

**Montana University System**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW**

Institution: **Montana State University**

---

Program Years: **2015-16**

---

**List of the programs reviewed:**

- American Studies Program
  - BA American Studies
  - MA American Studies
  - PhD American Studies
- Computer Science: Undergraduate Program [Note 1]
  - BS Computer Science
- Education: Teacher Education Programs [Note 2]
  - BS Agricultural Education Broadfield, 5-12
  - BA Art Education Broadfield, K-12
  - BS Biological Sciences Teaching, 5-12
  - BS Chemistry Teaching, 5-12
  - BS Elementary Education, K-8
  - BA English Teaching, 5-12
  - BS Family and Consumer Sciences, 5-12
  - BA Modern Languages and Literatures: French Teaching, K-12
  - BS Secondary Education: General Science Broadfield, 5-12
  - BA Modern Languages and Literatures: German Teaching, K-12
  - BS Health Enhancement, K-12
  - BA History Teaching, 5-12
  - BS Mathematics Teaching, 5-12
  - BS Physics Teaching, 5-12
  - Bachelor of Music Education: School Music Broadfield, K-12
  - BS Secondary Education: Social Studies Broadfield, 5-12
  - BA Modern Languages and Literatures: Spanish Teaching, K-12
  - BS Technology Education Broadfield, 5-12
  - MEd, Northern Plains Transition to Teaching
- Engineering: Undergraduate Programs [Note 1]
  - BS Chemical Engineering
  - BS Civil Engineering
  - BS Computer Engineering
  - BS Electrical Engineering
  - BS Industrial and Management Systems Engineering
  - BS Mechanical Engineering
- Engineering Technology
  - BS Construction Engineering Technology
  - BS Mechanical Engineering Technology
- English
  - BA English
  - MA English
- Military Science Minor

**Notes:**

1. Undergraduate programs in Engineering and Computer Science are accredited by ABET. These reviews of the undergraduate programs are based on an accreditation site visit in 2015-16. The graduate programs in engineering are separately reviewed, scheduled for 2018-19.
-

## Montana University System

### PROGRAM REVIEW

2. The Teacher Education Programs are accredited by CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation). These reviews of the undergraduate programs are based on an accreditation site visit in 2015-16.

---

**Decision(s) concerning the future of the program(s), based on the program review criteria established at the campus:**

See attached detailed individual Program review summaries.

---

**Rationale or justification for the decision based on the program review process established at the campus. Include graduation numbers and student majors for each of the last seven (7) years for every program under review.**

See attached detailed individual Program review summaries.

**Montana University System**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW**

Institution: **Montana State University**

---

Program Years: **2015-16**

---

**List of the programs reviewed:**

- BA American Studies
  - MA American Studies
  - PhD American Studies
- 

**Decision(s) concerning the future of the program(s), based on the program review criteria established at the campus:**

One or more steps (described below) will be taken to make the American Studies undergraduate program more successful. The results of these actions will be evaluated during the next program review cycle. At this time the American Studies programs will be retained.

---

**Rationale or justification for the decision based on the program review process established at the campus. Include graduation numbers and student majors for each of the last seven (7) years for every program under review.**

**Enrollment and Graduation Statistics**

**Fall Semester Enrollments: American Studies** (includes second majors)

| Level              | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | <b>AVG</b>  |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Undergraduate (BA) | 16   | 16   | 11   | 9    | 6    | 6    | 4    | <b>9.7</b>  |
| Graduate (MA, PhD) |      |      | 11   | 14   | 20   | 27   | 26   | <b>14.0</b> |

**Degrees Awarded**

|                      | AY 10 | AY 11 | AY 12 | AY 13 | AY 14 | AY 15 | <b>AVG</b> |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| BA American Studies  | 5     | 4     | 4     | 2     | 3     | 1     | <b>3.2</b> |
| MA American Studies  | 0     | 1     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 1     | <b>0.3</b> |
| PHD American Studies | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 2     | 0     | <b>0.3</b> |

Enrollment in the undergraduate program has declined as enrollment in the graduate program has increased. An external review of the American Studies program was conducted in March 2016. The report resulting from that external review is attached.

The review team conducted a thorough analysis and identified some of the primary challenges associated with the low enrollment of undergraduate students in the American Studies program right now. The MSU agrees with the external reviewers' assessment regarding the potential for future success of this program. It is clear that our goal is to find ways to build and strengthen these programs. Growing enrollment in the undergraduate

## Montana University System

### PROGRAM REVIEW

and graduate programs will require a higher degree of promotion of the program – another reason why the American Studies program would benefit from having its own dedicated Director. A likely first step to increase the visibility of the programs is to pull the department out of its current location within the Department of history, Philosophy and Religious Studies as a stand-alone program within the College of Letters and Science. The Director would likely a part-time responsibility of an existing faculty member. This approach is being used effectively with the Liberal Studies program and the Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies program.

Other steps being contemplated include increased GTA support, and improved communication about the program in targeted American Studies courses.

It is clear from the external review that this program has tremendous potential but needs some additional support in the near future. The MSU administration is working to determine what that additional support will encompass, but is committed to giving these programs the opportunity to grow and thrive.

Attachment: American Studies External Reviewers’ Report

## 2016 Review of American Studies Program at Montana State University

Submitted to: Susan Cohen, Head of the Department of History and Philosophy

June 30, 2016

### 1. Members of Review Committee

Ralph Johnson (internal committee member and Review Team Chair), Professor and Interim Director of the School of Architecture at Montana State University.

Brett Gary, Associate Professor of Media, Culture, and Communication in the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development at New York University.

TJ Boisseau, Associate Professor and Director of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies in the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, College of Liberal Arts, Purdue University.

### 2. Process

The External Review Committee convened and visited the program on March 21, 2016.

The External Review Committee (ERC) was provided with an overview document prior to commencing the onsite review. The document contained sections with brief descriptions of the following:

- Program History
- KPI data
- Strategic Plan & Assessment
- Curriculum Overview & Changes
- 2016 Self-Assessment
- 2015-16 Budget
- Five Year Plan
- Graduate Abstracts.

Following a review of the document by the ERC interviews/discussions were conducted with the following individuals or groups:

|                                       |                      |                |               |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Program Director                      | Dr. Susan Cohen      |                |               |
| Dean of the Graduate School           | Dr. Karlene Hoo      |                |               |
| Associate Provost                     | Dr. Ron Larsen       |                |               |
| College of Letters and Science Dean   | Dr. Nic Rae          |                |               |
| American Studies Graduate Students    | Lisa Zeillinger      | Jame DelDuca   | Charlie Spray |
|                                       | Tanya Robinson       | Sarah Colletta | Micaela Young |
| Vice President for Research           | Dr. Renee Reijo Pera |                |               |
| Program Graduate                      | Jennifer Hill        |                |               |
| Associate Dean of Letters and Science | Dr. David Cherry     |                |               |

Following the interviews/discussions the ERC met to discuss overarching observations and then gave a brief over view of observations and comments in an exit interview with Dr. Ron Larsen, Dean Nic Rae and Dr. Susan Cohen.

