

May 23, 2016

Margaret Farrar, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
John Carroll University
1 John Carroll Blvd.
Cleveland Heights, Ohio
44118-4581

Dear Dean Farrar:

It was our pleasure visiting John Carroll University this April 18 and 19 in the service of reviewing the Department of Art History and Humanities. With this letter we provide you with our overall assessment of the state of the Department and our more detailed answers to both general and specific questions that you posed in your letter of March 17, 2016.

Our assessment is founded on two sources of information: (1) the materials presented to us prior to our visit (principally the *Academic Program Review and Departmental Self-Study of the Department of Art History and Humanities* of February 2016; and (2) our on-site experience when we visited John Carroll, toured its campus, concentrated on the public, teaching, and office spaces of the Department of Art History and Humanities, conversed with various University representative and “stake holders” of the past, present, and future of the Department, and, above all, interviewed faculty, staff, and students in the Department.

Overall Assessment

You have asked for a review of the Department of Art History and Humanities at the appropriate juncture. While the Department is a mature and established unit with faculty having exercised a long-standing engagement in teaching, research, and service at John Carroll, it is clear that the moment is right for internal reflection and projection as well as external evaluation and recommendation. This is particularly so since the Department has never undergone external review and it, together with the entirety of John Carroll University, is in the important process of transforming its curriculum for the New Core.

Ours was an informative visit. What was immediately apparent was that the Department had carefully prepared for the review and, during our visit, engaged seriously, thoughtfully, and openly with our purposes of inquiry. The *Academic Program Review and Departmental Self-Study of Art History and Humanities* is a thorough and accurate assessment of departmental strengths and weaknesses as well a forthright declaration of the major challenges and impediments that the Department faces at present and will continue to do so unless significant changes are made.

This is a department that has seen its better days but is one that continues to show good evidence of a ubiquitous commitment across all faculty to teaching, research, and (to a lesser degree due to a high level of disenchantment) service. The faculty have quality, terminal degrees in their field of art history, they have established histories as accomplished teachers and

researchers (as is evident from the fact that all four of the faculty are tenured, all have been promoted, and three have attained the rank of Professor), they have reputations and contacts in the field that extend well beyond John Carroll, and their program is traditional but entirely respectable and not out of the norm for a small art history department.

On the face of matters, this is not a problematic situation. However, any number of problems surfaced in our reading of the supplied materials and from the experience of talking with faculty and others during our site visit. We address these matters below in greater detail, but here by way of introduction and overall assessment, we would stress that it is clear that the Department is significantly challenged in terms of seeing its place and opportunities for its faculty to sustain their teaching loads in the face of the New Core and a threatening decrease in the numbers of majors and minors in both Art History and Humanities. Other challenges include this Humanities major/minor that is poorly integrated into the Department's central focus and seems to be something of an orphan program even within its own academic home. The Humanities major/minor does not strengthen the Art History program; instead, it constitutes an evident distraction as a lingering remnant of an earlier and no longer valid call for such interdisciplinary humanities programs. This redundancy, if you will, is especially so in this present era of John Carroll's promising New Core, itself an integrated curriculum. Full participation of Art History and full integration of Art History with the other Humanities disciplines beyond the Department in the coming years should wholly obviate the need for this Humanities major/minor.

The challenges noted above are variously but not entirely related to problems we observed on site (and read about within the Department's self-study) relative to the physical location of the Department of Art History and Humanities and the actual facilities that the Department has been afforded. The Department's current location in the Dolan Science Center separates it from the rest of the Humanities on campus. Within the Dolan Science Center, a handsome new building in a prominent campus location, the Department's home is itself attractive and inviting and provides a respectable amount of space by way of an ample lobby, a main large corridor, and an office corridor for the display of images and information about art history. Within this environment the four faculty offices are quite suitable and respectable as professional working environments in terms of proximity to one another, size, appointments, desk, shelving, and cabinet space, and windows. These are nice offices in an environment within the Dolan Science Center that presents, on the face of things, a professional atmosphere for an academic department. What the Department does lack is an appropriate general office. There is a small general office, but where you would expect it to be (and where, apparently, other department offices are located elsewhere in similar suites in the Dolan Science Center) there stands instead a University kitchen and catering facility. This makes for an unwanted and often unsightly intrusion into the academic environment and image of the place. This is not the only problem regarding facilities. The Department has only one dedicated classroom, and this classroom is not entirely suited for the specialized delivery of image-based, projected art history material. Additionally, the Department has no dedicated space (or any dedicated staff time) to the curating and display of its small collection of art that remains essentially in storage. And finally, the Department's studio classroom is wholly inadequate and, by virtue of its small size and its use for multiple studio purposes that normally have separate dedicated spaces, this room is markedly substandard for studio offerings. Most seriously, because of this its apparent un-

modified state relative to its present diverse purposes, this studio classroom is very likely not within any number of safety codes for studio usage of various materials toxic or otherwise, proper ventilation, and the suitable storage and safe use of tools and processes associated with the making of works of art.

