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The review of the Department of Art and Art History (AAH) was conducted in accordance with the 2016 review guidelines. The Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) conducts and writes the final reviews of all academic units on the Boulder campus. The unit prepared a self-study during 2015, which was reviewed between December 2015 and February 2016 by an internal review committee (IRC) of two CU Boulder faculty members from outside of AAH. The IRC generally found the report fair and accurate and noted several issues for subsequent exploration by the external review committee (ERC) and ARPAC. The ERC, consisting of disciplinary experts from outside of the University of Colorado Boulder, visited the unit over March 10-11, 2016, reviewed relevant documents, and met with faculty, students, staff, and university administrators. ERC comments and recommendations are cited at appropriate points throughout the report. This public document reflects the assessment of and recommendations for the Department of Art and Art History as approved by ARPAC.
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Unit overview

The campus’ standardized description of the Department of Art and Art History, and information regarding comparable units, can be found on the Office of Data Analytics’ (ODA) website (http://www.colorado.edu/oda/institutional-research/institutional-level-data/information-department/academic-review-and-0). ODA updates profiles annually in the fall semester. This report cites the ODA data for AAH posted in October 2015, the most recent update available; these figures reflect the state of the unit in academic year (AY) 2014-2015.

The AAH mission statement declares the unit’s focus and ambitions: it “affirms the power of art to transform individuals and society [. . .] [and is] committed to the practice, production, critical and historical study of art within a liberal arts education that encourages experimentation and independence of thought.” The unit prides itself on a rigorous and interdisciplinary curriculum, creative and diverse students steeped in critical thinking, and faculty members engaged in local and global communities. The unit offers three approved undergraduate programs—a BA in Art History (AAAH), a BA in Studio Arts (AASA), and a BFA in Studio Arts (AASF)—as well as two undergraduate minors in AAAH and AASA. The unit offers three graduate programs: an MA in Art History (AAAH), an MFA in Studio Arts (AASF, now called “Art Practices” on the unit website), and an MFA/MBA, in collaboration with the Leeds School of Business. The unit also offers two BA/MA programs: one in Art History and a joint program emphasizing film production in Film Studies.

Personnel and governance

According to the self-study, as of August 2015, AAH employed 24 tenured and tenure-track faculty (TTT) and one senior instructor full-time employee. As of February, 2017 unit TTT had increased to 25. Distribution of those TTT faculty across rank includes ten professors, nine associate professors, and six assistant
professors. Seven and one-half TTT and the one full-time instructor were affiliated with Art History. The remaining 16 artist TTT were distributed across the unit’s five areas/degree tracks, including: three in ceramics, two in foundations, six in interdisciplinary media arts practices, three in painting and drawing, one in printmaking, and two in sculpture and post-studio. Eight lecturers supplement the program. Ten state classified staff and 25 student hourly employees support department operations.

Bylaws most recently revised in August 2011 govern AAH. The unit is formally led by a two-thirds majority-elected chairperson and two associate chairpersons, representing the Art History and Studio Art programs. The chair serves a four-year term (the possibility for renewal unspecified). Each associate chair serves as the director of undergraduate and graduate studies for their respective program. An executive committee (number of members unspecified) advises the chair in areas of recruitment and appointments, salary and teaching load, and leaves of absence and sabbatical. Other standing committees address matters of curriculum, diversity, grievance, merit review, scholarship, technology, and visiting scholars and artists. These structures conform to university norms, and the department appears to be well governed.

As noted above, 10 staff positions support AAH operations. These span a wide variety of jobs: one Administrative Assistant III; one Office Manager I; one Arts Technician II; one Technician IV; one Program Assistant I; two General Professional II; one Arts Technician II; one Laboratory Coordinator I; one Laboratory Coordinator II, and one Laboratory Coordinator III.

Uniquely, student program fees support staff salaries. The self-study reports that 14 percent of fees received in AY 2015-2016
(i.e., $79,000) were directed to support the salaries of three staff members (but does not specify what percentage of the position salary total is represented by that amount). The self-study expresses a desire to shift full funding of staff salaries to the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S), notes that staff salary levels are comparably low for campus, and reports that this discrepancy erodes otherwise commendable staff morale and dedication. The IRC confirms that unit staff are both well-trained and “vastly outnumbered by students” and merit appropriate support not only for standard performance, but also for their efforts in professional development and outreach. The ERC notes undesirable insecurity among staff created by lack of permanent funding, “mission creep without compensation,” and “lack of communication and participation in the decision-making process.”

