

## **A History of the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy**

Ruth M. Smith, PhD

May 4, 2017

Note: There are many ways that this history could be written, as Nancy MacGregor pointed out:

- Highlighting contributions of the faculty;
- Tracing the development of ideas generated from the department, a very significant contribution since this department prides itself in a strong research focus for both students and faculty;
- Via the impact of the department on the field of art education and society through research and the training of art teachers. This is problematic as the department has expanded to include multiple fields, and has historically been open to inter- and cross-disciplinary study;
- Through the documentation of archived materials and oral histories; or
- Through curricular and/or programmatic changes.

I have organized this history chronologically to create a working timeline documenting major changes in the department. This timeline has been divided into time periods according to significant shifts in the department's curricular and programmatic focus. These pivot points are driven by the ideas emerging from the research and interests of the faculty in addition to larger social and cultural movements. There were, as Nancy MacGregor describes it, "big ideas [moving] in and [moving] out. Like a circle, it just keeps going. Something comes in and something goes out. Comes in and goes out. It builds and builds. Like a spiral for human development and knowledge and dissemination."<sup>i</sup> I decided to also utilize the tenure of department chairs to help guide the history, as their leadership guided the department and their faculty hires helped shape future programs. Several other faculty are mentioned per interview and archival materials. This does not, however, negate the significant contributions that many faculty who have been tenured in the Department of Art Education/Arts Administration, Education and Policy have made to the department and the field.

Information was collected from university and department archives including old newsletters, department and college documents, university faculty and staff yearbooks, course bulletins, articles from *The Lantern*, and other miscellaneous documents, as well as interviews with Nancy MacGregor, Margaret Wyszomirski, Patricia Stuhr, Deborah Smith-Shank, and Karen Hutzel. I intentionally interviewed women, as much of the archived material featured male voices. As noted in the following document, in the early years, the department was majority male. Not until 1995 was there a proportional distribution of male and female faculty. Today, there is a majority female faculty.

Underlying themes emerged including a response to contemporary society and culture formation. The changes to arts policy on the federal level in the 1980s-1990s led to the formation of an arts policy and administration program embedded within art education. The development of ideas by Manuel Barkan in the 1960s informed Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE) in the 1980s, which Ohio State then transformed through its 15-year relationship with the Getty, and resulted in an interdisciplinary approach to art education in the Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC). Even in just these two examples is evidence of the spiral of big ideas that MacGregor described in her interview and Ohio State's Department of Art Education/AAEP role

in that process. In addition, the innovation of the department is evident in its role in pioneering computer graphics, promoting interdisciplinary study, partnering with policy for arts administration programming, and being the first (mostly) online Master in art education program in the country and the first (completely) online Master program in the College of Arts and Sciences. The department, time and again, is at the forefront of cultural production and cutting-edge research in the field of art education.

The focus of this history is primarily 1985 onward, as nothing besides the TETAC files has been formally archived since 1985, a problem soon to be remedied as most of the materials collected in this project will be archived with the University for preservation and easier future access.

## **Early History<sup>ii</sup>**

Art has been a part of campus life at The Ohio State University since the late 1800s, when courses were offered in freehand drawing, lettering, and botanical drawing. A Department of Art was established in 1880. The Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy shares its early history with the university's other visual arts programs, in particular the drawing area, which joined the college of Education in 1907. The Department of Fine Arts was formed in 1922, and in 1923 visiting artist James Hopkins became its chairman. In the 1920s, the university became the first of the state universities to offer graduate programs for the creative artist, art historian, and specialist in art education. Classes were taught in Hayes Hall.

In 1944, this department became the School of Fine and Applied Arts. By the mid-1950s, art instruction had filled Hayes Hall and expanded into all of the spare rooms available. In 1959, the first wing of a new art building was opened and in 1962, the second wing was completed and this new building would later be named Hopkins Hall in honor of James R. Hopkins who served as chairman for 24 years.

In 1962, the School of Fine and Applied Arts was renamed the School of Art and in 1968, the School of Art was disbanded and reorganized as four divisions within the College of the Arts: Art, Art Education, History of Art, and Industrial Design. Manuel Barkan became the first Chairman of the Division of Art Education in 1968. Art education at the undergraduate level was designed for professional preparation of art teachers of the elementary and secondary schools. On the graduate level students were trained to become teachers and supervisors of art in public school systems as well as college teaching in the field of art education.<sup>iii</sup>

“From the very beginning, since Manny Barkan was the first chair of the department, it has included some of the most important people to make their marks on art education”<sup>iv</sup> Manuel Barkan had many friends and associates throughout the United States, drawing many of the faculty foundational to the department history, including Kenneth Marantz,<sup>v</sup> who would become the Department of Art Education's first chairperson. It was under Barkan's leadership that the department rose to national prominence. “Barkan's close association with the OSU faculty resulted in a new conception of art education and, consequently, a new approach to art education curriculum.”<sup>vi</sup> The foundation of this curriculum understood artistic experience as an interactional relationship between artist and materials, including the artist's physical, social and cultural environment, influenced by Dewey's principle of interaction and, later, Jerome Bruner's “structure of a subject.”<sup>vii</sup> Barkan's later work was revitalized in the 1970s in the Discipline-Based Art Education movement (DBAE) sponsored by The Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

## 1971-1977: Building a Legacy

The Division of Art Education became the Department of Art Education in 1971,<sup>viii</sup> with Dr. Kenneth Marantz as chairperson until 1987,<sup>ix</sup> and made its home in Hopkins Hall. The Department of Art Education maintained strong ties with artmaking as well as education.

### Kenneth Marantz (Chair, 1971-1987)

Kenneth Marantz made it a goal to attract faculty to the department. Prior to 1971, “it was still a division, [and] according to university rules, you had to have at least ten faculty...At one time, we had close to twenty.”<sup>x</sup> By the end of his chairmanship in 1987, the department grew to twenty faculty and several adjunct positions.<sup>xi</sup>

In 1972, the new faculty unit, unlike its earlier counterparts, consisted largely of men faculty, ten out of the eleven, while the majority of its students were women. The one remaining woman is more closely affiliated with the College of Education rather than the Division of Art Education.<sup>xii</sup> This would not change until the mid-1990s, when the number of women faculty finally equaled the number of men.<sup>xiii</sup> Nancy MacGregor (an undergraduate student with Manuel Barkan, joined the faculty in 1975, and became a full professor in 1990) witnessed much of this change, acknowledging the change in values over the years when at one time women who were married weren't seen as able to get a degree and men and women were not paid equally.<sup>xiv</sup> These differences played out in the number of women earning tenure, and the number of women working on, for example, the classroom based research in TETAC in the 1990s<sup>xv</sup>.

Erickson went on to explore the relationship between gender and status (and subsequently departmental funding).