### 3. Scope of Review

A comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the program was undertaken however the ERC was specifically asked to identify the following:

1. Overall observations and determinations regarding the quality and the rigor of the academic program.
2. The appropriateness of the program's strategic plan
3. The effectiveness of the program's Assessment Plan and assessment activities
4. Relationship of the program to the stated mission of the University, including the development of graduate programs
5. Overall assessment of the quality of graduates produced by the program
6. The sustainability of the program for the future
7. The completion time of students participating in the graduate program
8. The strengths of the program with specific commendations
9. Any weaknesses or unrealized opportunities, with specific recommendations for action.

### 4. Assessments

#### a. Department Strategic Plan

The American Studies Program Strategic Plan is well intended but it is not organized or directly aligned in both form and content with the MSU Strategic Plan of 2012, making a meaningful evaluation problematic. The first three paragraphs articulate reasonably well a description of the program's academic intentions with paragraph two beginning to articulate a vision or mission.

The first paragraph concludes with the statement: "The program is designed specifically to meet the needs of students, including non-traditional majors and lifelong learners, who want to pursue a flexible, multi-disciplinary curriculum." Seen as either as a vision or mission statement it is quite generic, suggesting that anyone can do anything without identifying common values around which the program might be centered.

Paragraph two is a strong statement of vision for the program emphasizing "the opportunity [for students] to explore the experience and values of the people of the United States, as embodied in their history, literature, art, politics, and other forms of cultural expression .... They are invited to demonstrate their ability to expand traditional disciplinary boundaries, while self-consciously examining their own theories and practices."

A "special focus on the American West" is identified in the third paragraph but should receive greater emphasis as a distinct component of the program's vision.

The American Studies Program Strategic Plan identifies 10 Five-Year Goals. The goals are reasonable but lack specific, quantifiable objectives, and no implementation strategies are identified.

In 2011 an internal assessment reviewed the 10 Five-Year Goals. The recent Self-Assessment of Progress on Strategic Goals 2016 accurately expresses today's conditions but because no metrics were established related to the original goals the measures of achievement remain vague. As an example the goal; "Continuing to Serve Interests of Students". As stated in the report: "The goal has been met in a general sense" but without surveys, comparisons with peer institutions, evaluation of national trends or some means of determining what the interests of faculty, undergraduate or graduate students are, measuring the success of the goal will always remain vague.

MSU, in the University Strategic Plan, identifies 6 key areas through which the University, College, Schools, Departments and Program strategic plans should be focused: Learning, Discover, Engagement, Integration, Access and Stewardship. These six areas must be articulated as a means for the American Studies Program to achieve its vision and mission within the vision and mission for Montana State University. Articulating the Program's fit within the University's Strategic Plan will enable the Program's administration, faculty and students to more effectively establish goals that align not only with the Program's vision and mission but with the University's. This will then more clearly identify the strategies available to the Program in seeking support from both internal and external sources.

The ERC recognizes how difficult, and perhaps impossible, it is for the American Studies Program, without fulltime administration and faculty, to develop a strong vision, strategic plan, and implementation strategies coordinated with the University Strategic Plan.

### **Academic Programs (quality, rigor, relevance)**

The American Studies undergraduate curriculum is an interdisciplinary degree program, which offers three common courses required of all majors, AMST 101D, Introduction to American Studies, AMST 202RA, The Arts in America and AMST 401, Capstone. The first two courses AMST 101 and AMST 202 combine with a third course, American History, either HSTA 101 or 101Honors, to form the foundation for three focus areas, American Arts, American History, and American Literature.

A review of the syllabus for AMST 101D, taught by Dr. Sara Waller, found the course to be of very high quality with rigorous expectations of students and quite relevant as an introduction to modern and post-modern America thought.

A review of the syllabus for AMST 202RA, The Arts in America, taught by David Charles, revealed the course to be very well conceived and consistent with the intent of American Studies. The class studied American culture through three styles of music: hip hop, country, and jazz. The primary perspective was taken from ethnomusicology and the main method of inquiry ethnography culminating in each student's own ethnographic research project. At the conclusion of the course students demonstrated an appreciation of the connections between American music and culture; and understood how these styles of music can express and inform American values, beliefs, and ideas.

A substantive evaluation of the capstone course, AMST 401 was not possible due to lack of enrollment, however it is cross-listed with AMST 501 and AMST 502.

In summary the quality of the two undergraduate courses evaluated is excellent as is the rigor with which they are taught. Not only are they relevant to the program of study but obviously relevant to undergraduate students in general as evidenced by capacity filled enrollments.

The American Studies Graduate Program is entirely interdisciplinary with only two required courses, AMST 501, Methods in American Studies and AMST 502, Research in American Studies.

A review of AMST 501: Methods in American Studies, taught by Professor R. W. Rydell, revealed the course to be demanding and rigorous in its introduction to recent scholarship in American Studies. An extensive reading list was utilized to demonstrate how American Studies evolved, its major areas of inquiry, and the new emphasis on understanding American Studies in global contexts. The final assignment was to write a 2,500-word essay based on course readings and readings in the *American Quarterly* covering the past 5 years.

The assignment was to examine the major trends in American Studies scholarship and to position readings done for this class in the broader context of current and future trends in this scholarship.

A review of AMST 502: Research in American Studies, taught by Professor R. W. Rydell, and titled Buffalo Bill's West in Transnational Context, revealed a course immersed in the American West while linked to an understanding of the Wild West as a scholarly enterprise dedicated to understanding issues in transnational studies. The reading list in combination with articles and book chapters on reserve in Renne Library was excellent. For a final project students were to submit a 12-15 page double spaced review of the literature covered in the course, taking into account their colleagues' weekly comments, or submit the design for an independent research project that would be developed as an independent study within the next academic year.

#### **b. Department Productivity**

Since no faculty are housed within the American Studies Program an assessment of the Program's productivity is somewhat problematic with regard to research and publication. However, in terms of graduate productivity two Ph.D. student received their degrees in 2014 and two in 2016. Fourteen more Ph.D. candidates are scheduled to complete their degree requirements by 2018 for a potential total of eighteen Ph.D.'s awarded in nine years. For a Program launched in 2009 with little or no financial support this represents a remarkably high level of productivity.

#### **c. Alignment with Core Themes and Institutional Priorities**

Institutional priorities for Montana State University are identified in the Montana State University Strategic Plan, 2012. It identifies six categories of goals, each with specific objectives: Learning, Discovery, Engagement, Integration, Access, and Stewardship. The American Studies aligns with the following:

Learning Objective L.2.2 – Increase the number of graduate and doctoral degrees.

The primary focus of the American Studies Program has most recently been in serving the needs of graduate students. In 2012 there were 20 graduate students (MA, PhD) students enrolled in the program, 27 in 2013 and 26 in 2015. Significantly two Ph.D. student received their degrees in 2014 and two more in 2016. Fourteen more Ph.D. candidates are scheduled to complete their degree requirements by 2018 for a potential total of eighteen Ph.D.'s awarded in nine years. The American Studies Program is clearly in line with and successful in support of this institutional priority.

Discovery Objective D.1.3 – MSU will improve its rank among Carnegie Classified Research Universities.

The American Studies Program not only clearly supports this objective but does so by offering a venue where qualified faculty teaching in programs that do not offer PhD degrees can be engaged in conferring PhD's. Faculty in Native American Studies, English and Sociology & Anthropology are particularly active in their support of current PhD students accounting for a significant portion of the 14 candidates expected to complete their degrees by 2018.