The department self-study notes that comparative rankings prepared by the Office of Data Analytics in the fields of studio art and art history are problematic. This is because reported figures for scholarly works and creative works are not appropriately averaged for the numbers of faculty within unit program areas engaged in those modes of work (and are instead averaged in each case across total unit faculty). The external review committee (ERC) concludes that the faculty “boast a high national and, in many cases, international reputation, confirmed by prestigious research awards (including the Fulbright, Getty, Guggenheim, Kress, NEH, and Pollock-Krasner), visiting professorships and residencies, exhibitions at home and abroad (at such celebrated venues as the Museum of Modern Art in New York, the Tate Modern in London, and the Venice Biennale), and a significant record of publication.” Aggregated profiles of faculty achievement in the self-study support this claim.
As noted above, AAH offers BA programs in Art History (AAAH) and Studio Arts (AASA), the BFA in Studio Arts (AASF), and undergraduate minors in AAAH and AASA.

ODA figures for fall 2014 indicate a unit total of 594 majors. While this figure represents a 32 percent decrease over five years, it still ranks first among 16 units in the review cycle. The unit self-study notes that this decline reflects national trends. The report also suggests that the decline had stabilized at the time of writing and that the unit had implemented structural changes to advising and degree requirements intended to ease student progress toward graduation. ODA reports a total of 55 AAH undergraduate minors.

The department generated 8,748 student credit hours (SCH) in AY 2014-2015, representing a 28 percent decrease over five years and a ranking of ninth out of 17 units in the arts and humanities. TTT instruction accounts for 25 percent of these SCH—a 52 percent decline over five years (TTT class section size has decreased by a similar rate). Average size of sections is relatively low among comparable units, although the unit self-study emphasizes the importance of small class size in studio-based pedagogy.

Average faculty course questionnaire (FCQ) ratings (77th percentile for instructor and 83rd percentile for course) are among the bottom third of comparable units, although they represent small five-year increases. The ODA report of results from the 2013 National Survey of Student Engagement ranks the unit at the bottom of comparable units for graduating senior evaluations of course availability, academic quality, and advising quality. Student ratings of the program from 2016 survey results range from 3.05 out of 5.0 (lowest, for post-graduate preparation) to 4.15 out of 5.0 (highest, for diversity climate), averaging around 3.5 out of 5.0.
The internal review committee’s (IRC) review of these findings notes that “respondents wanted more, different, or varied classes, and more flexible scheduling of studio hours” and highlights concerns over the quality and accessibility of advising. In turn, the ERC notes that “students report conflicting information about requirements and some confusion about who can answer their questions.” The ERC connects this problem to the unit’s elimination of faculty director positions responsible for administering its entire graduate and undergraduate programs, respectively. AAH replaced those positions with associate chairs from art and art history and studio arts, who each now manage undergraduate and graduate degree programs contained within those areas.

The IRC and ERC note AAH’s innovative efforts to partner with other programs and units such as Film Studies, Theatre and Dance, and the Libby Residential Academic Program (RAP) to develop courses and programming that leverage unit resources (e.g., the CU Art Museum) for the benefit of both undergraduates and the general public.

As noted above, AAH offers the MA in Art History (AAAH), the MFA in Studio Arts/Art Practices (AASF), and an MFA/MBA in collaboration with the Leeds School of Business.

The ODA 2014-2015 census reports a total of 50 majors across programs (fourth among comparable units; a 16 percent increase over five years). The IRC reports a related distribution of 10 art history graduate students and 40 for the MFA in art practices. The unit awarded 10 graduate degrees in that period (ranked fourth out of 13; a 23 percent decrease over five years). The median time to degree completion is 2.3 years (seventh out of 13). Graduate
course offering student credit hours (SCH) totals 445 (ranked sixth out of 15; a decrease of two percent over five years). FCQ ratings (80th percentile instructor; 75th percentile course) rank at the bottom of nine comparable units.