The status of academic units serving primarily women students and status of academic units with primarily women faculties – women students associated with fine arts and academic interests, result[s] in a lowering of status.... As the department increasingly allied itself with the college of engineering, a “man’s field,” it received Presidential and Board of Trustees support, and prospered. The College of Education was formed at the lower status fine arts courses were immediately transferred to the new college. The Fines Arts grew more and more respectable, its faculty consisted more and more of men. Perhaps because of the double association of Art Education with women (fine arts and education) its reputation and dominance by men faculty was slower in developing. If the assumption is true --- that an academic unit’s being associated with women, results in a lower status for that unit, implicit or latent acknowledgement of this assumption on the part of art educators, students, administrators, public school officials or any other relevant groups, might help to account for the particular position in which the field of Art Education finds itself today.<sup>xvi</sup>

Despite this “particular position,” Marantz recognized the legacy of art educators, and the prominence of Ohio State’s faculty in the field, a tradition that continued so much so that in 1984, graduate students voted to direct yearly fund towards inviting one of the department’s many distinguished alumni to speak. In recognition of the significant cadre of graduates in prominent positions in art education, the lecture series was designated the “Kenneth A. Marantz Distinguished Alumni Award.” Until 1991, this event was cosponsored by the Graduate School. Each year, an eminent person has been selected as award recipient and returned to Ohio State to give

presentations and meet with the department's students, faculty and guests.<sup>xvii</sup> This award is partially supported by alumni contributions. "By giving to this award we not only honor Ken, but contribute to the maintenance of his vision of an academic community. In doing this, we can model for the field of Art Education the collegiality that is so important to a community's ability to thrive."<sup>xviii</sup> A full list of past recipients can be found at the end of this document.

As the department matured as an independent academic unit, it maintained its roots in artmaking as well as teacher preparation, evidenced by studio courses, its home in Hopkins Hall with the Department of Art, and the Arts in Education Division of the College of Education from 1974-1979. In addition, the department offered a Saturday Art Workshop, where student teachers offered classes, from the early 1960s until the late 1990s.

### **1977-1996: Expanding Art Education**

In 1977, the Department of Art Education instituted a new undergraduate curriculum.<sup>xix</sup> Its orientation is humanistic and liberal arts oriented with imagination as a disciplined focus. Its students could now pursue studies without necessarily aiming toward art teacher certification. The BAE was awarded jointly by the Colleges of Education and The Arts. Nancy MacGregor redesigned the whole graduate and undergraduate program, "reassembling the old in a different way to serve all the different groups of people who were interested in art therapy, arts administration, art education, etc."<sup>xx</sup>

Expanding Art Education beyond teacher preparation, the department began to increase its course offerings, adding courses to the books such as 604 Multi-Media Materials Development for Art Education, 631 Non-Traditional Art Education 635 Photographic Criticism, and 657 Bookmaking.<sup>xxi</sup> Courses, and others like them, paved the way for the development of alternative areas of study including:

- Computer Graphics/Animation
- Jewelry/Metalsmithing
- The Logan Elm Press
- Arts Administration/Community Arts Services<sup>xxii</sup>

The program review begun in June 1978 concluded in 1985.<sup>xxiii</sup> The external review committee emphasized in their report that Ohio State's Department of Art Education is "the outstanding department of its kind in the United States" and found that "strong leadership and initiative" characterized the Department's "vital and dynamic program," as do "a high level of scholarship and significant contributions to the state and to the field, including international art education."<sup>xxiv</sup>

By 1986, the goals of the department were:

1. To provide undergraduate instruction and create an environment that will nurture and prepare students for careers as art educators in schools and other community settings, grounded on the conviction that art education in its broadest sense can elevate every segment of the population by providing an experiential, knowledge-based understanding and critical appreciation of visual art;
2. To provide graduate instruction and create an environment that will nurture and prepare art educators for national and international leadership roles in universities and other agencies,

- and to investigate artistic, pedagogical, philosophical, psychological, and sociological concerns which may affect the state of arts and education;
3. To foster scholarship in areas historically, conceptually and practically tied with art education;
  4. To explore and advance the application of new technology to art education and the aesthetic dimension of life;
  5. To equip students with the ability and desire to articulate ideas visually, orally and in writing, to address current issues in arts and education;
  6. To maintain the departments' historical position of leadership in the field of art education through theoretical speculation, critical observation, scholarly research and innovative practice.<sup>xxv</sup>

In 1988, the department received a grant from the Getty Foundation to conduct curriculum development and research activities with teachers across Ohio through The Ohio Partnership for the Visual Arts (OPVA). This has been a partnership with school districts, museums, the Ohio Arts Council, and the State Department. It was the beginning of a fifteen-year movement supported by private funds. This project was led by Nancy MacGregor, who applied for and received a grant from the Getty Center.<sup>xxvi</sup> The program implemented a new approach to art education called Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE), revitalizing the work of Manuel Barkan, which teaches children how to value, analyze and interpret works of art using content and strategies from art criticism, art history and aesthetic. Administrators and educators from Ohio State, the Wexner Center for the Arts and the Columbus Museum of Art present the program, and was one of six institutes nationwide sponsored by the Getty.<sup>xxvii</sup>

### **Computer Graphics/Animation**

Pioneering work in computer graphics was initiated in 1963 by Charles Csuri in his role as a professor in the Department of Art at Ohio State (tenured in the Department of Art Education beginning in 1978-1989, emeritus 1990 onward).<sup>xxviii</sup> This began with experimental courses through Art Education and the Instruction and Research Computer Center (IRCC), a computer center that provided facilities for the processing of computer applications related to courses and seminars.<sup>xxix</sup> The Department of Art Education was the administrative and academic unit for undergraduate and graduate instruction in applications of computer graphics to the arts. In 1985, Mihai Nadin was appointed as Ohio Eminent Scholar in Design Technology and tenured in the Department of Art Education.<sup>xxx</sup> Tom Linehan (1979-1988) and Csuri converted the Computer Graphics Research Group into The Advanced Computing Center for the Arts and Design (ACCAD) in 1987, with funding from a long-term Ohio Board of Regents Academic Challenge grant. ACCAD was established to merge scientific investigation with aesthetic ideas and provide computer animation resources in teaching, research and production for all departments in the College of Arts and Sciences at Ohio State.<sup>xxxi</sup> ACCAD merges scientific investigation with aesthetic ideas. With the opening of the Advanced Computing Center for the Arts (ACCAD) laboratory in 1987, graduate instruction in applications of computer graphics to the arts moved to ACCAD's new facility on Kinnear Road. Art Education graduate students conducted advanced research and studies in computer graphics at ACCAD and ACCAD graduate students taught Art Education computer course in the Amiga Lab in Hopkins Hall. Many young faculty working in ACCAD and the Department of Art Education found it difficult to work in two areas and achieve tenure. Subsequently, by 1997, the relationship between ACCAD and The Department of Art Education dissolved.<sup>xxxii</sup>

## **Logan Elm Press (1978-1988/2015)**

The Logan Elm Press was established in 1978 for the purpose of studying, preserving and fostering the art of the book and investigating it as an art form particularly significant for art education. In 1979, a consultant was hired to determine and implement strategies for the development of the Press's facilities and activities and in 1983, an Administrative Professional appointment was made for continuing direction of the Press' operation and development. From its beginning, the Press has provided the University with an interdisciplinary "workshop" environment where students, faculty, and artists have had access to professional facilities, expertise and peer support for the production of limited edition books and other printed matter which have been recognized internationally for their high-quality workmanship, innovation, design and contribution to art and education.<sup>xxxiii</sup> In 1988, Logan Elm Press transferred to the Ohio State Press. In 2015, The Logan Elm Press, combined with the Libraries' Center for the Book Arts, suspended operations.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