Discover Objective D.3.1 – The percentage of faculty who advise doctoral students will increase.

See Objective D.1.3 above. The interdisciplinary foundation upon which the American Studies Program is founded offers the opportunity for **many faculty in the humanities, social and natural sciences**, teaching in programs that do not offer PhD's, to become an



advisor for doctoral students who wish to develop a depth of knowledge and research skills within multiple disciplines linked by an American perspective.

Discovery Objective D.3.2 – The graduate student population will increase 20% to approximately 2,350 by 2019, with an emphasis on increasing doctoral student enrollment.

See Objectives D.1.1 and D.3.1 above. The American Studies Program offers an extraordinary means of achieving this goal by taking advantage of underutilized existing faculty resources.

Discovery Objective D.3.4 – The number and proportion of graduate students presenting at national and international meetings, publishing in eminent academic outlets, earning high-profile fellowships, securing prizes from national and international competitions and garnering prestigious first job placement will increase by 2019.

See Objectives D.1.1, D.3.1 and D.3.2 above. The American Studies Program, by serving more graduate students and faculty can play a significant role in meeting this objective.

Engagement Objective E.1.2 – By 2013, the number of students, faculty and staff involved in outreach activities will increase, with particular attention to underserved areas and minority populations.

The issues facing underserved areas and minority populations are rarely addressed effectively from a single area of research but are more often the product of multiple overlapping and interlocking subjects of investigation. The multi-disciplinary integration demanded of the American Studies Program offers great potential for students, faculty and staff to engage these opportunities in a fruitful manner. For example, given MSU's geographic region and historic socio-cultural populations a focus on the American West would seem obvious, logical and potentially very productive in concert with the existing Native American Studies program. Not only would this likely be attractive to Native American students but also to students of the many ethnic groups (Asians, Latinos/Hispanics, Eastern Europeans, etc.) that have settled in the American West and continue to contribute, as minority populations, to its historic and contemporary social, cultural, economic and built environment.

Integration Objective I.1.3 – By 2019, community-based research projects will increase by 50%.

American Studies is inherently community-based and thus an ideal program to emphasize community-based research projects for its students and faculty. The opportunities for funded community-based research in support of public history projects, libraries, local, regional, national and international museums, especially in conjunction with the Center for the Study of Western People and Lands, would appear to be almost limitless. Together, the Center and the American Studies program could cultivate and nurture a unique community of writers, artist, photographers, naturalists, filmmakers and others engaged in collaborations formed around their personal perspectives and documentation techniques of the American West.

Integration Objective I.1.4 – By 2019, faculty scholarly products with undergraduate and graduate students will increase 50 percent.

See objective L.2.2 and D.1.3. Additionally, AMST 502, Research in American Studies, which is taught to both undergraduate and graduate students is conceived to produce scholarly products with undergraduate and graduate students. Specifically, for a final project a student may submit the design for an independent research project that would be developed as an independent study within the next academic year, an excellent vehicle for the production of scholarly products.

Integration Objective I.2.1 – By 2019, the number of students completing interdisciplinary programs will increase 30 percent.

Both the undergraduate and graduate programs are clearly interdisciplinary programs placing the American Studies Program in an ideal position to support this objective. The undergraduate degree requires, at a minimum, course work in American Arts (13 credits), American History (18 credits) and American Literature (13 credits) plus foundation courses in American Studies, Literature, Native American Studies and American Government.

In pursuit of the MA in American Studies all students are required to take AMST 501, Methods in American Studies, and AMST 502, Research and Writing in American Studies. Additional course work is selected by the student in conjunction with his or her committee chair and committee members, thus any manner of interdisciplinary programs of study are possible, restricted only by the availability of faculty.

Integration Objective I.2.2. – By 2019, MSU will increase interdisciplinary research and creative projects on campus.

See I.1.4 and I.2.1 above. The American Studies program is conceived to support this objective.

Access Objective A.1.3 – By 2019, the number of students enrolled in graduate programs will increase 20%.

See L.2.2 above. The American Studies Program has demonstrated its ability to contribute significantly to this objective.

Access Objective A.2.1 – By 2019, the number of Native American students enrolled will increase to 800.

Native American Studies does not offer an undergraduate degree nor a PhD. The American Studies Program has the potential to draw Native American students seeking a non-traditional interdisciplinary undergraduate degree in which they can examine Native American Arts, History and Literature exclusively or in relation to any aspect of the American socio-economic construct. See I.2.1.

With regard to graduate students the PhD program in American studies offers students taking the Master's Degree in Native American Studies at MSU a means of continuing their research interests here and, as has been demonstrated, draws Native American Students from other institutions seeking the mentorship of both the Native American Studies faculty and other faculty with long standing research and publication success in Native American scholarship.

Access Objective A.2.3 –By 2019, the number of international students enrolled will increase to 660. American studies in general is of increasing interest to foreign students and studies focusing on the West of even greater interest because of the clear socio-cultural, economic and landscape distinctions between the East, Midwest and Western United States. Because of our location in the Northern Rockies and Plains the American Studies Program, particularly graduate studies, has the potential to be of great interest to foreign students and thus could contribute significantly to this objective.

In summary the American Studies Program clearly aligns with thirteen of the forty (33%) institutional priorities in teaching, research and learning objectives (excluding Stewardship since the program has no fulltime administration, faculty, staff or facilities). Thus the program can be viewed as having a potentially prominent role to play in the University's aspirations to meet the objectives of the strategic plan.

**d. Diversity of the department's faculty and student body**

Since no faculty are housed within the American Studies Program and faculty teaching courses changes each year an assessment of faculty diversity was not possible. No statistics were made available to the ERT with regard to student diversity of race or gender, however, from meeting with students in the graduate program it would appear that well over 50% are female and twelve (12) of the fifteen (15) doctoral students are female.

**e. Department Learning Outcomes Assessment Program**

No quantitative or qualitative learning outcomes assessment program was provided to the ERT, however, all of the American Studies Program course syllabi reviewed had clearly stated learning objectives from which outcome assessments could be drawn.

**Associate Provost Larsen provided the ERT with a list of specific questions for which he sought responses:**

1. Overall observations and determinations regarding the quality and the rigor of the academic program.
  - Strong – see 4a, Academic Programs above, Strengths part 5 and Challenges part 6 below.
2. The effectiveness of the program's Assessment Plan and assessment activities.
  - A self-assessment of the program was conducted in 2016.
  - The strengths and weakness noted in the self-assessment are consistent with those articulated throughout the ERT report.
3. Relationship of the program to the stated mission of the University, including the development of graduate programs.
  - See 4c above.
4. Overall assessment of the quality of graduates produced by the program.
  - Strong – see Strengths, Graduate Students below.
5. The sustainability of the program for the future.
  - See Concluding Statement from External Reviewers below.
6. The completion time of students participating in the graduate program.
  - No statistical data was provided the ERT
7. The strengths of the program.
  - See Strengths, Opportunities and Summary of Recommendation below.
8. Any weaknesses or unrealized opportunities, with specific recommendations for action
  - See Opportunities and Summary of Recommendations below.