These challenges noted in brief above are significant, but relatively minor compared to the major problem that the Department of Art History and Humanities faces: The Department has become markedly dispirited and stands notably adrift in the current situation of having been led since 2012 by a sequence of external Chairs. That these external Chairs have been appointed not by internal decision of the art history faculty but by administrative appointment from beyond the Department has only contributed to the diminished morale at present and the uncertain future of the Department. The Department is simply existing and moving along as an assemblage of individuals and not as a concerted group. This either needs to change or the Department needs to be disbanded and its members assigned either together to another department or separately to other departments in the College and University where they can collectively or individually enjoy a definite and growing sense of University spirit, engagement, purpose, and growth. Reading between the proverbial lines as well as hearing in confidence from various quarters both within and beyond the Department, we developed the understanding that this present situation of external Chairs became or was believed necessary to address serious matters of conflict of interest within the art history faculty as well as entrenched personality problems and impediments to effective communication within the Department. Whatever the reasons for this history of external leadership—which seems to have been and continues to be more a situation of essential tending than constructive direction with vision—the administration owes the Department a resolution of this situation that simply cannot continue indefinitely. Moreover, given the lead and collaborative role among and even beyond the Humanities disciplines on your campus that we recommend John Carroll envision for the Art History faculty within the New Core as representatives of an inherently interdisciplinary and integrating field, the administration further owes the College and University as a whole a resolution of this situation in the interest of furthering the new curriculum.

In conclusion of this overall assessment of the Department of Art History and Humanities, permit us to go to a point that might initially seem to return us to facilities and away from the much more pressing matter discussed immediately above of departmental leadership, departmental morale, and overall cohesiveness of the faculty and their sense of collective purpose. As external reviewers, we would express again how pleasantly surprised we were by the overall physical environment of the Department of Art History and Humanities within the Dolan Sciences Center. Excepting the substandard state of the studio classroom, the intrusiveness of the catering facility, the rather makeshift nature of the classroom, and the complete absence of any gallery space, the hallways and office environments of the Department present a very professional (and even what many would consider impressive and enviable) façade. But a façade it seems to be (or perhaps, more troubling, a façade that has become wholly invisible and overlooked by the faculty themselves). To this point we were struck—notably so—by how more than one faculty seemed completely oblivious to even the presence and even the origin of what are very attractive and thoughtfully curated and arranged display cases, wall hangings, and bulletin board offerings in the public spaces of the Department. We were equally taken aback when one faculty member indicated that that he/she had never been in the studio

classroom and was not entirely sure of its location. This is surprising, to express the least, in a faculty in which no individual has been associated with John Carroll for less than the entirety of the tenure process! These matters of spatial awareness or not may seem minor points, but this obliviousness and/or indifference to the physical surroundings of the Department, and the apparent giving over of the design and appointments of its most public spaces entirely to the decisions of and maintenance by the Department's part-time staff person (precisely those spaces where undergraduates learn additionally about the discipline) were notable. Fundamentally, this reality struck us as entirely indicative of a problematic truth that these faculty are simply coming in, doing their work separately, conferring and envisioning not at all as a group, and giving over the general presentation and semblance of cohesiveness in their environment to the design of a part time person in an administrative support role. This would be problematic enough if this were in a discipline not at all associated with visual and spatial matters and their meaning. But this is a Department of *Art History* and *Humanities*, disciplines that have at their very core the presentation, reading, and interpreting of shaped environments of visual culture that transmits intention and communicates meaning. Perhaps more than anything else, this near total disengagement of the faculty with the general physical environment of their area communicated to us that this is a faculty that has rather lost its way individually and collectively.