## **Arts Administration and Community Arts Services**

In the 1980s, the Department of Art Education began activities in arts administration including mini-courses on the weekends and establishing a core of students within existing programs. Weekend courses phased out as the Department of Art Education formalized courses in arts administration and community arts services within its Master of Arts degree program.<sup>xxxv</sup> The first of such courses appeared in the university course bulletin as early as 1979 (Non-Traditional Art Education Settings ARTEDU 631)<sup>xxxvi</sup>, followed by ARTEDU 589 Internship in Art Education (Arts Administration, Museum Education, Pre-Art Therapy, Community Residential and Arts Centers, Art Criticism, and Other) in 1985,<sup>xxxvii</sup> and what would become core classes in the Arts Policy and Administration (APA) program: ARTEDU 670 Public Policy and the Arts, 671 Roles of Community Arts Administration and 672 Planning for the Arts in Communities in 1987.<sup>xxxviii</sup>

By 1986, Arts Administration and Community Arts Services was identified as an area of alternative study.<sup>xxxix</sup> At this time, core students (since late 1970s) took additional coursework in College of Administrative Services, School of Business Administration, School of Public Administration, and Department of Communications.

## **Michael Parsons (Chair, 1988-1994)**

Michael Parsons became chairperson in 1988 (until 1994). Under Parsons, the department identified initiatives including:

- Securing a more central place of the visual arts in general education
- Improvement of programs for educating art educators and administrators for schools and other public agencies
- Development of a program of museum education to capitalize on the opportunities afforded by the opening of the Wexner Center for the Arts in 1989, which was conceived as a research laboratory for all the arts, and emphasized commissions for new work and artist residencies since its inception. Its multidisciplinary programs encompass performing arts, exhibitions, and media arts (film/video) and have focused on cutting-edge culture from around the globe.
- A more focused and cooperative approach to research in art education, relating research programs more closely with instructional programs.<sup>xl</sup>

Driving motivations include maintaining and fostering leadership in art education as well as transferring alternative areas of study to more appropriate departmental homes. For example, Metalsmithing, Jewelry, and Bookmaking classes as well as the Logan Elm Press were transferred to other units. In 1985, external reviewers urged careful consideration of the relocation of the Jewelry and Metalsmithing program, “as the loss of this segment of the program and the faculty member responsible for it will change the image of the Department and its’ program.”<sup>xli</sup> The reviewers were correct in their assessment, the transfer of these programs did change the image of the Department. As these programs moved, others emerged, namely arts policy and administration and museum education.

### **James Hutchens (Chair, 1995-2002)**

James Hutchens became chair in 1995 (until 2002) and under his leadership, the Department of Art Education formalized its Arts Policy and Administration program and transitioned from a DBAE approach to TETAC. During his tenure as chair, the Department was ranked as the leading art education program, with the largest faculty and resources to offer a comprehensive program, in the United States and Canada.<sup>xlii</sup>

### **Arts Policy and Administration**

A graduate program in Arts Policy and Administration was first initiated in 1984<sup>xliii</sup> but was not realized for ten more years. Courses in arts administration have been offered since the mid-1980s, primarily under the guidance of James Hutchens, who had a long-standing interest in arts management and an awareness of the policy dimension. Constance Bumgarner Gee (Assistant Professor, 1995-1997) was “the bridge person who came out of art education, but had an art education policy interest. That section of the 90s, the idea of arts policy, cultural policy was very hot. There was a real feel that it was needed in order to think of, anticipate, the kind of controversies that had been hitting the arts since 1989 with the culture wars, with enough things changing around us for people to think of the next wave. She was the right person to make this connection.”<sup>xliv</sup>

On May 7, 1993, two endowed funds were established by Ohio State alumnus and entertainment industry leader, Lawrence Barnett and his wife Isabel to support the Arts Policy and Administration Program at The Ohio State University. The Lawrence and Isabel Barnett Fellowship Fund provides tuition, fees, and an annual stipend for promising Arts Policy and Administration students. The Lawrence and Isabel Barnett Distinguished Visiting Professor Fund supports an annual Barnett lecture series and the biennial Barnett Arts and Public Policy Symposium.

The Barnett Symposium concept was created to facilitate in-depth inquiry and analysis of public and not-for-profit sector policies and practices. The inaugural symposium in May 1993 brought together two key figures from the J. Paul Getty Trust, two highly regarded state arts council directors, university experts in public policy, artists, and arts administrators to discuss the broad topic of “Public Policy and the Arts.”<sup>xlv</sup> In this symposium, Harold Williams, the president of the J. Paul Getty Trust, presented a lecture on art education policy. In his talk, Williams described the evolution and complex nature of the federal, state, and local arts support network and its significance for arts education policy formulation. Williams emphasized the interrelatedness of the arts and arts education as well as the close linkage of arts education policy formulation to the overall reform of public education.<sup>xlvi</sup> This talk was the impetus for partnering with the School of Public Policy and Management in the Fisher College of Business, what is now the John Glenn College of Public

Affairs, to develop the Master of Arts in Arts Policy and Administration. This partnership was a significant shift in how arts administration programs were offered from existing programs, which stressed the importance of business theory and practice.<sup>xlvii</sup>

The Master of Arts in Arts Policy and Administration emphasizes the development of the concepts, skills, and attitudes required to administer public arts and arts service organizations in a culturally diverse and changing arts world. The program's major goal is to prepare students to deal with managerial decision-making (which most other arts administration programs, which were business-oriented, focused on at the time) as well as policy challenges in the arts. Students cultivate a vision and sensitivity to influence policy impacting culture formation in America through critically assessing the value and impact of arts-related legislation and public arts programming. Through their studies, students aim to recognize potential and existing conflicts of policy and practice, seek solutions to these problems, understand the relation between arts education and arts policy and public education, and participate in the public policy arena from local to federal to contribute significantly to the formulation, clarification and cohesion of more informed, sophisticated and effectual public arts policy.<sup>xlviii</sup> The program offered core classes in both Art Education and Public Policy and Management. The Master of Art in Arts Policy and Administration was first proposed in August 1994 and was approved by the Board of Trustees in 1995<sup>xlix</sup> followed by the Ohio Board of Regents in 1996.<sup>1</sup>

### **1996-2012: Shift to interdisciplinary and multicultural art education**

In addition to the Master of Arts in Arts Policy and Administration program, another major shift in curricular focus began in the 1990s. In 1989, the first undergraduate course focused on visual culture, multicultural art education, and social justice began and was offered university-wide as a General Education Course.<sup>li</sup> With this course, and others developed primarily by Patricia Stuhr, who joined the department in 1987 as an Assistant Professor,<sup>lii</sup> on a Lily Foundation Fellowship,<sup>liii</sup> began a curricular shift towards multicultural art education, interdisciplinary approaches, and a focus on the role of culture, identity, and social justice in understanding art and the diverse audiences served by art education.<sup>liv</sup> “Social Justice was a huge emphasis in multicultural literature. That was the whole purpose of multicultural education, to promote social justice for everyone. It came [into art education in the] early 1990s. It was being written about in multicultural education in the late 1980s.”<sup>lv</sup> Stuhr, in particular, was instrumental as a faculty member and later as chair in recruiting more women faculty into the department as well as individuals whose research focused on visual culture, multicultural education, and other specific areas such as Queer Studies and Disability Studies.