**5. Strengths**

**American Studies and the Study of the American West**

American Studies has been a distinct field of interdisciplinary research and studies for over six decades, with practitioners in literature, art, art history, history, material culture, popular culture, historical archaeology, anthropology, sociology, food studies, intellectual history, ethnic studies, film studies, sustainability studies, and more. Furthermore, American Studies is a field with considerable international interest: programs in England, the Netherlands, Turkey, Germany, and elsewhere, are thriving and well-funded. For a decade or more, the specialized interest of so many of these programs has been centered specifically on the American West as an imagined original site of American culture. This specialized interest offers Montana State University a unique opportunity to become an international hub of American Studies programming. We believe international students, as well as students from other parts of the United States, would be willing to prioritize MSU's American Studies program over others located in other sections of the country. The field

trajectory towards study of landscapes and land use, environment, peoples, cultures, and the idea of the American West are already extant emphases within local understandings of Montana's significance and unique sense of place. This existing place-based identity would help MSU to lay claim to this academic territory. With no competing American Studies programs anywhere in this region, MSU could easily assume national and international pre-eminence in this field. A better-funded doctoral program, grounded on a fully staffed undergraduate program, anchored by an interdisciplinary Center for Western Peoples and Lands, represents the triple legs of a truly outstanding program poised to reposition MSU as a top tier research institution.

### **Faculty**

The main faculty resource at this point is Professor Robert Rydell of the History Department: he's the anchor, the champion, the person who trains the students, develops connections for them, and pays attention to them. He is the main resource for American Studies. However, the committee notes the presence of numerous talented, passionate, and inspiring faculty at MSU harboring a broad set of interests that overlap or intersect with American Studies who could contribute to the teaching mission and mentoring of students in the program. The range and talent of faculty at MSU presents an opportunity to build something distinctive that might effectively draw on faculty from across fields, schools, and departments who have a shared commitment to the study of the American West. The AMST program could, without too much investment from upper administration, easily draw more effectively upon faculty resources from Arts and Architecture, Film, Music, Literature, Religious Studies, Sociology, Political Science, Anthropology, Art History, Environmental Studies, Rural Health Studies, and Native American Studies. Most of the faculty in the humanities and social sciences belong to units that do not have graduate programs. For this reason, they appear motivated to mentor AMST graduate students and might be interested in offering graduate level courses to AMST students that dovetail with their research areas and disciplines—if home departments were sufficiently incentivized to permit this practice.

Native American Studies is indicative of a neighboring program with committed faculty that represents a strong ally, indeed a feeder program for AMST. It is a solid program that has sustained its undergraduate and graduate numbers over time, and harbors a thriving Graduate Certificate and Master's program. Its M.A. students often transition to the AMST doctoral program to continue their studies and enhance their career opportunities. While maintaining Native American Studies' independence, American Studies could be positioned to work more closely with Native American Studies faculty, and there are mutual advantages in doing so to each unit. Indeed, the relative strengths of each program markedly complement each other: NAS offers an undergraduate minor but has no major, it has an MA program but no PhD program while AMST offers an undergraduate major (with virtually no students currently enrolled) and has a PhD program. Establishing a Native American minor or concentration within the American Studies doctoral program could provide more faculty involvement for the AMST program, would attract even more graduate students to it and better serve those doctoral candidates with strong interests in NAS already enrolled in AMST. A bolstered AMST undergraduate program could prepare and spark additional interest in the NAS minor and M.A. (More on this under #6 Opportunities).

### **Graduate students**

The American Studies Program already attracts talented doctoral students, many of who are recruited from MSU's Native American Studies' master's program. These are remarkably distinctive doctoral candidates with strong commitment to their own development as scholars, manifesting interests in a wide range of projects and issues organic to MSU's key strengths in Native American studies, environmental writing/environmental humanities, Museum Studies, and the Study of the American West. Currently these students have the capacity and motivation to self-fund, but self-funding is not a sustainable model. All of these interests—faculty and student-- could be reinforced and deepened by drawing more extensively on MSU's faculty resources, and its regional resources and strengths. Even without augmentation, the existing cohort of doctoral candidates represent a strong pool of available instructors and teaching assistants for a variety of courses, within American Studies, especially in the introductory courses, or in cognate fields; expanding the teaching

opportunities would encourage and support many students unable to fund themselves or complete their degrees efficiently and in a feasible time frame.

### **Undergraduate interest and potential**

Interest in American Studies is already high among undergraduates as evinced in the extraordinarily healthy enrollments of students in the introductory course. The lack of students enrolled in the major is undoubtedly a result of the fact that there are no middle or upper division courses beyond that introductory level—making it literally impossible for students to seek the major. This untenable situation squanders the opportunity to serve undergraduate students inspired by that introductory course and to build the base for a program that could sustain a graduate program over time by providing undergraduate teaching experience and revenue for graduate assistantships and fellowships.

### **New Center for Western People and Lands**

This new center represents a strong potential ally, possibly a physical and intellectual anchor, for the American Studies Program at MSU. The Center has the potential to achieve a high regional profile in the specialized subfield of American Studies—Studies of the American West—that could attract outside dollars, resources and expertise from those in the region who are interested and committed to local and state history, the history and culture of Western people, and related subfields such as Native American, Environmental, Agricultural, Rural Health Studies and more. The Center promises to further distinguish MSU as a distinctive regional presence, attract additional attention to MSU, and effectively connect with and echo the greater Yellowstone ecosystem framework for environmental studies and natural sciences as well as the Western Agricultural Research Center at MSU. The new and emboldened focus on the American West that the Center represents poses a golden opportunity for the American Studies Program to attract faculty, students, donors, and national attention. Like the MFA in Science and Natural History Filmmaking, and the PhD in Ecology and Environmental Sciences drawing on the obvious synergy with the greater Yellowstone ecosystem, American Studies can make similar kinds of arguments about creating a distinctive academic program at Montana State rooted in distinctive local and regional attributes, creating a program with a national profile and with a regional importance that would be legible to the people of Montana. Former MSU President Mike Malone’s name still resonates at the university and beyond, with the potential to comprise an effective point of reference for the building of a “friends” organization for the Center. This same support network, reinforced by a specialized focus on the subfield of the American West within AMST, could be leveraged by the American Studies program to establish it as a premier program in the field.

### **University Agendas and Momentum—Carnegie Status**

Many MSU faculty and administrators we spoke with expressed concern, and even alarm, regarding the recent downgrading earlier this year of MSU in the Carnegie Foundation classification system from the top class of 108 universities categorized by “very high research” to one categorized by “higher research activity.” Most believe the key element driving this downgrading is the near absence of doctoral programs in the humanities and social sciences at MSU. Many more decry the apparent neglect of the Liberal Arts generally, and believe MSU needs more non-STEM doctoral programs for its own internal integrity as a respected institution of higher learning. As one administrator put it, “real universities have real arts, sciences, and humanities,” and great humanities programs are a “distinguishing feature” that separates great schools from good schools. Many believe MSU President Cruzado wants to see growth of liberal arts doctoral programs specifically to help recover top research-1 Carnegie status as well as to enhance the overall quality of the MSU experience. American Studies has the potential to be a focal point in this effort and a flagship graduate program at MSU, representing a synergy of interests that cuts across—and provides opportunity for participation in graduate instruction to—a wide range of MSU faculty and academic units.