ODA reports that in AY 2014-2015, the unit appointed 20 graduate students as graduate part-time instructors (GPTIs), six as teaching assistants (TAs), and eight as instructional/research/administrative assistants (graduate assistants, or GAs), for a total of 34 funded positions. The unit self-study for 2015-2016 reports 19 GPTIs, six TAs, and 14 GAs for a total of 39 funded positions. As the self-study notes: “The GPTIS [holding a 30% appointment] are all in the art practices program and come with a teaching obligation. The GA positions [25% appointment] are held by both art history and art practices [students]; GAs are charged with various types of program assistance such as working in the department’s Visual Resources Center. TAs [50% appointment] are all art history [students], working for our World Art Studies courses [surveys which enroll up to 450 students in each offering].”

The self-study relays concerns that low levels of funding inhibit the unit’s recruitment of preferred program applicants and student enrollment in graduate offerings (e.g., due to the availability of tuition remission). The IRC notes the potential impact of low funding on the viability of the unit’s proposed PhD program. The ERC notes that inadequate stipends may also lower the quality of the graduate students offering TA and GPTI instruction. The external reviewers contrast these restrictions with an ideal of providing first-year students with teaching release fellowships, enabling them to train for classroom assignments in their second year.
A 2009 survey that addressed program quality and AAH graduate student/faculty dynamics found much to improve. Student satisfaction with assistance finding employment ranked at 12th out of 13 units in the survey, and academic advising and guidance ranked at 11th out of 13. Results from 14 items used in the 2016 graduate student survey average 2.94 out of 5.00, with a low of 2.41 out of 5.00 regarding “clarity of program requirements” and 4.24 out of 5.00 for “accessibility of supplemental resources.”

The IRC’s evaluation is as follows: “graduate responses indicate high degrees of dissatisfaction with availability of courses and clarity of program requirements. Comments indicate a perception of departmental disorganization about the graduate program, a lack of clarity about the graduate examination and the required graduate seminar, lack of a support network for students, and inaccessibility to faculty and advisors.”

In turn, the ERC noted graduate student frustrations concerning “different standards for comprehensive examinations in art history, for the formulation of the dissertation abstract and the requirements for the written thesis in studio practice areas. In addition, both art history and studio students mentioned the need to have greater flexibility in fulfilling the art history requirements, given the relatively small number of courses offered at the graduate level and fluctuations in the faculty size caused by retirements, leaves and course releases for administrative duties.”

Additionally, the ERC noted that “studio artists [. . .] emphasized the need for a course during the last semester of the MFA to focus on the practical considerations for studio artists including advice on how to apply for Ph.D. programs; writing applications; applying for grants; managing small businesses; marketing; and tax law in relation to artists as independent business people.”
The self-study lists sources of revenue as including funding from the college, student program fees, and gifts. The AAH operating budget is not specified. Program fees for AY 2015-2016 total $552,436. The unit classifies this revenue as a “significant portion of the budget,” funding equipment and materials purchases as well as support for staff salaries (discussed above) and specialized and general infrastructure needs (e.g., the Visual Resources Center and the metal and wood workshops). The self-study describes this funding as “vital to sustaining the department’s day-to-day operations.” The report does not go into how the unit coordinates with the A&S budgeting process nor does it give gift funding totals, although it describes measures to cultivate grants and gifts.

AAH enjoys occupancy of the Visual Arts Complex, which offers faculty, students, staff, and the public not only the material benefits of a new facility (e.g., dedicated exhibition space in the CU Art Museum), but also a symbolic affirmation of the student government’s commitment to supporting AAH operations (a student-approved fee funded construction). Inevitably, the recent shakedown period has identified challenges (e.g., ongoing repair of the Art Museum’s environmental control systems) and opportunities for increased effectiveness in space utilization. The unit self-study identifies needs including a permanent printing facility; a larger equipment checkout facility; reorganization of photo-, video-, digital-, and integrated art-related infrastructure in the intermedia arts area space; and expansion of the woodshop. The IRC report does not comment on these needs. The ERC, however, notes the importance of developing “a central, shared printing facility for all students”—perhaps also open to outside users paying for the privilege. The ERC also addresses the current lack of communal space, suggesting that more shared space might mitigate a perception of unit balkanization by specialization.
AAH was last reviewed in 2009. At that time, ARPAC characterized the unit as facing a crossroads arising from both beneficial conditions (e.g., an imminent new facility, hiring of new faculty, increased faculty productivity, large student enrollments, and hard-won faculty success in improving unit collegiality and climate) and a lack of a clearly articulated vision. ARPAC encouraged the development of such a vision as a means of addressing lingering subcultural tensions and a lack of curricular focus. It also flagged student advising issues as a major concern.