The development of programs throughout the 1980s and 1990s came to fruition in the early 2000s. Though officially approved, programs crystallized as faculty were hired and courses added to the books. As Wyszomirski noted, there was a lot of turnover at the university and an enormous amount of program and degree growth. “When I came [in 1998], there was an MA in Art Education. We had just launched the MA in APA with Glenn School and there was a PhD in Art Education. The Museum Education program wasn't really here. It would have been a year or two after Jim Sanders came. He was working at that point with the head of education at the Wexner Center of the Arts. It was a good partnership, surveying museum education programs around the country. Then, BAAM came up the last three to four years, even though we started leading into it with courses and talking with the business school. These things always have a long gestation period. Partners, curriculum, recruit students. There's a good 5-year ramp up period.”<sup>lvi</sup>



For example, several faculty members were hired into the APA program, including Wayne Lawson (adjunct in 1993 and full professor in 2008-2016), who was at the time the executive director of OAC. Lawson eventually became a “mainstay of the program by teaching a couple courses and thesis advising and PhD advising as the program grew, and, in terms of helping students make contacts in the professional world.”<sup>lviii</sup>

This marked a shift not only towards social justice and multicultural art education, but also towards interdisciplinary approaches to education which included partnerships across departments, the development of interdisciplinary specializations such as Native American Studies, and offering university-wide GEC courses. The emphasis on interdisciplinary approaches also emerged within the Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC), which ran from 1998 to 2003.

### **Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (1998-2003)**

Though TETAC grew out the DBAE program, the focus changed overtime. TETAC was launched in 1996 as a joint effort of the Annenberg Foundation, which focuses on school reform, and the J. Paul Getty Trust's Getty Education Institute for the Arts. Its aim was to look at how arts could be infused into the core curriculum of the nation's schools. It was a five-year initiative to link comprehensive approaches to arts education with national and local school reform efforts. In California, they did away with all their art teachers with proposition 13 and the idea was to train all the teachers in the arts so they can teach art.”<sup>lviii</sup> Six regional organizations — one each in California, Florida, Nebraska, Ohio, Tennessee, and Texas — formed the National Arts Education Consortium and became part of TETAC (4 of the 6 completed the 5 years). All had been part of Getty's earlier DBAE program. Through TETAC each organization worked with five or six schools in its region to develop and test what was called a Comprehensive Arts Education (CAE) program.<sup>lix</sup> In the Ohio TETAC program, “We wanted to promote inquiry-based learning that engaged students with meaningful issues...we wanted a curriculum structured around important ideas, one that called for the construction of knowledge across subject areas. And...we wanted the arts to figure prominently in the integration of this curriculum.”<sup>lx</sup>

After TETAC we were a little burnt out and people were upset. Again, it was almost all women doing the work. There were men, [but they] dropped out because I think that they thought all the work we were doing in the schools, we were doing case studies and working with teachers in the school, was women's work, or at least that was what it seemed like. People were burnt out because we had to write major case study reports and didn't have time for other research. In the end, we were promoting visual culture curriculum that was research-based. We were working very interdisciplinary, and we had a focus in that way. We were very intent with doing collaborations with the university, and the community...We brought in more areas of social justice and visual culture...DBAE emphasized criticism, production and studio. TETAC took in the concept of thinking about things under the concept of the big idea, and you could take that concept and come at it using the arts, not just the visual arts, but dancing and theater...to teach across all disciplines. As a faculty, we wrote papers together ... about TETAC...and that's how “big ideas” got into the literature, from our writing... There was an emphasis in interdisciplinary education and that was the emphasis in getting our [new] building [Sullivant Hall]. That was very different from before.<sup>lxi</sup>

## **Patricia Stuhr (Chair, 2002 – 2011)**

Patricia Stuhr became chair of the department in 2002. She began teaching in the department in 1989 and worked the change the atmosphere of the department, “to make it more congenial and to work together...where people would see us as a place to come to. We had great faculty, but we needed new ones to keep the department strong.”<sup>lxiii</sup> During her tenure at Ohio State, she focused on developing a culture of mentorship and international leadership in the department. She focused on creating closer relationships with local, regional, and state arts organizations, meeting regularly with representatives from the Ohio Alliance for the Arts/Ohio Citizens for the Arts, Central Ohio Student Advocates for the Arts, the Ohio Department of Education, the Ohio Arts Council, local schools, and the Dublin Arts Council. Stuhr focused on developing curriculum appropriate for disenfranchised groups with courses including courses concerning disability studies and LGBTQ+ issues.<sup>lxiv</sup>

“Another thing that I thought was really, really, really important was to get a broader international understanding and appreciation, and that we become premier international people as well. We did well in that regard. We had a lot of programs we did with other countries – Brazilian exchange program, Jamaican online program, courses focused in Native American studies. But we had memorandums of understanding with a lot of other countries. That was a lot of work to get those agreements and get them thought the university and communicate with them.”<sup>lxv</sup>

The Department of Art Education hosted summer one week intensive graduate courses, which brought in visiting faculty from around the country and world, including Deborah Smith-Shank, who would come to Ohio State in 2011 as a professor and then chairperson.

## **Online Art Education**

In 2002, the Department of Art Education launched the first online art education offering in the United States with it's Mostly Online Master of Arts in Art Education. It started as a mostly online MA program (2002-2013) and relaunched as a totally online program in 2016. The program has served art(s) educators teaching in a variety of settings, including public and private schools, community arts centers, museums, residential facilities, and colleges and universities. Graduates of the program routinely describe their experience as transformative. They have described such changes as a greater depth of meaningful teaching practices and personal art making; increased engagement with the local community; and an infusion of globally enhanced curriculum, exposing their students to a breadth of cultural practices through art. Within the context of the Online MA, the Department of Art Education developed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Edna Manley College of Visual and Performing Arts in Kingston, Jamaica and enrolled its first Jamaican cohort in 2008, who graduated in 2010.

## **Museum Education Specialization**

Although the idea first appeared in 1988 with the opening of the Wexner Center for the Arts, the Museum Education and Administration Specialization was really developed with Jim Sanders, who was hired as Visiting Associate Professor in 2002<sup>lxvi</sup> and became Assistant Professor three years later. Within the first few years of his tenure, Sanders was working with the head of education at the Wexner Center. According to Wyszomirski, “It was a good partnership, surveying museum education programs around the country. There were people, like Louis Lankford, who did work with

Museum Education. He left two years after I got here (January 1998).<sup>lxviii</sup> The Wexner Center for the Arts spent its first 10 years establishing itself in the contemporary art museum field and in the community, secondarily as a university identity (next 10 years). The department looked for opportunities to build relationships between arts intuitions and people and the department. “Nanette Maciejunes, the Executive Director of the Columbus Museum of Art taught last year. The success of her course convinced the department to bring in a faculty devoted to museum education.”<sup>lxix</sup> Dana Carlisle Kletchka joined AAEP faculty in August 2017 as Assistant Professor of Art Museum Education.