### **Liberal Studies at MSU**

Liberal Studies poses a good, viable model for interdisciplinary undergraduate education at MSU that has had success and has proved sustainable. It has achieved (and maintained) considerable success as an undergraduate major at a moment when liberal arts and humanities programs nationwide have seen declining

enrollments. Attention to that program by the CLS Dean has been critical to its success, and represents a model that could be employed for the American Studies undergraduate program as well. (This model would have the additional benefit of providing American Studies stronger administrative support at the Dean's level).

## 6. Challenges

### Undergraduate and Graduate Studies

The key problem associated with the undergraduate program is simply that there are no courses for students who might be interested in the major to enroll in and there is only one introductory section offered each semester. Those introductory courses have high enrollments, so any evaluative measures, such as number of majors or minors, don't actually provide adequate evidence of the American Studies program's potential as an undergraduate major.

Compounding the challenges to the graduate program, the gaping lacunae in the program's undergraduate curriculum then creates problems for the graduate program, serving as a constraint on the American Studies PhD students who have close to zero opportunity to serve as teaching assistants or instructors in the undergraduate curriculum. As a result, they have little teaching opportunity and virtually no funding. Such remediable circumstances and starvation of this program at every level has created demoralizing conditions for the graduate students. Interviews with them reveal they grimly hang on, but do not thrive. Clearly, the graduate students are deeply underfunded, under the radar, resource poor, and experience lots of turnover among those putatively responsible for the program. They experience a distinct lack of structures in place to help them develop as young scholars, including forming committees, getting advice, gaining professionalization experiences, training in instruction, etc. With the clear exception of Professor Rydell's loyalty to them, they have a strong feeling of not being recognized, and attended to as young scholars, or as people. On the other side of the equation, American Studies graduate students are understandably perceived as competitors with their History doctoral counterparts, as threatening to the scarce resources of the History department, and drains on History faculty. This general malaise, lack of dedicated space, and lack of attention, has produced no discernable sense of cohort or community among AMST PhD students, nor between them and the university. Despite the admirable and generous efforts of Professor Rydell and a few other key individuals, the experience of being a graduate student in American Studies at MSU is a very atomizing and alienating one. It is unclear what, if anything beyond Professor Rydell's unique brand of mentorship, sustains them. This is not the way to produce graduate students who will serve as emblems, ambassadors, or recruiters for the program.

The poor morale, lack of dedicated space or resources, and lack of community among the students prompts serious questions about the program's ability to continue without an infusion of administrative attention, faculty involvement, and graduate support. Although the first four doctoral candidates' swift completion of their degree programs (two in 2014, two in 2016) is testimony to the initial energetic dedication of the founders of this program and an excellent sign of the program's potential, the continued neglect and starving of this program will put the remaining students at serious risk of failing to meet their personal and professional objectives in a timely way. Without remediation, their situations do not appear sustainable over the long run.

Apart from structural change in the program's administration and faculty resources, no responsible advisor could possibly encourage undergraduate students to become majors, and most graduate advisors would have to couch their encouragement of graduate students to join the program very carefully as well. Likewise, with no incentives for faculty involvement, and meager support for its administration, American Studies is a truly

orphaned and severely under-nourished program. We find this to be tragically ironic, considering the program's potential to become MSU's flagship interdisciplinary liberal arts graduate program as well as a thriving and very popular undergraduate program.

### **Dedicated Faculty**

The American Studies Program at MSU lacks committed faculty who are incentivized to participate in the program, teach American Studies courses, and develop mentor relationships with graduate students. Looking beyond Professor Rydell's career at MSU, it is unclear how the program could survive without more dedicated faculty contributing to it.

### **Administrative Attention and Support**

Up to the present the program seems to have operated below the radar of administrators, faculty, and other potential key allies and partners. The American Studies PhD program lacks a champion in the Dean's offices, either at the College level or at Graduate Dean's level, someone who can garner resources and make sustained arguments about the program's value to the university, its research profile and agendas, and its students. Members of the administration (especially the Provost's office and Graduate Dean's office) lack dialogue with key faculty and the core group of top faculty at MSU who are or could be motivated to be invested in the American Studies Program, and who can position themselves as a group of faculty who can make it succeed. American Studies has not been promoted or supported in the same way as Liberal Studies, for instance, which itself appears to receive bare bones support, but yet has achieved a robust undergraduate major with growing enrollments, under the aegis of the CLS Dean (who evinced interest to us in building American Studies at the undergraduate level).

### **Campus Identity**

At every level (student, faculty, and administrative) there appears to be a pervasive lack of familiarity and near fatal high level vagueness if not confusion surrounding the American Studies Program, especially as it relates to or parallels (or fails to parallel) programs such as Liberal Studies and Native American Studies, resulting in a confused and amorphous identity for the program on campus.

### **Program Leadership and Academic Home**

Beyond the attention of an upper administrative champion, the program lacks a full-time Director who can change perceptions and lend intellectual coherence to the program, as well as attract and nurture a core group of faculty dedicated to facilitating and helping to shape the Director's vision. The American Studies PhD program is currently housed administratively within the History Department, but that Department does not have the administrative or staff support or space to sustain it or permit it to grow. Leadership is provided by the History Department, but with no additional compensation or course relief to the Chair, it is carried as an additional uncompensated commitment. Administratively it is neither a subset of the History Department, nor is American Studies as a field a subfield of history; the program should be recognized as a being distinct, institutionally and physically. Those members of the History faculty who are committed to American Studies as a field devote uncompensated time and energy to it, but it should not be perceived as or actually competing with History for faculty resources, administrative time and attention, and space. While we applaud the History Department's generosity in sustaining the American Studies Program to the limits of its capacity to do so, the situation is not sustainable. It was pointedly apparent to us that, without a change in its academic home providing for more secure footing, the program's future is in severe jeopardy.

### **Space**

The program lacks a stand-alone space that is clearly understood as the American Studies space that can serve as a place where graduate students have meeting space, carrels, or at least mail boxes, and where advising takes place, for both undergraduates and graduate students, where events can be planned if not held, where faculty can become familiar with one another's work and teaching, and dedicated staff and administrators can interact with students and faculty on a regular basis. The lack of community lies at the core of the many

overlapping layers of constraint under which this program suffers. Dedicated space and a dedicated Director—appointed solely to American Studies—are absolutely indispensable if MSU would like to see this program endure.

## 7. Opportunities

### Undergraduate and Graduate Studies

Undergraduate courses beyond the introductory level should be established, and faculty found throughout key allied programs (History, Religious Studies, English, Political Science, Sociology, Art & Architecture, Film & TV, Native American Studies, Environmental Studies, and so on) should be encouraged to develop and teach these courses, with the university incentivizing those faculty members' home departments to do so. Specifically designated upper division American Studies courses and electives for undergraduates will, at the least, boost enrollment, sustain commitment, and will give the American Studies graduate students more teaching opportunities, broaden their contact with the university's faculty, and broaden the availability of more consistent funding to more of them.

Graduate students need opportunities for teaching experience, for community building as a learning cohort, financial support to sustain themselves, to attend conferences, and travel for research. They need opportunities to engage with like-minded students and faculty across campus, and to meet American Studies scholars from other institutions and countries (through guest speaker events for example). All of these measures would enhance their research, their professionalization, and make them marketable as academics. Even for those not seeking academic careers, such measures and opportunities would augment their sophistication and ensure relevance and integrity to their research. Most will need a funding model that offers guaranteed funding for a predictable number of years: this will directly enhance the quality of students applying and the value of the degree as perceived within and outside of MSU.

