, should review the report before it is submitted to WSCUC, and such reviews should be indicated in this statement.

While work on all the areas described in the report continued directly onward from the end of the March 2017 Comprehensive Review site visit, specific work organizing this Interim Report began in January 2020. The preparation of this report was divided into three primary subject areas, as requested by the Commission. The composition of each of the essays was a collaborative effort, and the complexity of the self-reflection process and its impact on institutional evolution is not completely reflected in this report due to space limitations. Yet we submit this Interim Report having been enriched by the discussions, analyses and shared reflections incorporated herein.

The first essay addresses program review and was prepared by a team including: Leslie Johnson, Executive Director of Academic Affairs and Co-Director, Center for Educational Effectiveness (ALO); Karen Hofmann, Provost; Esmeralda Nava, Director of Institutional Research and Co-Director, Center for Educational Effectiveness; Stephanie Marshall, Senior Coordinator, Center for Educational Effectiveness; and Sarah Gass, Assistant Research Analyst, Institutional Research. The essay was reviewed and refined from feedback provided by the ArtCenter's Assessment and Program Review Initiative (APRI), which in addition to those listed above, includes representatives from the Faculty Assessment Liaison Cohort, Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development.

The second essay addresses program learning outcomes and WSCUC Core Competencies assessment and was prepared by a team composed of: Leslie Johnson, Executive Director of Academic Affairs and Co-Director Center for Educational Effectiveness (ALO); Esmeralda Nava, Director of Institutional Research and Co-Director, Center for Educational Effectiveness; Stephanie Marshall, Senior Coordinator, Center for Educational Effectiveness; Sarah Gass, Assistant Research Analyst, Institutional Research. The essay was reviewed and refined from feedback provided by the ArtCenter's Assessment and Program Review Initiative (APRI), which in addition to those listed above, includes representatives from the Faculty Assessment Liaison Cohort, Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development.

The third essay addresses the evolution of shared governance and was generated by a core team made up of: Lorne Buchman, President; Karen Hofmann, Provost; Ted Young, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs; Sam Holtzman, Director of Faculty Development, and Leslie Johnson, Executive Director of Academic Affairs and Co-Director, Center for Educational Effectiveness (ALO). The draft essay was reviewed and refined from feedback provided by the ArtCenter's Faculty Council, which is composed of elected representatives of all curricular departments and ArtCenter Extension.

The provost and other appropriate members of executive leadership also reviewed and contributed to the overall drafting and review of this report.

List of Topics Addressed in this Report
Please list the topics identified in the action letter(s) and that are addressed in this report.

The Interim Report instructions in the June 30, 2017 Commission Action Letter requested that we respond to the following topics:

Program Review:
Evidence of completed program reviews for each degree program, general education, and designated co-curricular areas, showing how the findings and areas identified for improvement will be addressed with action plans and timelines, as appropriate.

Assessment:
- Core competency assessments, to include four years of longitudinal data (2017 – 2020) for the five core competencies;
- Program learning outcomes assessments, to include four years of longitudinal data (2017 – 2020) for each of ArtCenter's degree programs.

Shared Governance:
Summary description of the evolution of shared governance, with specific response to the recommendations from the visiting team report of March 2017.

Institutional Context

Very briefly describe the institution's background; mission; history, including the founding date and year first accredited; geographic locations; and other pertinent information so that the Interim Report Committee panel has the context to understand the issues discussed in the report.

Founded in 1930 by advertising man and educational visionary Edward A. "Tink" Adams, Art Center College of Design (styled as "ArtCenter"), located in Pasadena, California, is a private, not-for-profit professional art and design institution. ArtCenter was the first school to teach real-world professional skills to artists and designers and prepare them for leadership roles in advertising, publishing and industrial design. For the time, this was a radical new concept. Its viability was quickly proven: even in the midst of the Great Depression, ArtCenter's graduates found employment.

We currently offer BFA and BS degrees in eleven disciplines: BFA degrees in Advertising , Graphic Design, Illustration, Film, Fine Art and Photography and Imaging; and BS degrees in Entertainment Design, Environmental Design, Product Design, Transportation Design, and Interaction Design. The college offers MFA and MS degrees in: Art, Film, Media Design Practices, Industrial Design, Graduate Transportation Systems and Design, Graduate Environmental Design and Graduate Graphic Design. Two non-degree programs support all of the majors with additional courses: Integrated Studies, which offers foundation-level classes as well as non-unit workshops in drawing, sketching, painting, typography and various digital media applications open to all students, faculty and staff; and Humanities and Sciences, which offers general education classes. The college also has extensive non-degree offerings via ArtCenter Extension focused on classes for children (ACX Kids), high school students (ACX Teens) and adults (ACX). Our ACX Teachers programs, for intermediate and high school teachers, provide design strategies for creative educational experiences. ArtCenter College of Design was first accredited by the Professional Art Education Association in 1949, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WSCUC) in 1955, and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), in 1963. In 1951, the college achieved 501(c)3 federal IRS tax-exempt status. It is also a member of the Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design (AICAD).

ArtCenter's Spring 2021 headcount enrollment of 1,974 undergraduate and 247 graduate students, with approximately 43% international students, reflects the changing demographic of the Los Angeles area and of the United States in general. Our student body is diverse in cultures, perspectives, gender, sexual identity, race and ethnicity. Financial aid strategies are intended to assist both the highest need students as well as those who bring strong credentials or contribute to diversity on campus.

ArtCenter provides a studio and critique-based educational experience. Studio classes are taught by one or two faculty members and have an overall faculty to student ratio of 8:1, allowing for frequent, individualized feedback and discussions between faculty and students regarding the work being produced. Certain classes may be smaller due to specific facilities or enrollment requirements; some may be larger based upon the nature of the work involved (some sponsored projects combine multiple majors with two to three faculty members and may grow to about 25 students organized into teams of five to six students each). Most courses are three credits and meet once per week for three to five hours per class (sometimes six or eight), depending upon the nature of the work done within and outside of class sessions. All Humanities and Sciences courses are three credits and meet three hours per week. The faculty is composed of a small group of full-time faculty members (134 as of Spring 2021), and a large pool of part-time faculty members, primarily art and design professionals who are active in their professional practices (approximately 371 in Spring 2021) and who generally teach one to two classes per week. Many of our part-time faculty members have been with the college several years, maintaining a consistency of content and practice shared with our core full-time faculty.

Our graduates continue to command good jobs and successful careers in the ever-changing fields of art and design, especially in new multi-disciplinary practices such as media and entertainment design. Each year the Office of Institutional Research conducts the Annual Graduate Employment Survey, targeting students graduating in the calendar year (spring, summer, and fall). The survey gathers data on current

employment status, salary, career satisfaction and the overall quality of their ArtCenter preparation. For the Classes of 2018, 80% of graduates indicated that they were employed either full-time or part-time one year after graduation (based on a 50% overall response rate for bachelor's and master's recipients). 83% of all graduates were somewhat or very satisfied with their post-graduation occupation and 42% were offered full-time employment as a result of an [internship](#) completed while a student at the college. 94% reported finding post-graduation occupations that were somewhat or very related to their program of study at ArtCenter.

Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

This main section of the report should address the issues identified by the Commission in its action letter(s) as topics for the Interim Report. Each topic identified in the Commission's action letter should be addressed. The team report (on which the action letter is based) may provide additional context and background for the institution's understanding of issues.