In 2008, the College of the Arts merged with the College of the Humanities to form the Division of Arts and Humanities within the newly reorganized College of Arts and Sciences, which was reunified by a unanimous vote of the university’s Board of Trustees in 2010. The reincorporation of the five colleges promotes a spirit of collaboration and cooperation providing opportunities for interdisciplinary research, provide new innovative teaching and learning opportunities, and enhance community outreach and engagement.<sup>lxx</sup>

The College’s objectives are reflected in the mission and vision crafted by Stuhr, along with the Art Education faculty (“I never did anything alone, because that wasn’t my leadership style, I tried to do everything with the faculty and staff, so it was what was decided by the group.”<sup>lxxi</sup>) in 2010. The department “promote[s] understanding of the arts and visual culture for all students through a curriculum that is research-based, interdisciplinary, and intent on collaboration with communities both within and outside the University, state, nation, and world,” “emphasize[s] understanding of arts and culture, especially visual culture, in a global, culturally diverse, and technological society,” and are explored through “pedagogical theory and practices; critical inquiry of historical and contemporary artworks; the analysis of public and educational policy in the arts and cultures; and inquiry in the philosophical, historical, and policy foundations of art education, arts management, and cultural policy administration. Our curriculum includes attention to understanding multimedia technologies in cultural production, critique of policies, teaching, learning, assessment, and awareness of comparative international practice.”<sup>lxxii</sup>

“The Mission of the Department of Art Education is to critically engage cultural meaning through excellence in research, policy, teaching, and leadership that fosters social change and advances the public interest through the arts and visual culture...to prepare educators, researchers, administrators and policy makers for research and practice in the interdisciplinary field of art education through its integrated, multifaceted programs and collaborations within and outside the University. Key goals are to prepare students to lead through the arts, to function as a critical and informed citizenry, to advance the public interest with regard to opportunity, diversity, effective public policy, social justice, and creativity. Through these endeavors the Department maintains its position of excellence at the local, state, national and international levels in the areas of research, teaching and service.”<sup>lxxiii</sup>

The Department of Art Education at this time offered:

- Undergraduate general education and courses for elementary classroom teachers
- Bachelor of Art Education degree program that provides undergraduate students with a well-rounded liberal arts education, intensive studies in visual culture, and significant preparatory course work in the theory and practice of art education.
- Undergraduate minor in entrepreneurship and the arts in collaboration with the Fisher College of Business.

- Graduate courses for experienced teachers and graduate licensure students
- Master of Art in Arts Policy and Administration degree program carried out in collaboration with the John Glenn College of Public Affairs
- Museum education specialization
- Professional development for in-service teachers and school administrators
- A wide array of doctoral research specializations.<sup>lxxiv</sup>

That same year, the Department of Art Education moved from its home in Hopkins Hall to the Ohio Stadium for a four-year interim period, while Sullivant Hall was renovated. Stuhr initiated the move from Hopkins Hall into Sullivant Hall, in conjunction with the College of the Arts through generous funding from the Barnetts. This move would, “enable us to program better. We definitely felt that our APA program crossed all the lines. We had students from theater, and English and opera students and dancers...I had at one time envisioned doing away with departments and working more collaboratively and in a more integrated fashion with this new building.”<sup>lxxv</sup>

### **2012 to present: The role of the arts in society**

“This department is so incredibly, broadly conceived and yet it brings together the notion that anybody who desires to be in the arts and in education, whether its traditional education or whether its public education, that what they’re bringing to the discourse is that they’re agents, actively agents for the arts in the community, in the schools. And that every child, every adult has a human right to art. Everybody at Ohio State throughout the years has been able to weave this magic into art education and to shift the focus of what art education is.”<sup>lxxvi</sup>

### **Deborah Smith-Shank (Chair, 2011 – 2015)**

With the reorganization of the colleges in 2008 came a change in university budget structure. Despite Stuhr’s successful growth of the department, this change redistributed funds brought in from GEC courses from the department to the college. By the time Smith-Shank became chair, the Art Education budget had shrunk and one of her priorities was “keeping us fiscally alive. The budget was the most challenging thing. Next, the faculty had been discussing the name change of the department, so we worked on that during my first or second year. Changing our fingerprint in the world. Shifting from straight art education to something broader, which we had been moving towards for some time. When we switched from quarters to semesters [in 2012], it made us take a look at ourselves and our curriculum and realize that we were doing a lot more arts administration and arts policy than we had been doing in the past. A lot of departments were changing their names to something like visual culture, but we really are unique because we have the arts administration policy connected to art education. One of the main reasons, we wanted to more accurately reflect what art education does. I wanted education right in the middle of it because art education is really at the center of what we do.”<sup>lxxvii</sup>

The undergraduate program, which had previously at different times focused on artmaking, DBAE, and TETAC, now included “intensive studies in visual culture, and significant preparatory course work in the theory and practice of art education.”<sup>lxxviii</sup> Graduate students could choose tracts in Arts Policy and Administration and Art Education, and students in both tracts could opt for a Museum Education and Management specialization.

Smith-Shank continued partnerships that began under Stuhr's leadership, such as Universities of the Arctic, which facilitated Ohio State's relationship with Alto University in Helsinki, Finland. There has been a direct exchange of graduate students, as well as study abroad trips. Other faculty developed relationships with institutions in Jamaica (Edna Manley School of Visual Arts in Kingston), Brazil, and South Africa.

### **Graduate Research in Art Education**

Since 2012, Ohio State has participated in the Graduate Research in Art Education (GRAE) conference. GRAE began as a forum for graduate students from Teacher's College and Penn State in 2002<sup>lxxix</sup> and now includes Penn State, Ohio State, Syracuse Universities and Teachers College. This annual conference brings together students and faculty to discuss issues and developments in art education that are being opened up by current graduate student research. The GRAE conference takes place each fall semester in a rotation at one of the participating institutions.

### **Expanding Arts Entrepreneurship and Management**

A Bachelor of Arts in Arts Administration and Management (BAAM) began in 2012. Additionally, The Barnett Center for Integrated Arts and Enterprise was established in 2012, by a generous donation from the Barnetts and opened January 2014. The mission of the Center is to educate and prepare students for successful careers in the arts and related entrepreneurial fields through advancing and increasing an understanding of the business side of the arts and the worlds of arts management, policy, and culture.

### **A New Name: Arts Administration, Education and Policy**

On June 22, 2012, the Ohio State Board of Trustees approved the proposal to change the name of the Department of Art Education to the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy. The change reflects and recognizes developments in the academic, policy and arts organizational worlds, and combines them with an enlarged sense of what it means to build knowledge and prepare future generations to teach, shape and practice the arts in the 21st century. In addition, students now earn a PhD in Arts Administration, Education and Policy with the option to specialize in Art Education or Cultural Policy and Administration.