General Questions and Reviewers' Responses

1. How well is the Department meeting the mission and expectations of the University?

In general terms, the Department is articulating and meeting through its teaching, research, and service the overall mission and expectations of John Carroll University as a Catholic and Jesuit institution. One cannot find fault with how the Department connects with and articulates the mission and expectations of the University in its *Academic Program Review and Departmental Self-Study*, and all evidence from individual faculty syllabi and faculty conversations about their teaching suggests an understanding of and respect for the overall mission of John Carroll. However, while the Department continues to do the work at hand of teaching, researching, and advising students, it is not effectively and strongly meeting the mission and expectations of the University for two principal reasons:

(a) the Department has been absolutely stymied and demoralized by this situation of unending external Chairs; and

(b) the Department is still lamenting the end of the old distributive curriculum, in which it had a more-or-less assured, steady flow of students into its introductory course that naturally fed students into its upper-level offerings. Now, with the New Core, that long-standing/predictable student enrollment is no longer there, and the Department has not yet fully engaged with a vigorous approach to the New Core that would enable it to construct a steady footing in the new curricular environment.

2. *How well is the Department meeting its own goals and mission?*

Here is where the problem surfaces. In its current state of administrative limbo (the external Chair situation) and in its uncertain way forward with the New Core, the Department is really without an evident sense of its goals and mission.

3. *What is your assessment of the Department in terms of curriculum, faculty strengths, teaching and learning, use of resources, assessment practices and results, student recruitment and performance, and future department plans?*

The Department's curriculum is traditional and offers a solid grounding at the introductory and upper levels in western art history (antiquity to the present) and in Asian art. While there is some indication of a more progressive, integrative approach in courses such as "The Beat Generation" and "The Silk Road," there remains a great deal of room for curricular revision and for expansion into new areas, especially American art and global art. It seems clear, however, that little in the way of curricular re-thinking, including greater integration with the rest of the Humanities, can be done effectively while the Department remains in limbo regarding the absence of a Chair of its own choosing and discipline.

As for faculty strengths, again it is clear that these are dedicated and successful teachers and individuals who have serious commitments in their research agenda and respectable track records (some stronger than others) of success in publishing and presenting their work in refereed contexts and in providing notable service to their sub-fields of the profession.

As for matters of the use of resources, assessment practices and results, student recruitment and performance, and future department plans, all of these seem essentially on hold given the general paralysis, uncertainty, and in some cases outright resentment of the New Core and how the new curricular direction of the University has rendered uncertain the future of the Department.

4. *What recommendations do you have for the Department on the issues above, mindful of its size and circumstances in a teaching-oriented, mid-size university?*

The Department needs to embrace fully the New Core by acknowledging, promoting, and *sharing via collaboration* with other Humanities faculty Art History as an inherently integrative practice; it is worth underscoring that the very name "art history" couples two separate disciplines, so the interdisciplinary is a natural path of inquiry and collaboration. In other words, Art History at John Carroll could be poised to take a leadership role in adapting to the New Core. Perhaps this could be accomplished by a move away from the more traditional period surveys and towards more topic-oriented introductory courses. Designed in such a way so as not to sacrifice historical accuracy and foundational understanding in the discipline, such courses would not only aid Art History in engaging with the New Core but would stand to attract more students to the Department's offerings as most of today's undergraduates are not so familiar with traditional period designations and are increasingly more responsive to the subjects of topic-oriented courses. Such an approach might also allow for an expansion of the Department's art history offerings beyond Europe and Asia, i.e. toward American and global art, in the interest of

covering—at the very least on a thematic or comparative level—more areas within the discipline.

5. *What recommendations do you have for the Dean and Academic Vice President as they work to support the Department?*

Absolutely critical for the future of the Department of Art History and Humanities will be the faculty's creative and vigorous engagement with the New Core as an opportunity not just for personal and collective growth and intellectual renewal but for engaging and retaining a growing body of students in introductory courses and majors for the Department's upper division offerings. To this end:

- (a) The faculty, supported and celebrated when appropriate by Dean and Academic Vice President, should take a leadership role in the implementation of the New Core by taking full advantage of art history's already integrative nature.
- (b) Depending on the future of the Department (assuming it is to remain as its own unit), the Dean and Academic Vice President must act to end as soon as possible the continuing sequence of Interim Chairs and allow its faculty more of a voice in selecting a department head.