Provide a full description of each issue, the actions taken by the institution that address this issue, and an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. Have the actions taken been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable? How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes. Responses should be no longer than five pages per issue

Topic 1: Program Review_____

At the time of the 2016-2017 WSCUC Comprehensive Review, program review was still in its initial deployment phase, having first been developed and approved by the college in 2014 and rolled out in 2015. Since that time, in accordance with the encouragement of the WSCUC Review Team and the Commission, program review has continued and become a valued, systematic component of ArtCenter's quality assurance and collaborative reflection and planning activities.

Program Review: Structure and Processes (CFRs 2.3, 2.7, 2.11, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)

The comprehensive program review process builds upon the best practices of program review as put forward by WSCUC[1] and by a number of ArtCenter's peer institutions, tailoring those practices to be effective and meaningful in the context of ArtCenter's governance structures and fast-paced institutional culture. The key components of program review: the self-study, external review, and Memorandum of Understanding/Action Plan, form the overarching framework.

ArtCenter's program review process functions on a 7-year cycle (see ArtCenter Calendar of Program Review). To allow sufficient time for extensive departmental participation, including that of our large numbers of practitioner-faculty, the process in its entirety is generally undertaken for a full calendar year: six months for completion of the self-study, followed by external reviewer visits and concluding with a Memorandum of Understanding/Action Plan between the provost and department based on the findings of the self-study, the external reviewers, feedback from the college's Program Review Committee, and the observations of the provost in the context of institutional mission, strategic goals and resources (see ArtCenter Program Review completed MOUs and Action Plans by department). The provost apprises the president of any significant developments in program review planning and budget, including via standing meetings each semester dedicated to program review, assessment, and accreditation. The Center for Educational Effectiveness (CEE), composed of Academic Affairs and Institutional Research, manages the program review process under the supervision of the provost. In addition to meeting with each curricular department during the launch of the program review process, the CEE meets with departments calendared for program review a term before their start date to discuss expectations, logistics and ways to engage faculty in the process.

In order to reinforce the college's efforts to cultivate a culture of systematic assessment, the program review process intentionally promotes the development and maintenance of assessment processes. For instance, the program review self-study template directly asks departments to include assessment results and to indicate how they have arrived at the conclusions regarding student achievement and the health of the programs (see ArtCenter Program Review Self-Study Report Outline Template and ArtCenter Program Review Self-Study example). In order to further support the collection and usage of systematic

---

[1] *WASC Resource Guide for 'Good Practices' in Academic Program Review*, Jenefsky et al. 2009, and *Program Review: Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews.*

assessment of student learning outcomes, all Memoranda of Understanding/Action Plans specify that departments must provide assessment results for one to two program learning outcomes per year. Departments are asked to be transparent about any current gaps and to identify ways to develop their assessment and data-usage practices so that the process remains dynamic and meaningful.

To ensure cohesion between the program review process and curricular assessment practices, staff from the Center for Educational Effectiveness and Faculty Affairs, along with key faculty leading assessment practices hold regular meetings together under the banner of the Assessment and Program Review Initiative (APRI).

Outcomes of Program Review

The college's program review process has resulted in a number of concrete actions tied into planning and budget, including:

Undergraduate Graphic Design
1. Revision of curriculum to provide greater breadth of program offerings;
2. Development of the MFA program (which was launched in 2017);
3. Expansion and planning of the Transmedia/Mediatechture curriculum.

Undergraduate Transportation Design
1. Attention to curricular planning towards greater diversity of content in the program, specifically in the areas of interiors and interaction design;
2. Department's faculty line budget was reviewed in consideration of increase of course offerings and part-time faculty merit increases.

Entertainment Design
1. Established partnership with Humanities and Sciences to further integrate academic and research content into department's curriculum.

Fine Art
1. Partnered with the Admissions department to extend recruitment into local, regional, and national art association and high schools; work to review current scheduling processes within the department to address issues with matriculation and complete a pilot of a shorter summer intensive program.

Illustration
1. Implemented a Faculty Track Leader structure that more effectively provides support for professional-specific planning and student mentorship;
2. Developed plan for enhanced student academic advising; partnered with the Director of Academic Advising to explore ways to do so;
3. Working with Faculty Development to develop a new upper-term course that spans multiple tracks to help ensure students are adequately prepared for their final terms at the college and for professional life after graduation.

Humanities and Sciences (serves as the General Education department for the college)
1. Defined subject areas and pathways within Humanities and Sciences, including revised course offerings and expectations for professional practice curriculum; partnered with Career and Professional Development to create non-credit workshops and other professional resources for students;

2. Investigated ways to expand scholarship and research within the department's faculty body; explore the hiring of additional faculty within both the humanities and the sciences areas to support diversification and expansion of the curriculum;
3. Based on feedback from the program review process, including external reviewers, Humanities and Sciences collaboratively developed and launched new minor programs in Creative Writing, Business, Materials Science and Research.

Graduate Media Design Practices
1. Program's mission statement was simplified and the website was revised to streamline communication for recruitment and promotion and curation of student and faculty materials;
2. Department modified the curriculum and engaged in the review of the program (conducted annually with administrative team and every few years with core faculty);
3. Updated research agenda for the program along with the integration of processes including protocols for human subjects research and other forms of research, educational materials and best practices.

Photography and Imaging
1. Based on feedback from external reviewers, the department curriculum committee has considered how to introduce video to students earlier in curriculum, and has partnered with Integrated Studies to offer Basics of Video Production course;
2. Began exploring the program's alignment with the college's DEI agenda including development of a more socially aware classroom, review of current admissions practices, data and program costs, consideration of low residency models to open doors to new populations of students.

Integrated Studies
1. Development of the IDEA Year (first year program) proposal, in collaboration with the Humanities and Sciences department, via the institutions new program proposal process.

Product Design
1. Began to work collaboratively within the department to pivot curriculum and programming, based on rapid change in industry practices, with an emphasis on integration of digital tools and platforms to aid in content delivery. Began discussions with the provost on a potential master's degree in Product Design.

Graduate and Undergraduate Environmental Design
1. Based on external reviewer feedback, re-evaluated the program's current identity as "Environmental Design," began to further clarify the difference between the undergraduate and graduate programs, and proposed to transition the program name to "Spatial Design" pending internal college approval;
2. Based on program review, department is adjusting program curriculum with continued assessment to improve student experience and ensure career readiness: increase digital deliverables and reassess the amount of physical making within the program; track changes with professional practice and skill building early in the learning process; explore providing kits to students earlier in the program in additional to virtual activities such as workshops, off-campus maker spaces, encouraging the use of available materials, etc.; work to improve narrative and storytelling in student's writing and presentation development.
3. Department is building internal and external partnerships with embedded DEI elements including co-sponsorship of industry projects and other interdepartmental collaborative opportunities, in addition to continued involvement in ArtCenter's discussions on cultural change and student success.

Graduate Film
1. Establishment of regular internal curricular review and improved assessment practices including collaboration with faculty to revise the graduate program learning outcomes. Ensure that the current graduate student experience is retained as the state of the world changes by examining the capacity of the department and facilities, and managing existing available resources and opportunities, as well as requesting additional support as needed;
2. Work within the program to integrate the DEI agenda into curriculum and programming by creating structure for underrepresented students to work with advisors and develop projects through increased industry partnerships and funding and expanding the departments working relationships with more diverse independent film makers; partnering with Admissions to identify new populations of students, particularly underrepresented groups, and developing plans for recruiting and retention; exploring potential locations for program activities in the U.S. and making connections with companies, studios, and individuals in these areas of the country.