### Director, Faculty and alliance with Native American Studies

The program needs a full time Director and at least a few dedicated core faculty. These might optimally be in the form of joint or split appointments with allied departments. Joint appointments/dedicated lines of faculty would help anchor the program and would generate buy-in from other departments: possibilities might include a joint appointment with Religious Studies, or someone in the field of political science, literature, or sociology: these would be people who would be resources for the graduate program and could develop and teach key undergraduate classes. Even a couple of new hires, split between several units but dedicated to teaching American Studies from their own disciplinary or methodological perspective, would also provide incentive to various departments to participate substantially in the program (they get a new faculty member, part of whose teaching and mentorship belongs to American Studies but whose enrollments and graduate participation can be credited to the home department therefore spreading the participation in a liberal arts based doctoral program around to many and raising the overall profile of the program).

In particular, we strongly recommend redesigning and building the doctoral program in concert with existing Native American Studies faculty, as they are committed and available with five tenure lines and have overlapping interests with American Studies as a discipline. The resulting doctoral program could be called the **Graduate Program for Studies of the American West**, and would include four tracks or concentrations such as: American Studies, Native American Studies, Environmental/Sustainability Studies, Agricultural/Rural studies. This partnership will draw on Native American Studies strengths and add a doctoral component to its curriculum, without infringing on its independence. It would also serve the needs of the major pool of doctoral recruits with current interests primarily in Native American Studies while also supplying a broadening and employability enhancing effect on all doctoral students' training. The other concentrations will do much the same for those concentrating in Environmental/Sustainable Studies or Agricultural/Rural Studies. American Studies could also have considerable Digital Humanities possibilities: A



PhD program would train people who would be well positioned to make decisions and provide intellectual decisions about the kinds of materials thought ought to be digitized, in a variety of fields: museum studies, public history, publishing, library science, etc.

### **Space and alliance with the Center for People and Lands of the American West**

The Center for the People and Lands of the American West is a natural anchor, resource, and intellectual center for American Studies at Montana State University. The Center also has the potential to have a profile that could attract outside dollars and resources/expertise, from those in the region interested and committed to Montana, Western US, and Native American history, art, music, film, literature, architecture, etc. Affiliation with the Center can help to further distinguish the program and MSU as a regional power. In turn, a close affiliation of American Studies as an academic program will augment and enhance the mission of the Center.

Shared physical space between the two affiliated entities would be optimal. The American Studies Program needs a place for administrative functions, advising, a place where graduate students would have offices or at least carrels and shared open space providing a sense of place and belonging. The existence of a physical space, and the synergy between the two entities would offer both various forms of and mechanisms for legibility (including public events such as symposia and conferences, and lecture or films series, along with a board of friends/directors similar to STEM's industrial advisory board).

### **Summary of Recommendations**

**1. Director.** The first step in establishing a new path for American Studies at MSU is to appoint a full time dedicated Director. We highly recommend an external search to bring in someone with administrative experience and whose career is well established in the discipline of American Studies who can raise the profile of this program on campus and in the profession immediately; someone who will have the contacts and perspectives on the field necessary to propel it into the forefront of this field at the regional if not the national level. A director is needed to provide leadership, vision, and disciplinary savvy, to chart the way forward and to determine the specific steps that will be taken to ensure a successful future for American Studies at MSU.

**4. Augmentation of undergraduate program.** We urge the administration to incentivize several liberal arts departments to contribute at least two middle and upper level courses and one capstone course that undergraduate majors could take to earn the major in American Studies. The first step in this process would be to canvas likely departments to identify existing courses that could serve double duty as electives contributing to both the home department major and the AMST major. The second step would be to identify faculty who might want to shift a fraction of their appointment to American Studies so as to regularly teach courses specifically designed for American Studies undergraduates. Home departments would be compensated for this loss by the third step in this process which would be to establish American Studies partial lines and hire several faculty with joint appointments in those same departments.

**2. Home.** We strongly recommend relocating American Studies out of the History Department. While the History Department has made a good faith effort to oversee and sustain the program, the program currently is a burden on the department especially considering the lack of resources assigned to its support. Nor do we believe that another departmental home would be appropriate—with the American Studies doctoral program poised to represent a signature and singular liberal arts doctoral program, no one department ought to monopolize the status that harboring the program will confer. Autonomy, and close affiliation to the Center for Western Peoples and Lands ought to provide opportunity for many other academic units to participate in, contribute to, and benefit from the program's successes. For these reasons, we recommend assigning American Studies independent status but affiliating it closely with the new Center for Western Peoples and Land and finding amenable shared spaced for both. For all of the reasons outlined above under #6

Opportunities, we feel this synergy of shared mission and interest's benefits both entities and positions MSU to become a regional, national, and international leader in this field.

3. Redesign of doctoral program. We recommend the doctoral program re-conceptualize itself as a four-way partnership of academic fields (American Studies, Native American Studies, Rural/Agricultural Studies, and Environmental/Sustainable Studies) sharing a doctoral program under the innovative and unique rubric of **Graduate Program for Studies of the American West**. This plan takes advantage of existing strengths at MSU in various fields of research and teaching that center around regional studies most relevant to the American West. Housed by the Center for Western Peoples and Lands, this plan augments and invigorates that mission, providing a focal point for many faculty scattered throughout the campus to create an intellectual community and provide a bridge to local and regional resources with related missions and agendas. The four concentrations within this doctoral program draws on the significant faculty resources already extant at MSU without threatening their home department's autonomous identities or independent undergraduate (or MA) programs, and should be attractive to these departments inasmuch as this partnering would permit shared doctoral training in fields where no current capacity for doctoral training exists, spreading around the benefits of a liberal arts doctoral program to many contributing departments and, in this way further heightening its profile on campus as a signature MSU graduate program.

We predict such a confluence of intellectual commitments and scholarly talent dedicated to the Study of the American West will not only provide firm footing for a blossoming American Studies doctoral program, but will also set MSU apart and make it the leader in this highly attractive, place-specific field.

#### **Concluding statement from external reviewers**

The potential for the American Studies Program to enhance MSU's reputation and rankings, draw new students and donors to the University and the program, to become not only MSU's flagship Liberal Arts doctoral program but also a thriving undergraduate program, is enormous and can be achieved we believe with a few key strategic decisions and allocations from upper administration. Leadership and vision is called for, but our interactions with administrators in the positions of power to make this happen leave us confident that American Studies at MSU has a very bright future ahead. An American Studies program that is at the forefront and intersection of several academic programs in the college, and firmly grounded in the place-specific mission of studying Montana and the American West promises to, in the words of the Vice Provost for Research Pera, take "us to the edge of our minds" by drawing upon and contributing to the single most valuable and enduring asset available to the university—its sense of place. Study of the American West has strong potential to be that "something shiny" Dr. Pera spoke of with us—a program that reflects outward and back to itself the special something about Montana and the West that energizes and moves the university community forward. We hope this external review provides some guidance towards that worthwhile goal.