Specific Questions and Reviewers' Responses

1. *In the Old Core, Art History fulfilled international and divisional requirements that will no longer exist in three more years. The Department is moving to an introductory world art survey that as part of a learning community would be applicable to one of the new requirements—a course in the category "Engaging the Global Community." It is also developing courses for the linked course requirement "Examining the Human Experience." Are there other strategies you would recommend to engage fully with the New Core?*

As stated in several places above, the discipline of art history is by its very nature well-designed to collaborate with other Humanities disciplines in developing curricula. The Art History faculty should be encouraged to take full advantage of this fact by designing innovative curricular offerings within their discipline (the topic-oriented courses mentioned above), while additionally and actively partnering with faculty from other areas of the Humanities to develop creative and challenging courses and learning communities for the New Core. History and English are two Humanities disciplines that are historically strong in enrollment in most colleges and universities and thus would make effective partners for Art History. But, as is suggested below, Art History should be looking for collaborators across the whole of the Humanities and even beyond as the discipline of art history addresses the relationship of material culture to myriad disciplines represented at John Carroll University.

A major problem with the New Core, clearly articulated by the Art History faculty in its self-study and amply anticipated by us as external reviewers, is that it is now and will continue to be for some time difficult to predict/guarantee healthy enrollments in Art History courses in comparison to the relative predictability that the Art History faculty enjoyed under the old curriculum with what was essentially a sustained flow of students into the Department's

introductory offerings. This problem is not unique to John Carroll and the circumstances surrounding its adoption of the New Core; this problem is almost a given whenever there is a major curriculum revision that unseats the old curricular order and established predictability of enrollments. Frustration and uncertainty in such a situation are inevitable and quite understandable, and we are certain that colleagues elsewhere at John Carroll variously share anxieties expressed by the Art History faculty about this situation. We therefore recommend, in aid of Art History and other units at John Carroll, a strategy of undergraduate advising and the channeling of students—spearheaded by the administration—that does not leave the populating of courses solely to chance or to the efforts at student recruitment of individual departments. When a faculty and an administration makes the important decision to embark on a radical revision of curriculum, they need to stay in close, understanding collaboration well into the curriculum’s establishment to ensure that individual areas and departments do not suffer the consequences, stigma, and resentment that so easily results from low or non-existent enrollments in courses specifically designed to further a new curriculum and contribute to the mission of the institution. To avoid this situation, we further recommend that John Carroll investigate best practices in general student advising that are being practiced by institutions that have likewise undergone significant curriculum revision that creates situations of uncertainly similar to those being experienced or anticipated by the Art History faculty and their colleagues in other areas at John Carroll.

2. *Currently, Art History requires AH 201 (a single-semester survey, previously, AH 101) as prerequisite for all other AH courses, including drawing, painting, and graphic design. Does this align with the expectations of peer universities? What are the implications of this prerequisite for enrollment in other courses? Are there other approaches to the introductory course that would be useful to consider?*

The traditional art history survey, be it either a one- or two-semester offering or offerings, is the product of an earlier era in which disciplines within the academy were regarded and taught as separate subjects. John Carroll’s New Core, on the other hand, belongs to the current era of curricular integration. With this in mind, it makes sense that the Art History faculty not continue with survey courses in the “old manner” but think about them anew as topic-oriented courses that yes introduce the discipline and its major monuments and emphases, but begin in that introductory moment to model—as art history is inherently well-disposed to do so—the integrated nature of the New Core. The expected result will be that students will move logically from an experience of integrated learning at the introductory level to similarly integrated learning experiences in upper division courses in the discipline.

3. *As of the new 2015-2017 Undergraduate Bulletin and as part of our New Core requirements, Art History requires a capstone portfolio for its majors. Do you have any advice as to how to structure or administer this requirement?*

Our thinking, and perhaps this is also the design, is that the portfolio should be the central feature of a capstone course for advanced students in Art History. The course should be topic-oriented in the spirit of an undergraduate research seminar, while simultaneously involving students in the assembly and final editing of a portfolio of writings, the investigation of career goals, and the preparation of resumes and personal statements. Students might also research

and write on specific topics related to the course theme and present those papers in the context of a student research symposium.

Traditionally these “capstone” courses are taken in the senior year, but often that means that such preparation falls after the period when students are seeking important mentoring and making critical decisions and applications for post undergraduate study. Therefore, it might be more practical and fitting for such a capstone portfolio course/experience to occur in the second semester of a student’s junior year. This timing would then position the student well for a summer’s research and reflection on “next moves” and position her/him for making applications in a timely manner the following fall of the senior year. The aforementioned student symposium could take place at some point in the student’s senior year as the final experience of an extended capstone experience between the junior and senior years.

Again, the New Core is key. Since the New Core will become, literally, the core of a John Carroll education, it makes sense that a capstone experience reflect and give demonstration that a student has embarked on learning and the production of undergraduate research and writings that reflect the underlying interdisciplinary principles of the New Core.