Undergraduate Film
1. Further development of assessment practices including formalization of plans to include more comprehensive term review activity for all students in all tracks with the program;
2. Discussing potential addition of Screenwriting and Production Design track: beginning stages of new program proposal including exploring internal partnerships with other degree granting programs, cost benefit analysis, potential markets and industry trend research, and impact on the current infrastructure and operation of the department;
3. Strengthening industry connections for curricular and co-curricular programming, increasing internship program opportunities (potential Production Assistant program), and engaging in conversations with the departments and provost about involvement in sponsored project process to clarify and magnify the contributions of the program.

Graduate Transportation Systems and Design
1. Program Review enabled the department chair and the core faculty to begin looking at the next phase of the program and to conduct an internal review of the structure, curriculum, etc. Began to look at the next set of challenges in the transportation design field in areas including energy, environmental impacts, geopolitical impacts, technology, social and political issues.
2. The program's faculty assessment liaison worked with the chair and faculty to develop better rubrics for reviews, examine the CLO/PLO alignment (which was not well built and will need more review), and to consider new models/cycles of content delivery and how to engage faculty more innovatively

Exchange and Study Away (co-curricular)
1. Increased staffing to three positions to include a fulltime support position for the director and assistant director (reclassification from part-time to full-time), and the appointment of a managing director for the ArtCenter Berlin program;
2. Continue work in progress revising the study away program proposal process and timelines and expanding best practices and procedures for risk assessment and management for all programs;
3. Working with the provost and the Development Committee to secure and expand funding for study away programs including support for operational costs, program budgets, and additional scholarship opportunities.

One of the most important outcomes of the program review process has been the self-reflective collective discussions faculty and department chairs have engaged in about their students' learning, their curricula, and their visions for their departments moving forward. Further, the college is able to identify opportunities and issues across multiple departments, which informs institutional priorities. Upon her assuming office in Summer 2018, the new provost noted that program review and assessment provide her

with important information as she collaboratively guides the educational functions of the college, including prompting explorations into the meaning of graduate education at ArtCenter.

In accordance with the June 30, 2017 Commission letter, the college prioritized program review in order to have all program reviews completed before March 1, 2021. As of this writing, nearly all of our academic programs have completed program review, including Humanities and Sciences, the department under which the college's general education program is housed. Due to the eruption of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020, program reviews for the remaining three programs: Graduate Art, Graduate Industrial Design, and Interaction Design had to be temporarily delayed, as circumstances required that we focus on the immediate and sustained pivot of all teaching, learning and administrative functions of the college to distance education rather than studio practice. However, the provost, with the support of the Center for Educational Effectiveness staff, leveraged these departments' 2019 reviews by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) to engage in initial planning discussions and prioritization for 2021. The Program Review Calendar has been updated, prioritizing these three programs in 2021-2022 (see [ArtCenter Calendar of Program Review](#)), with the anticipation that circumstances will permit the external reviewers to attend in-person reviews including evaluation of these programs' maker spaces and studio facilities.

Next Iteration of Program Review Process

The introduction of systematic program review in 2015 has provided another valuable avenue for departmental and college-level reflection and planning. The CEE has requested feedback on the process from the participating departments along the way, and will accordingly be making adjustments to the process to streamline the experience and support the most important aspect of the process – the collaborative and thoughtful discussions about teaching and learning and student outcomes. These adjustments are planned for implementation in 2022.

Topic 2: Assessment of Learning Outcomes_____

Art and Design Pedagogy and Assessment

In keeping with long-standing traditions of art and design instruction, ArtCenter's culture is one of active faculty/student engagement, involving a great deal of ongoing, direct feedback for students during the process of creating artifacts (student work). Additionally, our utilization of practitioner-faculty connects us deeply to external industry; programs actively adjust curriculum and instruction to best prepare students in accordance with developments in the professional world. Program curricula also include systematic, summative junctures for assessment via term reviews and course level embedded signature assignments. Term reviews are formal consultations where students meet with individuals from their department including practitioner-faculty, department committees, the department chair and occasionally industry representatives to review their portfolios of work, receiving individualized feedback before continuing to the next stages of their studies. Term reviews allow for identification and remediation of areas in which the student needs further development. Finally, senior students in all departments participate in a capstone graduation show of their work, with most departments dedicating a course in students' final semesters to help them prepare for this cumulative display of their work to the college community and external, visiting industry professionals and prospective employers.

Assessing Student Achievement of Learning Outcomes

Departments each have their own specific methods of assessing program and course learning outcomes. Term reviews, which had previously served as informal assessment opportunities primarily used to advise students and to inform curricular modifications, have been aligned with departmental program learning outcomes (PLOs), and serve as robust points at which faculty and department chairs assess students' achievement of the PLOs. During the term reviews, student work, including portfolios, is reviewed by practitioner-faculty, directors, or department committees, and in some cases, the department chair. Through assessment of the student's body of work, the department is able to provide important feedback to the student and identify (in aggregate) curricular areas that need adjustments. Term review rubrics help to capture scores for the PLOs, allowing the department to track student progress as well as providing the ability to analyze course and curricular needs. Departments that do not have term reviews have identified courses that are used to assess PLOs, and the process of collection of assessment data has been built into these activities using embedded signature assignments. Due to the work of the Assessment Liaison Cohort, departments have aligned their program learning outcomes to their term reviews or identified courses, which provided them the ability to assess their PLOs on a regular basis. All undergraduate departments aligned their PLOs with an identified activity or course, and the graduate departments assess their PLOs using the completed thesis as the point of assessment.

Students (both undergraduate and graduate level) graduating from ArtCenter also engage in a capstone event: "Grad Show," where students' work is displayed for the public and external industry professionals. In preparation for the event, most departments require a corresponding capstone course or courses be completed, which serve as a final summative juncture for students to receive feedback on their cumulative learning, as evidenced in their final Grad Show projects. It should be noted that as part of the college's commitment to professional preparation, the curriculum emphasizes connections with external industry. In addition to ongoing study with practitioner-faculty (many of whom are successful industry professionals), curricular opportunities such as the Transdisciplinary Studios (TDS), DesignStorms, Pensole study away program, Footwear Design Workshop (sponsored by industry partners, including Nike, Adidas, Under Armour, Vans, etc.) and Designmatters (DM) courses allow our students to work directly with and receive feedback from external corporate partners. All of these curricular components further ensure that our students are developing the competencies necessary to engage successfully in the professional world after graduation.

2017-2020 Longitudinal Data: Core Competencies and Program Learning Outcomes

As requested in the June 2017 WSCUC Commission Letter, we are providing evidence of collection of WSCUC core competencies and program learning outcome (PLO) data for our curricular programs for the years 2017-2020. All undergraduate degree-granting programs collected data for the WSCUC core competencies and all undergraduate and graduate degree programs collected PLO data for 2017-2020. (see ArtCenter Status of Program Assessment 2021*)*

WSCUC Core Competencies Assessment
Measurement of the WSCUC core competencies occurred as outlined in the *2013 WSCUC Handbook of Accreditation*, at or near the point of graduation (CFR 2.2a); the activities associated with the collection of data were determined by the faculty of the educational departments and the department chairs. Departments selected courses or term reviews (student meetings with individual faculty, department chairs, or department committees to review student portfolios or work) for the student assessments and data collection, with the majority identifying the graduation show (exhibition of student work) as the summative point of measurement for the core competencies.