Subsequently, the unit has engaged in strategic planning that has identified three areas for growth. The first involves replacement and growth hiring of three TTT positions in Asian art, printmaking, and art criticism (the last of which has been filled now as a joint hire with the Film Studies Program). The second area involves two program enhancements: a new graduate certificate in critical and curatorial practices for MFA students and a PhD in art history. The third area involves securing endowments to increase undergraduate scholarship support. Additionally, between 2009 and 2016 the unit created a new initiative for its graduate curriculum, the Art and Rural Environments Field School, offered during Maymester.

ARPAC also directed the unit to examine reallocation of existing TA resources to serve large-enrollment courses, and it has done so. In light of funding constraints, however, this requirement appears to have challenged the unit’s ability to respond to a separate requirement of ensuring adequate TA training.

ARPAC directed AAH to evaluate and respond to student concerns related to advising (e.g., course selection, degree completion, and career preparation). The IRC notes that the unit responded by creating two area curriculum committees, which
appear to have made initial headway in addressing undergraduate concerns. However, significant doubts among both undergraduate and graduate student populations persist. The unit has yet to implement any systematic tracking program for its graduates.

ARPAC directed the unit to develop an assessment plan, and the self-study indicates that it has done so through survey mechanisms developed by the new curriculum committees and the student advisory board.

ARPAC directed the unit to revise its bylaws as they relate to the rights and responsibilities of instructors. It appears to have done so. Nonetheless, the documentation of standards for evaluation speaks almost entirely to the TTT employee group, not instructors.

ARPAC directed the unit to differentiate BFA and MFA program objectives and requirements from their BA and MA counterparts. The department seems to have accomplished this, although student confusion regarding requirements within degree categories persists. Additionally, the unit has responded to a request to review its MFA requirements, reducing the number of credit hours and permitting students’ more rapid completion of coursework and the thesis.

The ERC notes that, while the unit responded to the 2009 requirement to improve its internal climate, their interviews indicate that AAH should now expand this initial work on faculty collegiality to address graduate student and staff concerns.
Art expresses a fundamental, human capacity for creativity and storytelling, and its global, historical, and cultural significance connects the AAH mission to those of many other CU Boulder programs. Additionally, public interest in art exhibits establishes the unit as a premier site of engagement with community members and other stakeholders. Not surprisingly, then, the department’s self-study lists its faculty’s formal, interdisciplinary affiliation with at least five campus centers (Asian Studies, Latin American Studies, Medieval and Early Modern Studies, Mediterranean Studies, and Native American and Indigenous Studies), one other department (Classics), and a college (Media, Communication and Information). It also reports teaching and research collaborations between AAH faculty and faculty in 13 other campus units. The unit reports that it is currently developing an initiative with the College of Engineering and Applied Science (called the Idea Forge) to cross-list courses and facilitate faculty and student collaboration in related project areas (e.g., materials fabrication and installation design). The unit has an obvious and strong partnership with the CU Art Museum, in which faculty curate exhibitions and students show their work. The unit’s art historians have worked with the graduate program in Museum and Field Studies (part of the CU Natural History Museum) to develop an art track.

All three reports indicate the unit’s perception of inadequate advocacy for the arts (at least on the college level) and concern that other administrative priorities may inhibit their success at securing approval for faculty hiring.
National context

AAH initiatives (e.g., internships, collaborations, and outreach) generate potential national-level effects via local and regional museums, including those in Boulder and Denver.

More conventionally, the ERC confirms that the research and creative excellence of unit faculty “offer [. . .] a significant resource for the practice and critical study of the visual arts that benefits the entire state, and importantly, the larger region.” The unit’s record of faculty scholarly and creative achievements in prized venues (e.g., for scholarship, National Endowment for the Humanities awards; for creative work, exhibition at New York’s Museum of Modern Art) suggests its national reputation.

The ERC notes that a “relatively high faculty/student ratio in comparison with peer institutions” characterizes the unit.