4. As of the new 2015-2017 Undergraduate Bulletin, Art History requires a studio art class as part of the major. Since there are no full-time studio art faculty, are there staffing implications and strategies to consider? How might we think of the relationship between studio art and Art History in ways that strengthen both?

Neither the Department of Art History and Humanities nor the University is equipped to mount a credible studio program, and the current offerings are inadequate add-ons. As there are a number of good studio programs in other institutions of higher learning in the Cleveland area, John Carroll could work out an agreement by which its students could receive credit for studio classes taken at these institutions. We believe that introduction to and practice in studio are beneficial to student learning in art history, and such should remain in the curriculum. We simply do not see that John Carroll is positioned at present or will be in the future to do this well by its own. To continue as the Department presently does in studio education solely with adjunct faculty and substandard facilities—not to mention a notably distant and in some faculty cases non-existent engagement with what is literally going on and where with regard to studio—only undercuts the significance of this important element of art history education, precisely what the Department should not do if it sincerely wishes students to understand the importance of this curricular element and requirement.

5. Art History graduates fewer than five majors a year—for 2015/2016 the number will be two. Are these numbers typical for AH departments at similar institutions? If not, what strategies—be they curricular, marketing, or instruction—might improve these numbers? (Minors are similarly few.)

This situation is not uncommon for Art History departments at similar institutions. One possible solution may be exploring the promotion of double majors with other departments not just in the Humanities but in the Social Sciences as well. Here again is another opportunity for the Art

History faculty at John Carroll to step out of their relatively closed environment and engage on the broader plane of the University.

To this matter of enrollments, it bears mentioning that art history is rarely taught or even introduced in most high schools; therefore students typically do not encounter the discipline until they enroll in an introductory, college-level course. In view of this situation, it might be helpful for the administration and art history faculty to work more closely than perhaps they have in the past with university admissions to make sure that art history is fully and invitingly positioned in John Carroll's promotional literature and even in the critical campus visit experience of prospective students.

6. The Art History Department is home to the Humanities major and minor, flexible programs that require the majority of coursework to be in Art History and Literature. There are generally no students graduating in this major. Are there ways to make it more attractive, or should it be eliminated?

As stated previously, the Humanities major/minor seems an orphan within the Art History Department and within the University. It should be discontinued so that full attention can be given to strengthening the Art History program.

7. Given the small number of majors, does it make sense to integrate Art History with another department? If not, what are the implications for the Department going forward?

The opening clause and premise of this question suggests that the small number of majors would itself be the grounds for integrating Art History with another department. We think this a premise that should be queried. Just what has contributed to the small number of majors is a debatable matter, ranging likely from a general national trend declining numbers of art history majors as students seek concentrations perceived as "more practical" and leading more directly toward careers to an absence at John Carroll itself of a vigorous recruiting effort on the part of the Department and/or University admissions in support of this discipline. Additionally, the present paucity of majors needs to be seen in relation to the old curricular structure at John Carroll with some forecasting done in view of what role and presence Art History faculty and their major can play in the development of the New Core and in encouraging students to continue in art history after having experienced that discipline in introductory courses that have been designed in the spirit and philosophy of the New Core. Finally, this paucity of majors is likely attributable—to either a lesser or greater degree—on the present uncertain state of the Department in its continuing administration by a series of external Chairs who have apparently not been focused or have not succeeded in aiding the Department in increasing its enrollment of majors. In the Department going forward in the present manner of external administration, diminished morale, and questionable to reluctant engagement with the New Core, the predictable implications for the future are that Art History will become little more than a department not attracting majors in any notable/respectable numbers and existing in essentially a "service capacity" providing courses for students enrolled in other majors. This would be unfortunate, especially given (to underscore one of our major points in this report) the very integrative nature of art history as a discipline that should place it at the very center, complete

with a healthy complement of majors, rather than the problematic periphery of undergraduate education with no or few majors.

There are a number of scenarios that could be proposed for moving forward:

(a) **The Art History Faculty Appoint an Internal Chair:** In this scenario, the Department remains as it is and is permitted to select an internal Chair. That Chair is specifically charged and clearly supported by the College to work with her/his faculty and other Humanities departments in the College in transforming the art history curriculum in creative alignment with the New Core and in connecting the art history offerings, through learning communities, to other disciplines.

This scenario would immediately address the problem of the external Chair situation of several years' standing, but it would not in and of itself improve the situation of enrollments, solve departmental morale, or establish the ground for the department to engage creatively with the New Core.