The Office of Institutional Research conducted an analysis of the WSCUC core competencies in 2020 (see ArtCenter WSCUC Core Competencies Analysis Report 2020), including a comparison of results to the report produced prior to the WSCUC comprehensive review in 2016/2017. Findings of the report include:

- Increase in average scores for all WSCUC core competencies between 2015 and 2020;
- Largest improvement in the area of oral communication, previously an area of concern for the college based on the analysis conducted in 2015, with an increase in average scores across departments (+10%);
- Benchmarks set by the college were met for all WSCUC core competencies, and at least 98% of students were scoring a 2 or higher [2];
- Improvement in average scores across most departments seen over the collection period 2017 - 2020, with the largest increases in average scores in the areas of oral communication, information literacy, and critical thinking;
- The area of written communication did see an increase but remains an area that the college will continue to address due to the large international population at ArtCenter (about 40%);
- The provost and the departments will work together to explore areas that saw decreases in average scores in depth with corresponding actions as needed;

Undergraduate degree-granting programs review PLO and core competencies data as part of the review of curriculum (annually or during specific times of the academic year depending on the program) and for departmental programming purposes (see ArtCenter Assessment Liaison Cohort Online Form sampling). Some of the outcomes of the discussions and review within the department includes:

- Incorporation into or refinement of a written self-assessment as part of the department or program's student term review process *(written communication);*
- Working to improve *written and oral communication* as part of the development of student engagement and capability in critiquing the work of their peers;
- Ensuring that *written communication* is addressed throughout the curriculum by developing, implementing, and refining activities that help students build their skills with a final culminating activity at or near the point of graduation;

---

[2] A score of 2 is considered "Passing" according to the rubrics developed by the academic departments, with a recommended scale established by the college

- Incorporating written requirements into co-curricular activities such as the application for and review of materials to receive departmental scholarship *(written communication);*
- Departments and faculty referring students to the Writing Center as a resource for improving *written communication;*
- Encouraging students and faculty to seek support with reading and research via the college's assigned departmental Library Liaison and the Library itself *(written communication, information literacy);*
- Strengthening of courses with content and activities involving student presentations such as pitching, critique, collaboration, etc. *(oral communication);*
- Requiring students to work with the college's Office of Career and Professional Development, completing a series of one-to-two-hour workshops within their capstone portfolio course *(oral communication);*
- Cross-track projects, events, and activities curricular and non-curricular between degree tracks or departments that require students to collaborate on team projects or participate in activities where *oral communication* is critical;
- Development and implementation of a peer-mentoring program to assist students with competency based and specialized skill within the majors (*co-curricular activity);*
- Introduction of new course content, assignments or activities within courses related to business skills *(critical thinking, information literacy, and quantitative reasoning);*
- Department review of curriculum in order to improve distribution of instruction on specific skills, adding additional topics in more courses throughout the curriculum, rather than being presented in a dedicated course, for example, ID form a class in the Product Design program (*critical thinking).*

Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessment

All graduate and undergraduate degree-granting programs also collected data (2017 – 2020) for their program learning outcomes (PLOs), as requested by the WSCUC Commission (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3). Faculty and department chairs refined rubrics to use with their term reviews or other departmental activities in order to fully assess PLOs each collection cycle (summer, fall, and spring of each year in most cases). The Office of Institutional Research analyzed each program's assessment data at the end of each cycle, and provided reports on the outcomes of the analysis to each department's chair and faculty assessment liaison (see [ArtCenter Summary of PLO and CC Assessment 2017-2020](#) and [ArtCenter PLO Assessment Analysis Report Sampling](#)). The data and analysis reports were shared with additional department or program stakeholders at department meetings, and reviewed by individuals involved in curricular and programmatic decisions for the program. Some examples of this include:

- Review of curriculum maps and subsequent adjustment to courses and modification or addition of CLOs on the course syllabi to eliminate gaps and close the loop on PLOs;
- Refinement of rubrics, adjustments to PLO descriptions and scoring descriptions within the rubrics for the department's assessment activities;
- Exploration, development or refinement of new or existing areas of knowledge and/or practice within the programs and adjustment to teaching methodologies;
- Working collaboratively as a department with the PLO analysis results:
  - Presenting results at department meetings and having open discussions on addressing areas of opportunity within specific PLOs;
  - Development of task forces to address some of these areas in more detail with specific faculty;
  - Monitoring of courses and communicating with faculty teaching courses whose CLOs align with PLOs that were identified as areas of challenge for the department;
  - Sharing of data between departments, and in some cases, between degree-granting and non-degree granting departments, as appropriate;

- Adjustment of benchmarks as part of the analysis of PLOs and Core Competencies to better reflect appropriate levels of measure for student learning;
- Use of data to discuss and review program credit count and inform the department's approach to shared, foundational classes in earlier semesters as well as the consideration of reduction of credits in order to support student success and completion as well as access and affordability;
- Use of data for planning of course sections and enrollments and comparison with other institutional data such as graduation and retention;
- Improvement of existing or addition of new assessment activities within the department or program, such as the addition of a new portfolio requirement for students at or near the point of graduation;
- Adjustment of the semester when students complete their term reviews, consideration and adjustment to the semester when specific courses being assessed are completed by the students;
- Development or improvement of faculty and staff committees related to assessment, curriculum, and/or programmatic activities with programs and departments.

Faculty Leadership of Assessment: The Assessment Liaison Cohort
The June 2017 WSCUC Commission Letter recommended that "the institution provide considerably more faculty training to ensure course- and program-level assessment processes reflect best practices and provide data and evidence of student learning." (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3) To that end, the college has continued development of, and support for the ArtCenter Faculty Assessment Liaison Cohort, an ongoing, faculty cohort-based model of developing and sharing assessment practices across departments. Funded by the provost, departments identify and delegate faculty representatives to participate in the cohort, acting as liaisons representing their specific department/discipline's needs and engaging in collegial work with faculty from other departments. Led by the Director of Faculty Development, faculty mentors, and the Center for Educational Effectiveness, projects for the Assessment Liaison Cohort include:
- Curricular mapping of the respective liaisons' course learning outcomes to program learning outcomes;
- Development or revision of course learning outcomes;
- The adoption of a course syllabus template that includes course learning outcomes;
- The development or revision of departments' program learning outcomes;
- Discussions on best practices capturing assessment information from assessment activities, including term reviews and graduation show;
- Discussions on how assessment results then inform departments' program review self-studies for the college's new, systematic program review process.

In addition to the sustained progress made in these areas, the Assessment Liaison Cohort serves to support authentic ways for faculty to engage with assessment, thus enhancing teaching and learning. The first cohort ran in Summer 2014 and has continued each term since. Faculty often rotate within their department, providing opportunities for other faculty members to participate, and for faculty to train one another within departments. Faculty Liaisons work with faculty within their departments to expand on the knowledge and training they receive from the Assessment Liaison Cohort, and bring the work of the cohort to the chair, support staff, and students. The college has continued to leverage its Assessment Liaison Cohort training to delve more fully into the alignment of learning outcomes, the development and use of term review rubrics, the exploration of new systems, technology and other tools to support the assessment process, and other activities necessary to improve ongoing practices across the college.