The ERC also notes that the art history faculty lack representation in key disciplinary areas, including “African, American, Ancient Art and Archaeology, Early Modern Northern European, Islamic and Asian Art.” Nonetheless, the ERC notes that the unit’s proposed PhD in “The Art of the Americas” leverages the unit’s faculty strengths in related areas (e.g., North American, pre-Columbian, colonial Spanish American, and Latin American art and architecture) with other interdisciplinary campus programs (e.g., Latin American Studies) and regional museum resources to create a unique program that may have significant national impact. This “niche program,” they argue, “cannot be duplicated elsewhere.” Less directly, the ERC notes the potential benefits of regional and national professional network connections that the unit’s proposed MFA certificate in curatorial studies stimulates.

Faculty salaries at rank are relatively close to the American Association of University’s public peer average for the discipline,
with full professors at 86 percent, associates at 96 percent, and assistants at 99 percent.
Analysis

AAH is a complex unit whose dual creative and research missions, wide scope of intra-area topics and competencies, dual undergraduate and graduate degree programs, and unique infrastructure needs create ongoing challenges for successful operation.

Unit strengths and successes that the IRC and ERC reports emphasize include continued national prominence in research and creative work; high levels of faculty activity across research, teaching, and service; continued popularity and relative success of curricular offerings, characterized by high enrollments, and diverse representation of traditions in art history and practice; recent faculty improvement in unit climate and cohesion, supported by strategic planning and thoughtful revision of policies and procedures; high levels of commitment from staff to unit mission and programs; and promising opportunities for innovation and collaboration associated with evolving use of new facilities.

Related concerns and challenges noted in these reports include the dissatisfaction expressed in surveys of graduate students; staff concerns with job security, salaries, and incentives for professional preparation; unit success in replacing retired and departed faculty; viability of funding models for graduate students, contingent faculty, and equipment purchase/upkeep; effectiveness of advising and professional preparation programs for both undergraduate and graduate students; sufficient development of a distinctive public narrative emphasizing program distinctiveness and strengths; and relative adequacy of A&S support for art units.

Personnel and governance

The ERC also recommends that the unit do more to include staff in regular faculty meetings and key committee meetings. This may of course create a tradeoff in additional time requirements for staff involvement.
The unit claims that, in light of enrollment pressures and impending faculty retirements (at least four), its ability to continue to offer high quality courses and degrees significantly depends on the administration’s replacement of TTT lines, as well as investment in new lines. The unit prioritizes the hiring of faculty specializing in printmaking and in Asian art, the latter of which will facilitate the unit’s development of a “global curriculum.” After analyzing curricular demand and current unit capacity (e.g., the use of adjunct faculty), the ERC recommends support for all three proposals.

As previously noted, the unit also requests funding for expanded graduate teaching and support for its development of two new graduate programs: a graduate certificate in critical and curatorial practices (MFA) and a PhD in art history. The IRC notes that support for the PhD may assist the unit in retaining faculty looking to move to other such programs. The ERC recommends support of first-year fellowships for all graduate students before they are put in the classroom.

Both the IRC and ERC recommend that the unit pay immediate attention to concerns about morale expressed in student surveys.

The unit seeks to have A&S permanently fund staff employment costs that revenue from student program fees currently covers. Citing issues of demand and capacity (i.e., low staff salaries compared to PAC-12 peer institutions, considerably higher student-staff ratio, and so on), the IRC deems this a serious concern. The ERC is explicit in its support for this proposal.
Inclusive excellence

Among its 16 comparable units in this review cycle, AAH displays marked diversity. Faculty representation of women (48 percent) and minority race/ethnic status (43 percent) is relatively high, placing in the upper quarter of those units. Diversity among students is also strong: among AAH undergraduates, 72 percent are female and 23 percent are minority race/ethnicity (a 75 percent five-year increase). Notably, the unit’s representation of international majors has increased 550 percent during this same period, ranking it first among the 16 units on that indicator. Among its graduate student population, women represent 66 percent (ranking fourth out of 13; a nine percent, five-year increase), and students of minority race/ethnicity represent 14 percent (ninth out of 13; a 44 percent decrease). No data was made available concerning comparability of these figures for other art and art history departments nationally.

Library resources

The self-study flags related concerns of understaffing of collections, restrictive access and borrowing policies, and unilateral cuts to collections budgets. Neither the IRC nor the ERC further elevated these concerns.
Recommendations

The members of the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) address the following recommendations to the Department of Art and Art History (AAH) and to the deans of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School. It is the committee’s intention that the recommendations serve to benefit program improvement and development and to further the mission of the University of Colorado Boulder.

