

## **IUPUI GAC Reviewer Form**

**Documents Reviewed:** Proposal for Master of Arts in Art Therapy. An excel attachment provided a list of library holdings pertinent to the proposed program.

**Summary of Proposal:** Herron School of Art and Design at IUPUI proposes a two-year, 60 semester-hour program leading to the degree of Master of Art in Art Therapy. The proposal presents the case that this program is non-duplicative with other campuses, will be but one of two programs in the state, is an excellent fit with the unique characteristics and strengths of IUPUI and the Herron School of Art, and complements an Art Therapy initiative at Riley Hospital. Anticipated student interest is high, graduates will have considerable employment opportunities, and graduates should have the requisite educational background to seek licensure and certification as Art Therapists and other, closely related mental health service providers.

All considered, the basic case is well-made by the proposal and this seems a program well worth pursuing at IUPUI. However, I think the proposal is still rough in places and may benefit from some reworking.

The two sets of program objectives on pg. 5-6 are confusing. Perhaps consolidate or justify the need for two sets. The next several pages contain long quoted sections from licensing/certifications sections and seem off-target. The exact statements and rules these bodies make seem to me to be of little significance to the reader except as they impact the program. A briefer narrative can point out how the curriculum is responsive to these requirements or perhaps a Table that highlights program requirements against regulatory goals or requirements can inform the reader that careful planning assures professional standards and access to professional licensing for program graduates.

Other parts of the proposal also include large quoted sections derived from other sources with a statement that the program would meet these requirements (e.g., 28-33). My preference would be to not use extensive quotes in any form in the body of the proposal and the narrative is best focused on the current proposed program—what it will look like, how it will be implemented, and so on. How the program has been shaped by or is consistent with national standards of professional training excellence is certainly worth noting. These standards may also provide a template for program presentation.

Admission requirements on page 14 are really application materials, and the admission requirements appear on page 16 under student clientele. Requirements might be best under requirements. The 25<sup>th</sup> percentile or above on the Verbal, Quantitative, and Analytical Writing of the GREs is a low standard. Because the program will employ a flexible, compensatory approach to admission criteria, perhaps higher criteria (e.g., top half of test takers) can be usefully used, but lower scores can be compensated by other strengths.

**1. Are the goals clear and achievable? Goals are clear and achievable although more detail about potential supervisors and training sites would be helpful. Appendix with the Riley initiative was not included in what I received. Think this is a very significant element in the proposal and clearly a strength. The faculty and staff involved, potential training sites, etc. would make for a stronger proposal. One big program goal is to develop supervisory leaning experiences and this might be more clearly delineated in the proposal, even listing potential staff and faculty from these sites. It may be best to interweave the Riley element into the proposal per se, rather than an Appendix, but having not seen the document it is hard to know. Listing faculty from Education who are involved in the core curriculum might paint a clearer, stronger picture of the breadth of faculty involvement. In terms of achievable goals, a lot of new courses are to be developed, apparently by the 2 (1.5-2 FTE) new faculty, and this seems quite a challenge. Presenting a map of by who and when this is to happen may be useful. Are there identified part-time faculty (page 22) and will they be involved in course development?**

**2. Is the program academically sound? Yes.**

**3. Are faculty resources available to offer this certificate without undercutting other key missions of the unit? This is not raised as an issue. They seem to have adequate resources.**

**4. Is there overlap, either real or potential, with any other unit that could harm the program or be exploited to help the program? There seems no adverse overlap and connection with Riley and other health care units might be detailed more in the proposal.**

**5. My recommendation, comments/concerns regarding this proposal...**

**I think this is a solid direction, and the proposal can be strengthened and improved.**