Topic 3: Shared Governance_____

Since the 2017 WSCUC site visit and June 2017 Commission Letter, ArtCenter has continued its development of shared governance structures and practices. In response to the requested update on the role faculty play in shared governance and institutional decision-making, this section includes a summary of these activities, as well as a description of the institution's current shared governance structure and process, achievements of shared governance, and the collaborative discussions regarding the reinvigoration and refinement of shared governance that are under way at the college.

Faculty Achievements Accomplished Via Shared Governance

There are many ways in which the faculty role is central to decision-making at ArtCenter, and there have been numerous accomplishments led by faculty in recent years. The Faculty Council, working in conjunction with the Faculty Policy Committee, has been instrumental in developing and refining the process of shared governance through practice. Several of the recent achievements below were the result of collaboration between Faculty Council, Faculty Policy Committee, and the Chairs Council. Significant achievements led by faculty through the college's shared governance process include:

- Faculty Council's collaborative work with the Faculty Policy Committee and Chairs Council to introduce part-time and part-time extended faculty contracts (launching Fall 2021);

- Faculty Council's collaborative work with the Faculty Policy Committee and Chairs Council to revise the faculty performance review policy and procedures (applies to both full-time and part-time faculty). The updated reviews include a DEI component.

- Faculty Council's collaborative work with the Faculty Policy Committee and Chairs Council to make part-time and full-time faculty pay grids aligned and made available to all faculty;

- Faculty Council's collaborative work with the Faculty Policy Committee and Chairs Council to create alignment of academic ranks (previously "titles") and the pay grid for full-time and part-time faculty;

- Faculty Council's collaborative work with the Faculty Policy Committee and Chairs Council on revision of the full-time faculty contracts, including removal of a long-standing "at will" clause;

- Faculty Council's collaborative work with the Faculty Policy Committee and Chairs Council on Updating of the full-time faculty hiring policy and procedures;

- Faculty Council's successful proposal to incorporate faculty review of department chairs in the provost's annual performance review of the chairs. This was implemented in 2020 and enhances the voice of faculty in the administration and teaching and learning aspects of their programs;

- Faculty Council's collaborative work with the Faculty Policy Committee and Chairs Council to more fully identify and formalize the college's curriculum committees. This will serve to clarify the roles faculty have in their departments as regards curriculum development and pedagogy;

- The faculty-led Research Committee planned and began development of an art and design focused research infrastructure for the college, including tailored human subjects research policy and protocols. The Research Committee has hosted conferences and symposia regarding research ethics and practices that included faculty, students and staff from the college community and from peer art and design institutions across the country. The work of the committee has impacted

the college's curriculum and pedagogy in numerous ways, including those related to diversity, equity and inclusion;

- The maturation of the college's faculty-driven learning outcomes assessment infrastructure and learning community – the Assessment Liaison Cohort. This serves to help ensure that assessment work is connected to curriculum adjustments and pedagogy and reinforces the engagement of faculty in data-driven educational decision-making;

- The successful development of two institution-wide strategic plans, the first of which involved over 500 faculty, staff, students and trustees;

- The programming of the 870 building, home of the college's Illustration and Fine Art departments, which included faculty from both departments;

- The programming of the 1111 South Arroyo facility, home of the college's Graphic Design, Advertising, Humanities and Sciences and Integrated Studies departments;

- The review of and revised strategy for our public programs, which involved day and evening faculty members in conjunction with administration. The program has been rebranded as ArtCenter Extension as a result of this work.

Faculty Role in Institutional Decision-Making

Faculty participation and leadership is embedded throughout ArtCenter's decision-making infrastructure. The college has worked to expand the direct role of faculty in student learning, curricular development, and academic programming. Faculty mentorship has grown, helping to build a larger body of faculty involvement in student learning activities. Faculty also play a direct role in decisions regarding allocation of scholarship funds for current students. Further, faculty, including part-time faculty, are compensated for their role and engagement in the shared governance process (full-time faculty have service hours included in their contracts).

Faculty have important decision-making roles in the development and revision of curriculum, including the overall curriculum within majors and general education, specific course content, development of new classes, and development of new programs such as majors, minors, and tracks. Faculty Council is leading the collaborative revision process of the course evaluation instrument to help ensure it is optimized to capture information faculty need to inform teaching and learning.

The expansion of faculty track leader and faculty director positions in the academic departments is an example of the development of a stronger faculty role in decision-making within the college – these faculty are involved in decision-making pertaining to course development, curricular planning, term review/thesis processes, admissions process and decisions, academic and career advising, and decisions about facilities and technology. Faculty drive the learning outcomes assessment at the college, via the work of the Assessment Liaison Cohort and the connection of learning outcomes assessment to curricular development.

In addition to their participation in the guidance of curriculum and learning outcomes, faculty play a significant role in institutional governance bodies, including representation on all shared governance committees and leadership of the following committees:

Faculty Council
ArtCenter Faculty Council (ACFC) is the official advocate body of the faculty, and includes elected representation of faculty from all departments of the college. The purpose of ACFC is to represent the concerns of faculty within the shared governance structure of the college. The Council makes policy recommendations relevant to educational and faculty issues, and representatives serve on all of the college's shared governance committees.

Since approximately 75% of the college's faculty are part-time, it purposefully includes part-time faculty in key faculty governance groups. The longevity at the college of much of the part-time faculty allows for stability and effective governance ownership. For example, of the 21 members of Faculty Council, 16 are part-time and only 5 are full-time. Of the part-time members, ten have worked at the college more than ten years; half of these have been on the faculty more than 20 years.

Faculty Policy Committee
The Faculty Policy Committee is a standing committee chartered to review and propose changes to faculty policy, which includes but is not limited to faculty hiring, placement, payroll, performance review, grievance, and other academic and/or administrative issues. Chaired by the associate provost for faculty affairs, the committee consists of two Faculty Council representatives, two faculty-at-large, two department chairs, two administrators, and one staff member.

Research Committee
The Research Committee provides a specific site through which ArtCenter can work to better understand the role of research in the life of the college, while also providing advocacy for the specific structures and policies that ongoing research demands.

The Research Committee sets specific goals based on the strategic plan, establishes metrics to monitor and report strategic progress with respect to research college-wide, makes recommendations for educational and operational domains, makes policy recommendations where need has been identified, researches best practices and established models from peer institutions and emerging professional practices, participates in appropriate research networks and organizations, and builds the research infrastructure and culture at the college.

In addition to the above-noted faculty led shared governance bodies, Faculty Council is represented on all other institutional shared governance committees at the college. Reports to the council and discussion of these issues by the group are a standing agenda item at Faculty Council meetings, allowing the respective Faculty Council representatives to provide the groups with the Council's feedback. For further information about the overarching shared governance structure of the college, please see "The Bigger Picture: ArtCenter's Current Shared Governance Structure and Process" in this essay's next section.

Faculty Council regularly interacts with the college's senior administration through the participation of the associate provost for faculty affairs in every meeting (by the Council's invitation), and by addressing queries directly to the provost. Moreover, the president and the provost normally attend one meeting per semester, also at the council's invitation. These sessions provide an opportunity for the president and the provost to address specific issues and concerns raised by the faculty.