Since the mid-1990s, there has been a growing recognition that policy concerning the arts is not limited to public arts funding but to a host of other issues including globalization and international cultural relations, technology, the creative trades, urban development and creative cities initiatives, the arts and heritage preservation, etc. AAEP directly addresses these contemporary cultural issues in our programs and the new name is descriptive of the changes our department has made since it was first named in 1907. While the department does continue to focus on visual art education and educates teachers for pre-kindergarten to twelfth grade in traditional public funded schools through an accredited state licensure program, AAEP also seeks to collaborate with other arts disciplines and acknowledges the multiple institutions and venues where the arts are taught, experienced, and learned including (but not limited to) community centers, museums, hospitals, extended care facilities, prisons, etc. We do not believe that art can be understood without also understanding the social and economic context in which it is conceptualized, created, critiqued, organized, maintained, disseminated, and for which advocacy is essential.<sup>lxxx</sup>

The current department chair, Karen Hutzel (chair, 2016 – present), identified opportunities for expansion under a new name. “First of all, our name changed to encompass and better represent the breadth of the programs in the department, including arts administration and arts and cultural policy, as the department of art education that housed arts policy and administration as a program, it was hard to give life to that program in a way that seemed doable. And so changing the department name provided an opportunity for us to really give more life to the arts administration and arts policy side of our program offerings.”<sup>lxxxix</sup>

Many AAEP faculty are on arts organization boards of some kind, and as more graduate students span Arts Policy, Arts Administration and Art Education, students, alumni and faculty “get to know each other’s language a whole lot better...there is parallel development of theory in these fields...There’s a fertility there that is possible...[and] you could have a big impact in both fields.”<sup>lxxxix</sup> The outreach into the university and community, strong research-practice dynamic, and crossover between the fields of arts policy, arts administration, and arts education creates strong possibilities for future theory, research, and practice. Hutzel, as chair, has a vision to “create a space and culture where we can all thrive that we can all do the work that we do so well and be valued and validated for it.”

### **A New Home: Sullivant Hall**

The department moved into its current home in Sullivant Hall, which also houses ACCAD, the Barnett Center for Integrated Arts and Enterprise, the Billy Ireland Cartoon Library, and the Department of Dance. Sullivant Hall is a three-story Neoclassical Revival building that was completely reconstructed and refigured to create more visibility and better spaces for students to work together across the visual and performing arts.<sup>lxxxiv</sup>

Sullivant is next door to the John Glenn College of Public Policy and the Wexner Center for the Arts. Ohio State President Michael V. Drake described Sullivant’s various new uses, including teaching “the art of business, and the business of art,” as well as its place as “the cornerstone for the arts district we have envisioned for the corner of 15th and High.”<sup>lxxxv</sup>

However, the biggest change was the inclusion of several disciplines under one roof, a deliberate interdisciplinary consolidation that Stuhr was very intentional about in the planning for this move. Now, several arts disciplines as well as arts business are represented in the building.

Although creating an interdisciplinary space was part of the conversation from the very beginning, not all that was envisioned for AAEP came to fruition. There is no art education studio space in Sullivant, the department maintains a room across campus in Ramsayer Hall, home of the College of Education. Smith-Shank in particular worked to bring artmaking and studio practice back into the department. “There was a movement in the department before I got here to take the art out of art education and make it a theoretical discourse. That influenced a lot of the policy decisions in this department. My heart is in studio, so my goal was to bring art back into art education. It continues to be a challenge.”<sup>lxxxvi</sup> The lack of studio space in Sullivant Hall was a disappointment. However, she notes, “we have a beautiful space.”

## AAEP Today, AAEP Tomorrow

Today, the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy's Graduate Program is generally acknowledged to be among the best nationally. The scope of graduate study in art education at Ohio State is the most comprehensive in the world. With 12 full time faculty, one part-time faculty and over 100 graduate students in various programs of study, it is also one of the largest existing graduate programs in Art Education and Arts Administration. Programs include a Bachelor of Art Education, an Arts Management undergraduate major, Master of Arts degrees in Art Education and Arts Policy and Administration, and Doctor of Philosophy degrees with specializations in Cultural Policy and Arts Management and Art Education. In addition, the department offers a graduate specialization in Museum Education.

AAEP continues to inform arts education policy and arts policy through participation on boards and policy development, involvement with state, regional, national, and international organizations in leadership positions, and the publication and presentation of cutting-edge research. The Department is distinguished by a vigorous agenda of research and publication. With a strong interest in social justice and interdisciplinary application, faculty engage as individuals as well as with colleagues and graduate students in a wide array of projects, including the following: community-based research and activism; colonialism and self-determination of indigenous peoples; theoretical inquiry; field-focused studies in cultural policy and visual culture education; development of curriculum and pedagogical advancement in studio education; museum studies; visual and material culture; inquiry into the dynamics of policy-making processes of arts, cultural policy, and administration; arts-based research methodology; and disability and gender issues.<sup>lxxxviii</sup> There is a strong practice-theory dynamic in the department, and Columbus is one of the more studied cities in arts administration and policy in the country.<sup>lxxxix</sup>

From its inception, the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy has been an innovative leader in the field of art education and now the fields of arts administration and arts policy. The curricular and programmatic focus shift from artmaking and teacher preparation to social justice and visual culture and finally to the arts in society are not simply a reflection of cultural shifts; the department leadership, faculty research, and alumni drove these shifts. This spiral of influence is seen in the development of the arts policy and administration program, computer graphics, the DBAE and TETAC movements, and more. It is a response to society, but also a mark of innovation. The department, time and again, is at the forefront of cultural production and cutting-edge research in the field of art education.

“We’ve always been sensitive [to what’s going on in the world], creative, imaginative, visionary. Some passed in and out and they made their stamp and use Ohio State as a launching pad for something else. The department has always cultivated thinkers, and folks have taken that development through their career. That has always been a part of Ohio State. Ohio State has always identified the problem first, justified the problem whether or not it was worth spending time on, what are the historical roots. That kind of thinking was always nurtured and it was taught. Our department has always been sensitive to what has been going on in the field and responsive to it. It’s always been an outreach department.” MacGregor goes on. “What’s changed? Programs have changed. We were in the College of the Arts. We had our own college. We were preparing teachers. Then that was part of the MA program only, and they had to have a BA in another program. Now we’re back to the art teacher training again.”<sup>xc</sup>

The department's horizons have always been wide. Time and again, program and curriculum changes have been responsive to the needs of contemporary culture and the art educators working in it. "[Our] focus has always broad based, and it started with Barkan. He was expanding his horizons then."<sup>xcii</sup> Today, AAEP's programs promote understanding of the arts and visual culture for students through a curriculum that is research-based, interdisciplinary and intent on collaboration with communities both within and outside the university, state, nation and world. We emphasize understanding of arts and culture, especially visual culture, in a global, culturally diverse and technological society.<sup>xciii</sup> Faculty, students, and alumni across the world continue to teach in a variety of settings, inform arts education policy and arts policy through participation on boards and policy development, involved with state, regional, national, and international organizations in leadership positions, and the publication of research.