**At the conclusion of the Introduction provided to the ERT seven (7) questions were asked.**

1. Is the American Studies Program healthy?
  - The graduate program, despite all of the current circumstances, is relatively healthy but without adoption of the recommendations offered above could easily disintegrate.
2. Should it remain as is or do changes need to be made?
  - See the Summary of Recommendation above.
3. Should the program continue to be attached to a department, be connected to the CLS dean's office, or exist in some other form?
  - See Summary of Recommendation, 2. Home, above.
4. How should the leadership be organized? Who should lead? Is an advisory committee needed?
  - See Summary of Recommendation, 1. Director and 2. Home, above.
  - Yes, advisory boards are appropriate entities.
    - An academic board consisting of faculty to guide the curriculum.
    - A non-academic board to assist and guide in external affairs and support of the program.
5. Is staff support appropriate?
  - Perhaps as the Program is currently but full time staff will be needed if the ERT's recommendations for a director and home are to be effectively executed.
6. Is funding sufficient?
  - No.
    - The program lacks adequate funds to support administrative activities such as program management, long and short term planning, faculty hires, program recruitment, administrative travel, the building of an American Studies culture, etc.
    - The program lacks adequate funds to compensate faculty for teaching in the curriculum and/or advising graduate and particularly PhD candidates who are not within the faculty member's home department.
    - The program lacks adequate funding to support graduate student teaching and research through GTA and GRA positions.
    - The program lacks adequate funding to support the research, travel, presentations and publication efforts of its graduate students and faculty in their scholarly activities.
7. Are there opportunities for cost-savings and efficiencies?
  - The ERT did not address this question since the existing program is operating with funding far below that which would be expected of a program accommodating the number of graduate students currently enrolled in the program.

**Montana University System**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW**

Institution: **Montana State University**

---

Program Years: **2015-16**

---

---

**List of the programs reviewed:**

Bachelor of Science in Computer Science

---

**Decision(s) concerning the future of the program(s), based on the program review criteria established at the campus:**

The program remains strong and will be continued.

---

**Rationale or justification for the decision based on the program review process established at the campus. Include graduation numbers and student majors for each of the last seven (7) years for every program under review.**

The BS Computer Science program was reviewed by the Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) of ABET during 2015-16. The program was accredited to September 30, 2022, the best possible result.

| <b>Enrollments</b> | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Majors             | 151     | 163     | 184     | 220     | 246     | 283     | 321     |
| Minors             | 3       | 3       | 3       | 1       | 1       | 5       | 13      |

  

| <b>Graduates</b>    | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| BS Computer Science | 25      | 16      | 18      | 19      | 26      | 42      | 31      |

The CAC had a concern about adequacy of resources. The enrollment has nearly doubled since the last accreditation visit in 2009, but the institutional allocation to the department has increased by only 12% during the same time period. The College of Engineering is aware of this issue and will be working with the Provost to address this concern.

**Montana University System**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW**

Institution: **Montana State University**

---

Program Years: **2015-16**

---

**List of the programs reviewed:**

Teacher Education Programs

- BS Agricultural Education Broadfield, 5-12
- BA Art Education Broadfield, K-12
- BS Biological Sciences Teaching, 5-12
- BS Chemistry Teaching, 5-12
- BS Elementary Education, K-8
- BA English Teaching, 5-12
- BS Family and Consumer Sciences, 5-12
- BA Modern Languages and Literatures: French Teaching, K-12
- BS Secondary Education: General Science Broadfield, 5-12
- BA Modern Languages and Literatures: German Teaching, K-12
- BS Health Enhancement, K-12
- BA History Teaching, 5-12
- BS Mathematics Teaching, 5-12
- BS Physics Teaching, 5-12
- Bachelor of Music Education: School Music Broadfield, K-12
- BS Secondary Education: Social Studies Broadfield, 5-12
- BA Modern Languages and Literatures: Spanish Teaching, K-12
- BS Technology Education Broadfield, 5-12
- MEd, Northern Plains Transition to Teaching (NPTT)

---

**Decision(s) concerning the future of the program(s), based on the program review criteria established at the campus:**

With one exception, these programs will be continued. The exception is the Northern Plains Transition to Teaching Program, which has been terminated.

---

**Rationale or justification for the decision based on the program review process established at the campus. Include graduation numbers and student majors for each of the last seven (7) years for every program under review.**

These programs were the subject of an accreditation review and site visit in 2015-16. The result: the MSU Teacher Education Programs are now accredited by CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) through 2023. With the exception of the NPTT program, this accreditation visit was highly successful and resulted in a campus news article (Attachment 1).

## Montana University System

### PROGRAM REVIEW

The CAEP organization is the result of two accrediting agencies merging, and the accreditation requirements and processes have changed with the merger. The Northern plains Transition to Teaching program was designed to operate under the accreditation requirements and processes in place prior to the merger. The program could not function within the new CAEP requirements. The decision was made to terminate the NPTT program. This termination has already been approved by OCHE with notification to the Board of Regents.

#### Enrollment and Graduation Statistics

| <b>Fall Enrollment: 1st and 2nd Majors</b> | <b>2007</b> | <b>2008</b> | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Agricultural Education Broadfield, 5-12    | 36          | 39          | 33          | 33          | 34          | 39          | 34          | 28          | 30          |
| Art Education Broadfield, K-12             | 47          | 41          | 51          | 61          | 54          | 46          | 36          | 28          | 31          |
| Biological Sciences Teaching, 5-12         | 15          | 9           | 9           | 12          | 13          | 11          | 11          | 11          | 5           |
| Chemistry Teaching, 5-12                   | 4           | 3           | 6           | 3           | 5           | 3           | 6           | 6           | 7           |
| Elementary Education, K-8                  | 341         | 374         | 377         | 407         | 410         | 438         | 451         | 413         | 410         |
| English Teaching, 5-12                     | 72          | 63          | 66          | 87          | 91          | 86          | 88          | 73          | 79          |
| Family and Consumer Sciences, 5-12         | 0           | 0           | 8           | 14          | 17          | 18          | 24          | 19          | 15          |
| French Teaching, K-12                      | 2           | 3           | 1           | 0           | 2           | 2           | 3           | 6           | 8           |
| General Science Broadfield, 5-12           | 30          | 24          | 38          | 39          | 34          | 35          | 26          | 23          | 29          |
| German Teaching, K-12                      | 4           | 2           | 2           | 4           | 5           | 6           | 5           | 4           | 1           |
| Health Enhancement, K-12                   | 0           | 7           | 21          | 28          | 58          | 59          | 67          | 56          | 60          |
| History Teaching, 5-12                     | 75          | 71          | 69          | 77          | 63          | 52          | 49          | 51          | 37          |
| Mathematics Teaching, 5-12                 | 38          | 30          | 32          | 31          | 31          | 40          | 46          | 34          | 42          |
| Physics Teaching, 5-12                     | 6           | 4           | 6           | 12          | 13          | 5           | 5           | 7           | 9           |
| School Music Broadfield, K-12              | 49          | 41          | 40          | 41          | 48          | 43          | 38          | 44          | 50          |
| Social Studies Broadfield, 5-12            | 29          | 41          | 51          | 74          | 56          | 65          | 66          | 61          | 68          |
| Spanish Teaching, K-12                     | 19          | 18          | 20          | 19          | 13          | 15          | 10          | 6           | 3           |
| Technology Education Broadfield, 5-12      | 25          | 19          | 23          | 16          | 23          | 24          | 17          | 16          | 11          |
| <i>Totals:</i>                             | <i>792</i>  | <i>789</i>  | <i>853</i>  | <i>958</i>  | <i>970</i>  | <i>987</i>  | <i>982</i>  | <i>886</i>  | <i>895</i>  |