Faculty Council chairs also participate in board of trustees meetings, providing updates at each meeting (three times per year) and engaging in discussions with the executive leadership of the college and Trustees regarding key decisions. Their representation allows the trustees to better understand the teaching experience and faculty needs at ArtCenter. For example, the chairs of Faculty Council recently shared the faculty's experiences of remote teaching and learning in the pandemic, giving the Trustees a comprehensive, firsthand overview of the challenges, benefits, needs and opportunities of delivering education in this modality. A Faculty Council representative also participated in a 2020 retreat on the future of education at the college.

The Bigger Picture: ArtCenter's Current Shared Governance Structure and Process

In addition to describing the vital role faculty play in institutional decision-making, it is helpful to describe ArtCenter's current overarching shared governance structure and process.

ArtCenter has two primary types of shared governance bodies: 1) constituent committees (of which there are four), and 2) institutional committees composed of faculty, staff and students devoted to planning and policy (of which there are also four).

Proposals are routed to stakeholder groups for review via a policy proposal form, which includes a rationale for the proposal and inclusion of any impacts the proposal, if enacted, would have on students, faculty, staff, resources, and existing policies. Endorsements or concerns noted by various entities upon review of proposal are captured on the form. Normally, proposals are not forwarded to the provost without support from all stakeholders.

Constituent Committees
There are four committees charged with representing specific constituent groups: Faculty Council, Chairs Council, Staff Council and ArtCenter Student Government. Each group participates in shared governance through their own meetings and by sitting on institutional committees. Each constituent committee has a charter and members serve as representatives on institutional committees (described below) and liaise with them.

Institutional Committees
There are currently four shared governance institutional committees with constituent representation devoted to planning and policy, and whose formation and ongoing work are informed by the college's strategic plan: the Budget Committee; Faculty Policy Committee; Student Academic Policy Committee; and the Third Campus Committee (dedicated to facilities and technology matters). As is the case with the constituent committees noted above, each institutional committee has a charter, and participants are responsible for liaising between their respective constituent committees and the institutional committee in which they participate.

Our shared governance process leads to recommendations being put forward to the executive level and, as necessary, the board of trustees, as these are the entities ultimately responsible for institutional shared governance decisions.

Refining Shared Governance at ArtCenter

ArtCenter, like all learning organizations, is perpetually and dynamically evolving; this includes our system of shared governance. Based on the findings from our 2017 shared governance research project and feedback from the WSCUC, we have continued to refine our collaborative proposal and recommendation process through ongoing practice, as evidenced by the list of recent accomplishments in policy made by the Faculty Council, Faculty Policy Committee, and Chairs Council. We are also engaging in discussions to refine our definition of shared governance and our corresponding structures. Despite the universally-experienced disruption brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, our commitment to advance our shared governance model has remained firm.

As our current strategic plan ends and we embark on planning our new strategic agenda and diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives, the college has actively taken up the matter of further defining and refining shared governance as part of this work. In Fall 2020, President Buchman launched professionally-facilitated "culture shift" meetings, including Executive Cabinet, Senior Leadership Group, Faculty Council, Chairs Council, and other educational leaders to collaboratively discuss current strengths, gaps and needs to inform the 2021-2023 Strategic Agenda and the next iteration of shared governance at the college. More specifically, the culture shift meetings were convened with the intent to:

- Build on shared values of collective work across the college;

- Develop more effective structures of working together;

- Develop greater respect and understanding of the work and processes of various constituent leadership groups;

- Reaffirm importance of a human-centered work environment, and

- Reaffirm fundamental values of shared governance.

In May 2020, the college established a Shared Governance Steering Committee made up of Executive Cabinet and leadership of all shared governance constituent groups. Informed by these collective culture shift conversations, the work of the Shared Governance Steering Committee is to:

- Revise fundamental definitions of shared governance at ArtCenter and to modify as needed;

- Harvest feedback of all groups regarding that which is working and that which needs improvement and change;

- Discuss mechanisms to create a better flow of governance work and explore the possibility of establishing a position for someone to facilitate and manage some of the work that currently relies on staff and faculty to complete as "additional duties." Feedback on some of the flaws in our processes suggests that those involved simply do not always have sufficient time to keep the administrative aspects of the work going, especially when it becomes additive to an already full-time schedule;

- Focus particularly on faculty involvement in shared governance that is effective within the particular structure of ArtCenter—namely, the department chairs and the work they do shaping the curriculum and academic programs. While we all agree on increasing faculty voice in governance, we need to do so with a structure that works with the leadership apparatus of the college. Conversations currently range from an enhanced Faculty Council to the establishment of a Faculty Senate. Pros and cons exist to various models and will be continue to be discussed as part of this group's work;

- Test and refine modifications of shared governance through a process of community input and shaping of the next 2-year strategic agenda of the college.

The above-described work on our revised model of shared governance is scheduled to be completed by Fall 2021, and the updated model will be circulated widely to the ArtCenter community at that time.

Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution

Instructions: *This brief section should identify any other significant changes that have occurred or issues that have arisen at the institution (e.g., changes in key personnel, addition of major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, unanticipated challenges, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described in the preceding section. This information will help the Interim Report Committee panel gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the actions of the institution discussed in the previous section have taken place.*

Impact of COVID-19 on Enrollment, Teaching and Learning

While the COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted the higher education sector across the United States and the world, ArtCenter has navigated these challenging conditions with relative strength.

Spring 2021 enrollments experienced a slight decrease compared with Spring 2020:
- 4.80% lower total enrollment (2,221 in Spring 2021 versus 2,333 in Spring 2020)
- 6.57% lower FTE (2,048 in Spring 2021 versus 2,192 in Spring 2021)

Fall 2020 also saw a slight decrease compared with Fall 2019:
- Total enrollment was 6.67% lower (2,182 in Fall 2020 versus 2,338 in Fall 2019)
- FTE was 8.05% lower (2,023 in Fall 2020 versus 2,200 in Fall 2019)

The difference between the percentages of total headcount and FTE suggest that a higher number of students are enrolling on a part-time basis in response to the pandemic.

These figures compare favorably to our peer schools in the Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design (AICAD), which collectively, after increasing consistently for four years, saw overall enrollments decline by 10% from Fall 2019 to Fall 2020.

Our success maintaining relatively healthy enrollment during the pandemic is largely due to our firm commitment to remote learning of the highest possible quality for our students, tailored to the needs of our art and design disciplines.

Curricular Design and Pedagogy
ArtCenter has made curricular design modifications that support the course content being delivered through new asynchronous and synchronous virtual environments. Department chairs and faculty have carefully reviewed the overarching learning outcomes of their programs and classes and identified which courses lent themselves readily to online teaching and learning. The college also surveyed its students in spring and summer semesters to ensure adequate access to necessary technology and provided resources accordingly. In many cases, the shift to teaching and learning at a distance reflects the current professional practices in the fields for which we are preparing our students, especially for departments where the work is often created on the computer and displayed in a digital environment. Faculty in these departments were able to share best-practices with peers across the college. Simultaneously, other faculty were directly engaged in the development of new practices for expressing 3D work in a 2D environment, demonstrating painting or drawing techniques, or modeling the creative process.

For the minority of classes that absolutely require access to shops and similar maker spaces, we have been able to create a "service bureau" approach that allows students to, in compliance with City of Pasadena and County of Los Angeles regulations, send instructions to employees in maker spaces who then can fabricate items as per those instructions. Students then make appointments to safely come to campus and pick up those items.