"The department is probably THE MOST interdisciplinary and innovative department in its fields. It has all these different alliances with differing interdisciplinary fields and its integration of arts policy, administration and education. We have the assemblages of pieces that could really give us a unique and valuable profile for the field...I've always thought we're uniquely positioned to take on art education policy the way nobody else in the country is."<sup>xciii</sup>



## Resources

- ACCAD. "About." Retrieved from [http://accad.osu.edu/about\\_us/about/accad\\_history.html](http://accad.osu.edu/about_us/about/accad_history.html)
- "History." Retrieved from [http://accad.osu.edu/about\\_us/about/accad\\_history.html](http://accad.osu.edu/about_us/about/accad_history.html)
- "ACCAD and the Amiga Lab." *Graduate Perspectives in Art Education. A Department of Art Education Publication at the Ohio State University*, 1(1), January 1994, p. 11.
- Anderson, Tom, Elliot Eisner, and Sally McRorie. "A Survey of Graduate Study in Art Education." *Studies in Art Education*, 40 (1), 1998, pp. 8-25
- "Center studies service needs." *Ohio State Lantern*, 1972, January 13.
- College of Arts and Sciences. Strategic Plan. 2011-2016.
- Sullivant Hall. Retrieved from <https://artsandsciences.osu.edu/facilities/sullivant-hall>
- Art Education. Retrieved from <https://artsandsciences.osu.edu/academics/programs/art-education>
- Day, Tyler. "OSU trustees approve Master program." *The Ohio State Lantern*. Friday, May 19, 1995, p. 1
- Department of Art Education. Memorandum of Understanding, Department of Art Education, October 1986
- Mission and Programs Description, 2010, June 8. Document from Pat Stuhr
- Name Change. 2012. Document from Deborah Smith-Shank
- Pattern of Administration, Department of Art Education, College of Arts and Humanities, The Ohio State University, Revised May 2011. Document from Pat Stuhr.
- Proposal for a new degree program, The Ohio State University, Master of Arts in Arts Policy and Administration, August 1994.
- Plan of Action. Spring 1988
- Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge: Final Project Report. The National Arts Education Consortium. *GLA Reader*, 14(2), 2003
- Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy. Barnett Symposium. Retrieved from <https://aaep.osu.edu/research/barnett-symposium-arts-public-policy>
- Research. Retrieved from <https://aaep.osu.edu/research>
- Erickson, Mary. A Progress Report on the History of Art Education at The Ohio State University. University Archives Online Content, Art Education Department File, 1972, April 20. Retrieved from [https://library.osu.edu/documents/university-archives/subject\\_files/Art%20Education-%20Department%20of.pdf](https://library.osu.edu/documents/university-archives/subject_files/Art%20Education-%20Department%20of.pdf)
- Feran, Tim. 2014, Sept. 21. "Ohio State's Sullivant Hall reopens as arts cornerstone." *The Columbus Dispatch*. Retrieved from <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2014/09/21/hall-reopens-as-arts-cornerstone.html>
- Giminez del Pueblo, Jose Louis. "Salient Dates in American Art Education at The Ohio State University." The Logan Elm Press, 1982. [print located in AAEP department].
- Graduate Perspectives in Art Education, A Department of Art Education Publication at the Ohio State University, Vol 1, N. 1, January 1994.
- Hutzel, Karen. Personal Interview by Ruth Smith. Columbus, Ohio, 2017, March 28.
- Janoski, Jason. "Academic Ancestry: A Look at the History of Art Education at Ohio State." 2012 [video]
- MacGregor, Nancy. Personal interview with Ruth Smith. Lafayette, IN/Columbus, OH, April 28, 2017
- Madeja, Stanley S., Ralph Smith, and Harold Truax. *Review Art Education Department The Ohio State University*, July 1985.

Marantz, Kenneth. *The Department of Art Education Newsletter 1973-1981*. Ohio State University, College of the Arts, Division of Art Education Records (RG.31.F, UA.1985.0174.0003). Ohio State University Archives, Columbus, Ohio.

Miller, Gail. Workshop focuses on new methods in art education. *The Ohio State Lantern*, 1990, June 28.

Norris, Ross. The Cultured Mind and the Skillful Hand: Art and Art Education at The Ohio State University, 1874-1944. OSU Centennial History Series, 1970. ERIC No. 50011946.

Ohio Board of Regents. Resolution. Meeting Minutes. Department of Art Education File. University Digital Archives, April 19, 1996.

*The Ohio State Lantern Digital Archives*. Retrieved from <http://digital.olivesoftware.com/Olive/APA/Ohio/#panel=home>

Ohio State University, College of the Arts, Division of Art Education Records (RG.31.F, UA.1985.0174.0001). Ohio State University Archives, Columbus, Ohio.

--- Faculty and Staff Directories, 1968-2008, University Archives.

--- Office of the University Registrar. *Course Bulletins*. University Archives Online Content. Retrieved from <https://library.osu.edu/find/collections/the-ohio-state-university-archives/digitalcontent/course-bulletins/>

Parsons, James. The Getty Center for Art Education. Graduate Perspectives in Art Education, A Department of Art Education Publication at the Ohio State University, 1(1), January 1994.

Smith-Shank, Deborah. Personal Interview by Ruth Smith. Columbus, Ohio, 2017, March 28.

Stuhr, Patricia. ONE AND FIVE YEAR PLANS (2002-2006). Document from Pat Stuhr, 2002

---. ONE AND FIVE YEAR PLANS, 2006-2010. Document from Pat Stuhr, 2007

---. Personal Interview by Ruth Smith. Lafayette, Indiana/Marshfield, Wisconsin, 2017, March 13.

The OSU TETAC Mentors, 2002, May, Integrated Curriculum: Possibilities for the Arts, *Art Education*, 12-22

TETAC Files (1995-2002). Ohio State University, College of the Arts, Division of Art Education Records (RG.31.F, UA.2003.0105). Ohio State University Archives, Columbus, Ohio.

“Trustees’ Report to the Campus.” *Ohio State Lantern*, May 9 1995

University Libraries. Preservation and Reformatting. Retrieved from <https://library.osu.edu/about/departments/preservation/book-arts-division/logan-elm-press/>

Wyszomirski, Margaret. 2017, March 28. Personal Interview by Ruth Smith. Columbus, Ohio.

University’s Centennial History (1970), *University Archives*, 2-2409

Zahner, Mary. *Barkan*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association, 2003.

Zucker, Leslie. Teachers learn how to help kids with art. *The Ohio State Lantern*, 1989, July 13.