(b) **The Art History Faculty Conduct a National Search for a Chair:** In this scenario, the Department again remains as is and holds a national search and hire a Chair whose area of expertise would be up to the Department to decide and whose charge—prominently articulated in the position description and constituting a deciding and non-peripheral factor in the decision to hire—that this individual lead the Department in a vigorous and creative, cross-campus engagement with the New Core and in a sustained process in which all faculty are actively and creatively engaged in reaching and teaching undeclared students and encouraging them by example of a dynamic discipline at the core of the New Core to elect Art History as a major at John Carroll.

This scenario is consistent with standard practice across academia when a department needs a new Chair, does not a suitable candidate within its existing ranks, and/or needs to expand its faculty and curricular offerings to cover a subject area or engage in a major new direction and identity. Admittedly, this is clearly the least likely and affordable scenario given present and projected budgetary constraints at John Carroll.

(c) **The Art History Faculty are Integrated Elsewhere at John Carroll and Continue to Deliver a Major:** In this scenario, the Art History faculty is disbanded and its members are integrated and have their official academic home in another Humanities department or an assemblage of Humanities departments. The Art History major continues but is administered by one or more of these new departments in which the Art History faculty are reassigned.

This scenario would constitute a painful and largely unconstructive declaration that the Art History Department is a failed department and cannot responsibly administer its affairs according to the standards of the College and University.

(d) **The Art History Faculty are Integrated Elsewhere and the Art History Major is Eliminated:** Again, the Art History faculty are integrated into another Humanities department

or an assemblage of Humanities departments. In this scenario, Art History is eliminated as a major with its faculty providing separate Art History courses—unlinked to a major—that simply fulfill general University requirements in the New Core without constituting curricular stepping stones toward a major.

As with scenario “c,” this scenario would constitute a painful and largely unconstructive declaration that the Art History Department is a failed department and cannot responsibly administer its affairs according to the standards of the College and University.

(e) A New Interdisciplinary Major in Art History or Visual Studies: Again, the Art History faculty are integrated into another Humanities department or an assemblage of Humanities departments. In this scenario, Art History designs a new major in concert with colleagues in other disciplines that is an interdisciplinary major in Art History or Visual Studies made up of Art History and other courses that would be double listed by the disciplines/departments that constitute the new home department(s) of the art history faculty.

This scenario may be the most creative and forward-looking option for it would encourage the Art History faculty and their colleagues in the Humanities and elsewhere to transform completely Art History and integrate it richly with other disciplines into a new major wholly conceived and developed in the philosophical spirit of the New Core.

As reviewers, we wish to offer our strong opinion that this scenario “e” is the most attractive way forward for Art History, for its faculty to engage with and lead an important and innovative initiative of collaborating with others in the establishment of a new interdisciplinary program in support of the New Core, and for the prospects of sound future relationships with the administration and with other departments at John Carroll. Pursued in good faith and with ample creativity and enthusiasm, with due balance of caution and optimism, with no rancor or resentment about an unfortunate past, and with openly and widely expressed and received commitment to and support from both Art History and the administration, this scenario would allow Art History to advance with pride and growing recognition from a position of challenge to one of collegial leadership.

Conclusion

In support of our strong recommendation above of scenario “e,” and in acknowledgement that the early stages of implementing this scenario or one of the others could be set in motion as early as academic year 2016-2017, there are two overriding factors that must be addressed in the short term in order to lay a solid foundation of good faith in and mutual commitment to this work:

(a) The Art History faculty must engage enthusiastically, creatively, and collaboratively with the New Core.

(b) The Art History faculty must be given an assurance by the administration that the current situation of external Chairs is not punitive, is not permanent, and will be brought to a close at a

clearly defined and mutually agreed-upon date *in the near future* with the joint purpose of moving definitively forward with one of the scenarios suggested in the previous section.

We thank you again for the opportunity and experience of reviewing the Department of Art History and Humanities. We wish you well in your coming deliberations, and we offer our continued assistance should you have any questions as you work responsibly, creatively, and openly with shared purpose with the Art History faculty in the coming years. Key to this work, as you know, will be your affirming with them and with their colleagues across your institution the importance of their discipline to the continued success of the New Core, to liberally learning in general, and to the mission of John Carroll University.

Sincerely,

Roger J. Crum, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Art and Design
University of Dayton

Rachel Dressler, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Chair
Department of Art and Art History
University at Albany
SUNY