While the majority of our students are located in California, we have evaluated the timing of classes to ensure that our students in other time zones have access to classes and co-curricular support. The majority of our remote instruction is synchronous, including offering sections of classes and student services at times we would not have offered them in the past to ensure our students outside of California have options and support. We also offer asynchronous access to class content.

A series of ongoing training sessions has been implemented, with accompanying documentation that can be accessed pre and post meeting. Faculty and academic leaders discuss adjusting teaching approaches, creating engaging discussion sessions, new approaches for presentations, critiques, and formative and summative evaluations.

Curated Learning Technologies
When required to pivot to remote instruction, ArtCenter identified a standard tool suite that is mandated for instruction and available to all: a combination of ArtCenter email, Zoom for synchronous instruction and out of class advising, and DotED, our Moodle-based LMS, for access to all asynchronous content, including syllabi, course assignments, readings and any additional content.

As the pandemic continues, the college implemented a curated set of technologies that support our learners and faculty in California and around the world. New tools were selected to augment the existing LMS and technologies to support teaching and learning in both synchronous and asynchronous environments. New technologies include synchronous teaching environments that emulate studio working spaces, multi-camera views, and web conference/live streaming capabilities, and meta-collaboration and design thinking cloud-based software. Similarly, asynchronous content has been augmented with additional teaching technology that helps faculty create recordings of original demonstrations and capture the making process, producing multi-stream media libraries that interpret the studio experience in a virtual space.

We have learned a great deal from the experience and remain committed to ensuring our students have the best possible learning opportunities.

- **Zoom**: ArtCenter has contracted with Zoom to provide synchronous teaching and learning environments for all faculty and students;
- **Studio in a Box:** ArtCenter has developed a complement of tools to support remote teaching including new uses for podcasts, transportable, three-camera studios (light ring camera optional) with switchers designed to be used in identified campus locations for faculty broadcast and recording as well as in faculty home studios. ArtCenter has also worked with GoPro to develop the "Studio In A Box, (SIAB)" a self-contained multi-camera studio with lights, audio, and a switcher.;
- **YuJa:** ArtCenter also invested in a new media platform that ingests the multi-stream recordings that can be closed captioned in 14 languages. Faculty are able to edit these recordings to use to create class content and students will be able to access recordings of classes to review material if needed;
- **Bluescape:** This is a software platform that is being piloted as a compliment to the LMS, functioning as a virtual studio for visual collaboration using rich media, providing live, collaborative work spaces for video, audio, images, text, and 3-D content, a live critique environment for instruction, and a place to collect coursework and archive course content;
- **Graduating Industry Interview Environment:** ArtCenter developed a new virtual interview environment for all graduating students to meet and be interviewed by industry partners. This allows what was done in-person to continue online;
- **Synchronous Graduation Gallery and Ceremony:** ArtCenter has developed a proprietary online graduation gallery where students post their final work and have private Zoom rooms to talk with prospective employers, parents, friends, colleagues, and faculty. This interactive

experience takes place right after the synchronous graduation experience that is available as an invitation-only instance of Zoom and is broadcast to the public through YouTube.

<u>Faculty Development and Training</u>
In response to the sudden and ongoing pivot to remote learning, the college focused on training for all faculty and students to learn the best practices for using our new technology tools to ensure meaningful teaching and learning experiences in this new learning environment.

Regular training sessions (both group and individual) take place every term to help faculty revisit their course design, consider their new teaching methodologies and learn the best practices for the new tools that support these changes. Evaluation practices continue to take place each term as new tools are brought into the teaching and learning environment and shared best practices emerging. Additional questions have been added to course evaluations as an additional avenue for students to provide feedback regarding their online learning experiences. The Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning also engages extensively with faculty via department meetings and individual sessions to help faculty members understand how to best organize online classes. Guidance is provided regarding when and how to facilitate class discussions online versus lectures/demonstrations, when students should be working all together and when then can work individually or in smaller teams in a remote class or studio.

While the pandemic continues and on-campus teaching and learning still must be suspended for now, we have learned a great deal from the experience and remain committed to ensuring our students have robust and relevant learning opportunities. ArtCenter has been granted temporary distance education authorization by WSCUC for all of its programs.

ArtCenter's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Action Plan

In addition to being remembered as a year disrupted by a global pandemic, 2020 will also be recalled as a time of social justice reckoning for our society, including higher education. ArtCenter had already made significant commitments to diversity, equity and inclusion through its strategic plan, *[Create Change 2.0](#),* by hiring Dr. Aaron Bruce, the college's inaugural Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer, in Fall 2018, and the subsequent establishment of the Center for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI). In August 2020, the college launched its first [Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Action Plan](#)*.* The plan not only articulates several important commitments for fundamental and systemic change but includes detail on the individuals/offices responsible for implementation of each initiative, a clearly stated timeline and an articulation of milestones to mark change. Our plan includes 40 specific initiatives and expands on the diversity-related commitments of our strategic plan, *[Create Change 2.0](#)* that, though critical and well-intended, were too limited for the needs and urgency of the moment and for the pressing issues of racial injustice that require attention now.

<u>Highlights of our DEI Action Plan Progress</u>
Scholarship and Financial Aid. The DEI Action Plan commits to offering an additional $1.5 million in institutional scholarships to diverse and historically underrepresented students (an increase above the $5.5M in the budget at that time—for a total of $7M), and we are happy to report that, as of February 2021, we have offered more than $1.2M thus far, working toward reaching our goal of $1.5M by the start of the summer term. (Initiative 1)

Culturally Responsive Recruitment Materials. We recently launched a [new DEI website](#), featuring culturally responsive resources for our campus community, which will continue to expand and evolve. Additionally, the new 2021–22 Viewbook, our primary publication for prospective students, presents the college's desire to create a more equitable learning environment in a clear and transparent manner. (Initiative 2)

Culturally Responsive Recruitment Events. The Center for DEI and the Admissions department have expanded their collaborative programming to 12 events annually, exceeding our initial goal of four to five such events. These events include the "DX3: Dialogues in Diversity & Design" program as well as DEI-related programming included in our "Experience ArtCenter: Virtual Open House" and "Admitted Student Night" events. (Initiative 4)

Scholarship Transparency. We have published a [list of donor-funded Diversity Scholarships on the ArtCenter website](#) and have begun in-depth research and stakeholder conversations regarding improving the continuing scholarship program. The Development department actively raises scholarship funds from alumni and other donors throughout the year, and the webpage will be updated as new scholarship opportunities are secured. (Initiative 6)

Academic Advising. In Fall 2020 we piloted a mandatory advising program for all new incoming students in two departments to ensure students' success and reduce the overall time it takes them to earn their degrees. Academic advisors met with 100% of the incoming Entertainment Design cohort (78 meetings) and 90% of the incoming Illustration cohort (105 meetings). The pilot is continuing in Spring 2021. (Initiative 7)

Community Building and Safe Spaces. In Fall 2020, DEI hosted a dozen virtual roundtable discussions and activities to support community building and inclusive excellence. DEI is also partnering with academic departments to host DEI conversations throughout the year. Dates and times of future events are posted on the Inside ArtCenter calendar. (Initiative 8)

Accessibility of Online Learning and International Student Engagement. DEI has partnered with ArtCenter's Media Services team to increase access to online captioning tools. This effort will improve campus-wide communications and learning for English second language learners as well as individuals with other challenges associated with online learning. (Initiatives 10 and 11)