### **Marantz Award Recipients**

1985 – Jon Sharer  
1986 – Maurice Sevigny  
1987 – Margaret DiBasio  
1988 – Joseph LaChapelle  
1989 – Mary Erickson  
1990 – Barbara Nicholson  
1991 – Samella Lewis  
1992 – Mary Ann Stankiewicz  
1993 – Doug Blandy  
1994 – Elizabeth Garder  
1995 – Bonnie Kelm  
1996 – Susan Witten  
1997 – Georgia Collins  
1998 – Graeme Sullivan  
1999 – Renee Sandell  
2000 – Mary Leigh Morbey  
2001 – Paul Sproll  
2002 – Lana Henderson  
2003 – Jan Fedorenko  
2004 – Angelika Plank  
2005 – Cassandra Tellier  
2006 – Terry Barrett  
2007 – Marantz Alumni Symposium  
2008 – Marilyn Stewart  
2009 – Wanda Knight  
2010 – Anniina Souminen Guyas  
2011 – Christopher Adejumo

2012 – David Guion  
2013 – Patricia Dewey  
2014 – Connie DeJong  
2015 – Vittoria Daiello  
2016 – Shari Savage

### **Barkan Award Recipients**

1998 – Jane Cera  
1999 – Rina Kundu  
1999 – Donald Perone  
2000 – Shiyun Yoo  
2001 – Nurit Cohen-evron  
2003 – Abhuit Varde  
2004 – Melanie Buffington  
2005 – David Guion, Rohni Danduate, Chen-Hua Kuo  
2006 -Hyo Jung Cho, Phyllis Hill  
2007 – Mindi Rhoades  
2008 – Vicki Daello  
2009 – Shari Savage  
2010 – William Niberding  
2011 – Joni Boyd  
2012 – Manish Sharma  
2013 – Marissa Nesbit  
2014 – Michael Kellner  
2015 – Jason Cox  
2016 – Veronica Betancourt

---

<sup>i</sup> MacGregor, personal interview

<sup>ii</sup> “University’s Centennial History”

<sup>iii</sup> Norris, “The Cultured Mind and the Skillful Hand”

<sup>iv</sup> Debbie Smith-Shank in Janoski, “Academic Ancestry”

<sup>v</sup> Janoski, “Academic Ancestry”

<sup>vi</sup> Zahner, “Barkan,” p. 150

<sup>vii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. x.

<sup>viii</sup> Board of Trustees reports states that the Department of Art Education was approved as a department in 1974. May 3, 1974 meeting, Board of Trustees. From University Archives, Art Education digital file.

<sup>ix</sup> “Graduate Perspectives,” pp. 5-6

<sup>x</sup> Kenneth Marantz in Janoski, “Academic Ancestry”

<sup>xi</sup> Ohio State University, Faculty and Staff Directories

<sup>xii</sup> Erickson, “Progress Report”

<sup>xiii</sup> **Ohio State University, Faculty and Staff Directors**

<sup>xiv</sup> MacGregor, personal interview.

<sup>xv</sup> Stuhr, personal interview.

<sup>xvi</sup> Erickson, “Progress Report,” pp. 5-6.

<sup>xvii</sup> Graduate Perspectives in Art Education, p. 36.

<sup>xviii</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

<sup>xix</sup> Giminez del Pueblo, “Salient Dates”

- 
- xx MacGregor, personal interview
- xxi Ohio State University, Course Bulletin, 1979-1980.
- xxii Department of Art Education, "Memorandum of Understanding," pp. 5-6
- xxiii The 1985 Self-Study is not archived in the department or University Archives.
- xxiv Madeja et al., "Review," p. 1.
- xxv Department of Art Education, "Memorandum of Understanding," pp. 1-2.
- xxvi Zucker, "Teachers learn," p. 5; Parsons, "The Getty Center for Art Education," p. 14.
- xxvii Miller, "Workshop," p. 8
- xxviii ACCAD, "History"
- xxix "Center studies service needs." *Ohio State Lantern*, 1972-01-13
- xxx Department of Art Education, "Memorandum of Understanding," p. 6.
- xxxi ACCAD, "About"; "ACCAD and the Amiga Lab"
- xxxii Stuhr, personal interview
- xxxiii Department of Art Education, "Memorandum of Understanding," p. 6
- xxxiv University Libraries
- xxxv Department of Art Education, "Memorandum of Understanding," p. 6
- xxxvi Ohio State University, "Course Bulletins," 1970-1980
- xxxvii *Ibid.*, 1985-1986
- xxxviii *Ibid.*, 1987-1988
- xxxix Department of Art Education, "Memorandum of Understanding," p. 6
- xl Department of Art Education, "Plan of Action,"
- xli Madeja et al., "Review of Art Education," p. 5
- xlii Anderson et al., "A Survey,"
- xliii "Trustees' Report"
- xliv Wyszomirski, personal interview
- xlvi AAEP, "Barnett Center"
- xlvii Department of Art Education, "Proposal," pp. 3-4
- xlviii Day, "OSU trustees approve Master program," p. 1; Wyszomirski, personal interview
- xlvix Department of Art Education, "Proposal," p. 5
- l Day, "OSU trustees approve mater's program," p. 1.
- 1 Ohio Board of Regents, "Resolution"
- li Ohio State University, "Course Bulletin," 1989-1990
- lii Ohio State University, Faculty and Staff Yearbook
- liii Stuhr, personal interview
- liv Ohio State University, "Course Bulletin," 1996-1997, p 47.
- lv Stuhr, personal interview
- lvi Wyszomirski, personal interview
- lvii *Ibid.*
- lviii Stuhr, personal interview
- lix Department of Art Education, "TETAC"
- lx OSU TETAC Mentors, "Integrated Curriculum"
- lxi Stuhr, personal interview
- lxii *Ibid.*
- lxiii Stuhr, "ONE AND FIVE YEAR PLANS (2002-2006)"; Stuhr, "ONE AND FIVE YEAR PLANS, 2006-2010."
- lxiv *Ibid.*
- lxv Stuhr personal interview
- lxvi Ohio State University, "Faculty and Staff Year Book," 2002
- lxvii *Ibid.*, 2005
- lxviii Wyszomirski, personal interview
- lxix *Ibid.*
- lxx College of Arts and Sciences. "Strategic Plan."
- lxxi Stuhr, personal interview
- lxxii Department of Art Education, "Mission and Program Description"
- lxxiii *Ibid.*
- lxxiv *Ibid.*
- lxxv Stuhr, personal interview
- lxxvi Smith-Shank in Janowski, "Academic Ancestry"

- 
- lxxvii Smith-Shank, personal interview  
lxxviii Department of Art Education, “Mission and Program Description”  
lxxix Smith-Shank, personal interview  
lxxx Department of Art Education, “Name Change”  
lxxxi Hutzel, personal interview  
lxxxii Wyszomirski, personal interview  
lxxxiii Hutzel, personal interview  
lxxxiv College of Arts and Sciences, “Sullivant Hall”  
lxxxv Feran, “Ohio State’s Sullivant Hall”  
lxxxvi Smith-Shank, personal interview  
lxxxvii Ibid.  
lxxxviii AAEP, “Research”  
lxxxix Wyszomirski, personal interview  
xc MacGregor, personal interview  
xci Ibid.  
xcii College of Arts and Sciences, “Art Education”  
xciii Wyszomirski, personal interview