To the unit

1. Immediately create a task force of faculty representing each program area to address urgent issues of curriculum, advising, and professional preparation, raised in surveys of graduate and undergraduate students. In this process:

   a. Reconsider the current design of program administration (i.e., the use of associate chairs for program areas, with oversight of respective undergraduate and graduate programs) to ensure more successful engagement with undergraduate and graduate students;

   b. Work with the Office of Data Analytics (ODA) to review current survey data (as well as faculty course questionnaire data) and to design future surveys in order to compare ratings and comments from majors in the two program areas;

   c. Continue to draw on the undergraduate student advisory committee as a resource. If not currently practiced, appoint graduate students to a similar advisory committee and to the faculty task force;

   d. Charge each associate chair and their staff with increased responsibility for coordinating with Graduate
School staff to ensure student awareness of grant and fellowship opportunities and reliable preparation of files and paperwork;

e. Design and implement programs to prepare undergraduate students for successful post-graduation employment and careers. Encourage graduate student pursuit of professional and entrepreneurial training in the AAH/Leeds MFA/MBA program. Consider models offered by similar programs in the Department of Theatre and Dance and in the College of Music;

f. In all cases, set specific goals and timelines for implementing reforms and assessing outcomes;

2. Expand ongoing discussions of unit culture and climate beyond faculty concerns (e.g., mistrust of colleagues and administration) to include expressed concerns of staff and graduate students. In this process:

a. Coordinate these discussions with ongoing unit discussions concerning diversity. Draw upon campus resources such as the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement and the director of faculty relations. Prepare and submit an inclusive excellence narrative;

b. Appoint staff where appropriate to committees in order to facilitate their greater participation in departmental decision-making. Continue to develop communal spaces (e.g., the second floor terrace) that foster a more unified culture;
3. Leverage the results of recent strategic planning to present a positive and distinctive identity to campus colleagues and public stakeholders;

4. Work with the College of Arts and Sciences to resolve questions concerning budgetary administration of student program fees to confirm actual need for additional staff funding. If student fees continue to subsidize staff salaries, confirm eligibility of this expenditure under the fee policy;

5. Contingent on demonstrated success in improving graduate student evaluation of program quality, proceed with planning for new curricular initiatives involving the PhD in the arts of Americas and the MFA certificate in curatorial studies. Work with the College of Arts and Sciences to project staffing and budget models required for the success of these programs. Collaborate with other campus units holding similar conversations concerning criticism and curatorship, such as the art and natural history museums, the Film Studies Program, and the College of Media, Communication and Information. Ensure that implementation of new programs does not adversely impact existing activities. Consider needs for additional space and technology support for any new programs;

6. Engage with other arts units in ongoing discussion concerning restructuring of the arts. Embrace the unit’s considerable potential for constructively shaping this conversation;

7. Review the current strategy of using student program fees to fund infrastructure support needs. Prepare proposals for college funding of needs that cannot be met by this approach.
8. Give full consideration to AAH faculty hiring requests in light of demonstrated curricular needs, the impact of projected retirements, and unit demonstration of its capability to deliver new graduate programs while maintaining the success of current programs;

9. Support continued AAH planning for the proposal of a new PhD program and MFA certificate. As a condition of that support, monitor unit progress in addressing concerns in its current programs and in collaborating with other college and campus stakeholders;

10. Collaborate with the unit in resolving questions concerning administration of student program fees and the related need for college funding of staff costs. Give full consideration to unit requests for permanent funding of those costs in light of evolving position demands and salary equity concerns.

11. Assist the unit in improving the climate for its graduate students;

12. When existing concerns have been sufficiently addressed, fully consider unit proposals for new graduate programs.
The chair of the Department of Art and Art History shall report annually on the first of April for a period of three years following the year of the receipt of this report (i.e., April 1st of 2018, 2019, and 2020) to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and to the provost on the implementation of these recommendations.

Likewise, the deans of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School shall report annually on the first of May to the provost on the implementation of recommendations addressed to the college. The provost, as part of the review reforms, has agreed to respond annually to all outstanding matters under her/his purview arising from this review year. All official responses will be posted online.