The Collective and Black Student Exchange Program. Morehouse College and Howard University have established joint programming partnerships with the Center for DEI as part of the Collective. (Initiatives 12 and 13)

Economic Response Team (ERT) The Economic Response Team (ERT) continues to assist students who are experiencing severe economic hardship on a case by case basis with a focus on food and housing insecurity. ERT funds are provided by philanthropic efforts—not tuition dollars—and to date we have distributed nearly $150,000 to support our students in times of unexpected and heightened need. (Initiative 14)

Enhanced Search Processes. Human Resources has updated our recruitment guidelines and procedures to ensure all search committees actively demonstrate that an effective, objective and fair process is being implemented to increase the diversity of college employees. (Initiative 15)

Diverse Faculty Initiative. As previously announced, $1 million has been earmarked for faculty salaries to aid in the recruitment and retention of new, diverse faculty hires. To establish benchmarks, Faculty Affairs is systematically tracking aggregate demographic data about our full- and part-time faculty to determine improvements, growth and hiring strategy for diversity. From 2019 to 2020, both in absolute numbers and as percentages, we have increased the racial/ethnic diversity of our part-time faculty. At the same time, we have seen a 5% decline in non-international faculty identifying as White and increases in the overall percentages of American/Alaskan Native, Asian, and Black or African-American faculty. We also have increased gender parity among both our full- and part-time faculty for this same time period: 3% increase in female part-time faculty, and 13% increase in female full-time faculty. (Initiative 16)

Mandatory Employee Learning. The college has approved and implemented mandatory programs for all employees to address discrimination, harassment and unconscious bias. The deadline for employees to

complete their online DEI learning modules is the end of Spring term. In January 2021 the Executive Cabinet also participated in an unconscious bias workshop, their first module of a year-long DEI leadership initiative. (Initiative 18)

Ongoing Professional Development. In addition to mandatory employee learning programs, we continue to enhance college-wide learning opportunities open to all faculty and staff to promote diversity and inclusion. Sessions begin on March 22nd. (Initiative 19)

- The Center for DEI in partnership with Human Resources are piloting a DEI Leadership Track, providing an array of DEI topics, guest speakers and media to support professional growth and cultural competency. The first cohort includes members of the Senior Leadership Group (SLG).
- The Center for Teaching and Learning continues partnering with DEI on a workshop series for faculty. Upcoming workshops include "The Self and the Student: Amplifying Classroom Inclusion and Equity" (Week 6) and "From Principle to Practice: Universal Design in Learning" (Week 11).
- The Research Committee has arranged and curated new online training resources from the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) on ethics for interacting with people in human-centered research.

Staff and Faculty Review Process. At the end of Fall 2020, we implemented an anonymous online faculty survey of chairs' activities structured similar to the existing student course evaluations. More than 200 faculty members participated, representing all academic departments. The provost is incorporating their feedback into her review of chairs. DEI practices continue to be part of annual staff reviews. (Initiative 20)

New Culturally Responsive Course Offerings and Workshops. In addition to those already listed in the DEI Action Plan, more than a dozen new culturally responsive courses and workshops have been offered in Fall 2020 and/or Spring 2021 across most curricular departments, including Advertising, Entertainment Design, Environmental Design, Fine Art, Illustration, Interaction Design, Photography and Imaging, Product Design and Designmatters. Additionally, working closely with chairs and faculty, the Development department has helped to secure seed grants for piloting new types of coursework to explore DEI themes, including work related to technologies for disabled persons ("Reimagining Access"), women faculty and students in technology and entrepreneurship, and illustration classes for diverse pre-college teens (ACX Teens in partnership with artworxLA). (Initiative 24)

Diversifying the Humanities and Sciences Curriculum. Humanities and Sciences continues to diversify its offerings term to term and, in order to allow for more comprehensive curricular change, Humanities and Sciences initiated a focused program review with a focus on equity and justice. This review process is examining the program in a systematic manner and identifying the resources required to continue to build a more equitable curriculum. As part of this review process, Humanities and Sciences has proposed a new learning outcome related to "Anti-racist and Decolonial Perspectives," which would require students to be able to understand and interrogate their disciplines within broader histories of oppression. (Initiative 25)

Shared Governance. A steering committee, including co-chairs of our Shared Governance groups and members of Executive Cabinet, has been formed to reinvigorate and clarify ArtCenter's shared governance structure and re-establish the Diversity Council. Our goal is to have this process completed by Fall 2021. (Initiative 29)

Industry Engagement. The departments that encompass Professional Education and Industry Engagement--including Entrepreneurship and Professional Practice, Career and Professional Development, and Exchange and Study Away—continue to offer an array of programming that promotes the value of design across a wide range of industries and business contexts. Recent programs include "Critical Discourse in Design: Design and Technology of Social Equity," "How to Talk About DEI

During Your Job Search," ongoing BOLD Creative Leadership workshops, and the upcoming "Building Black-Led Social Initiatives." (Initiative 31)

Foster Relationships with Indigenous Communities. DEI has connected with Julia Bogany, a Tongva tribal elder, educator and the Cultural Affairs officer for the Gabrielino-Tongva Band of Mission Indians. She has reviewed a draft of our land acknowledgement and is partnering to explore new community partnerships. DEI has also solidified an educational partnership with the Autry Museum of the American West and will continue to facilitate joint programming with them. (Initiative 32)

Supplier Diversity. Business and Campus Services has conducted an initial review of its current vendors to determine ArtCenter's baseline activity in this area. Approximately 18% of ArtCenter business partners/suppliers represent minority-owned, women owned, veteran owned, LGBT-owned, service-disabled veteran owned and historically underutilized businesses. Moving forward, we will continue to develop a comprehensive supplier diversity business model that informs and encourage the use of diverse business.(Initiative 38)

Board of Trustees DEI Task Force The newly constituted board of trustees' DEI Task Force is keeping informed of our institutional progress. Their next meeting is on February 22. The current action plan continues to go through a process of evolution and refinement through the contributions of shared governance groups and community participation and we will present a complete plan to the board of trustees at its June 2021 meeting. (Initiative 40)

Concluding Statement

Instructions: Reflect on how the institutional responses to the issues raised by the Commission have had an impact upon the institution, including future steps to be taken.

We have been grateful for feedback from the 2017 Comprehensive Review team and the Commission during our latest reaffirmation, as it has helped us to guide our continued development in the important areas of quality assurance and inclusive governance. While 2020 and the beginning of 2021 have been challenging times in the world and in higher education, the ArtCenter community has benefitted from the WSCUC review process, and by staying close to our mission: *Learn to Create. Influence Change.* The spirit of this mission threads through our work and our commitment to continuous improvement.

The worlds of art and design education, and the broader landscape of postsecondary education, have all changed considerably since ArtCenter's inception in 1930; these changes have been accelerated by the global pandemic, and will have lasting impact. Robust systems of program review, learning outcomes assessment, and a reinvigorated framework of shared governance—all of which have been supported through our engagement with the accreditation process—will be necessary as we respond to the challenges and opportunities before us. As we move towards our centenary, we will continue to explore what art and design education and professional practice means in this new era, as well as what art and design provides to the culture at large, while preserving our deep connections to the legacy on which we are building.

Appendices
Relevant Documents and Source Material

Topic 1, 2, 3 - Evidence Table

ArtCenter College of Design Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Action Plan 2020