| <b>Graduates: 1st and 2nd Majors</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> | <b>2008-2009</b> | <b>2009-2010</b> | <b>2010-2011</b> | <b>2011-2012</b> | <b>2012-2013</b> | <b>2013-2014</b> | <b>2014-2015</b> |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Agr. Educ. Brdfld, 5-12              | 2                | 6                | 11               | 4                | 6                | 4                | 7                | 4                |
| Art Education Brdfld, K-12           | 14               | 5                | 13               | 6                | 7                | 13               | 8                | 5                |
| Biological Sci. Teaching, 5-12       | 5                | 5                | 0                | 4                | 2                | 0                | 1                | 0                |
| Chemistry Teaching, 5-12             | 2                | 3                | 1                | 4                | 0                | 2                | 0                | 1                |
| Elementary Education, K-8            | 87               | 78               | 94               | 85               | 62               | 68               | 99               | 78               |
| English Teaching, 5-12               | 10               | 11               | 5                | 10               | 13               | 24               | 17               | 15               |
| Family & Consumer Sci., 5-12         | 0                | 0                | 1                | 3                | 4                | 2                | 1                | 9                |
| French Teaching, K-12                | 1                | 1                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 1                |
| General Science Brdfld, 5-12         | 9                | 5                | 4                | 17               | 4                | 13               | 11               | 7                |
| German Teaching, K-12                | 1                | 0                | 4                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                |
| Health Enhancement, K-12             | 0                | 1                | 0                | 0                | 3                | 4                | 15               | 21               |
| History Teaching, 5-12               | 7                | 12               | 17               | 16               | 11               | 18               | 6                | 7                |
| Mathematics Teaching, 5-12           | 10               | 13               | 9                | 5                | 5                | 7                | 13               | 6                |
| Physics Teaching, 5-12               | 2                | 2                | 1                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 1                | 1                |
| School Music Brdfld, K-12            | 8                | 3                | 6                | 9                | 5                | 13               | 3                | 10               |
| Social Studies Brdfld, 5-12          | 12               | 8                | 9                | 13               | 12               | 15               | 16               | 12               |
| Spanish Teaching, K-12               | 8                | 9                | 10               | 5                | 2                | 4                | 1                | 4                |
| Tech. Educ. Brdfld, 5-12             | 5                | 2                | 5                | 1                | 6                | 4                | 7                | 4                |
| <i>Totals:</i>                       | <i>183</i>       | <i>164</i>       | <i>190</i>       | <i>182</i>       | <i>142</i>       | <i>191</i>       | <i>206</i>       | <i>185</i>       |

Attachment: MSU News article: MSU Teacher Education Program nationally reaccredited, July 12, 2016

# MSU Teacher Education Program nationally reaccredited

July 12, 2016 -- MSU News Service

BOZEMAN – The [Teacher Education Program](#) at Montana State University recently received full reaccreditation for seven years through both Montana’s [Board of Public Education](#) and the [Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation](#), the single specialized national accreditor for educator preparation in the United States.

The program is among the first in the nation to be fully accredited under new rigorous national standards for the preparation of new teachers, according to Jayne Downey, head of the [Department of Education](#). The review team noted in its final report that MSU’s program fully met every state and national standard with no areas identified as needing improvement.



Montana State University education major Jennifer Skinner reads with students at Hyalite Elementary. The Teacher Education Program at MSU is among the first in the nation to be fully accredited under new national standards. MSU photo by Kelly Gorham.

The [CAEP standards](#), adopted in 2013, reflect the voice of the education field on what makes a quality teacher. CAEP accreditation ensures that there is solid evidence that a provider’s graduates are competent and caring, and that the faculty have the capacity to create a culture of evidence to be used for continuous improvement.

“It is quite remarkable that MSU’s program received no marks for areas for improvement (AFIs) or stipulations for reaccreditation,” said Aaron Popham, director of Brigham Young University’s teacher preparation program and a member of the accreditation team. “In this era of a new accreditor (CAEP) and new accreditation standards, it is almost unheard of for an educator preparation provider to not receive at least one AFI. Jayne Downey and her colleagues should be very proud of their efforts and the quality of their programs.”

In their final report, the review team commended the faculty for their hard work and dedication to the new, rigorous standards, stating, “MSU is poised to be a national and state leader.”

“We believe that, as a program, we have a duty to engage in the work of continuous program improvement. We take our responsibility to serve the citizens of Montana and the country as a whole very seriously,” Downey said.

Through key partnerships with schools and districts across the state, the Teacher Education Program, housed in the Department of Education, prepares teacher candidates from eighteen majors in twelve departments located in four colleges at MSU. The Department of Education also supports the state by offering graduate degrees in curriculum and instruction, adult and higher education, and educational leadership.

“Achieving Montana and CAEP Accreditation is a validation of the commitment that Montana State University has made to provide the innovative and rigorous educator preparation programs required for our students to achieve academic excellence and employment success,” Downey said.

The Department of Education at MSU offers undergraduate and graduate degrees in the following areas: teacher preparation for elementary and secondary education; technology education; educational leadership; adult and higher education and curriculum and instruction. The department is part of the College of Education, Health and Human Development, which is made up of the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Development. The college had a total enrollment of 1,820 in the fall of 2015, the most recent semester for which data is available.

For more information about CAEP, see <http://caepnet.org/>.

For more information about the MSU Department of Education, see <http://www.montana.edu/education>.

*Contact: Jayne Downey, Department of Education, (406) 994-7426 or [jdowney@montana.edu](mailto:jdowney@montana.edu)*



**Montana University System**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW**

Institution: **Montana State University**

---

Program Years: **2015-16**

---

**List of the programs reviewed:**

Engineering Undergraduate Programs

- Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering
  - Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering
  - Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering
  - Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering
  - Bachelor of Science in Industrial and Management Systems Engineering
  - Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering
- 

**Decision(s) concerning the future of the program(s), based on the program review criteria established at the campus:**

The programs remain strong and will be continued. There is one program, BS Computer Engineering, which is currently graduating an average of less than 10 students per year. However, enrollments in recent years have increased (see data table, below) and we anticipate that the program will make this threshold within a few years. The program will be continued.

---

**Rationale or justification for the decision based on the program review process established at the campus. Include graduation numbers and student majors for each of the last seven (7) years for every program under review.**

The BS programs in Engineering were reviewed by the Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET during 2015-16. All programs were accredited to September 30, 2022, the best possible result.

The following institutional strengths were identified (paraphrased from the ABET report to the institution):

- Rapid enrollment growth has enabled the College of Engineering to hire approximately 20 new faculty members in the past five years and significantly improve its gender diversity.
- The University's Honors College enrolls over 1500 students, approximately 40% of whom are engineering majors. Participating students have won prestigious national and international awards, including Marshall, Goldwater, and Rhodes Scholarships.

There were also strengths identified for many of the individual programs.

**Montana University System**  
PROGRAM REVIEW

| Enrollments (Undergraduate) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Chemical Engineering        | 189     | 196     | 210     | 244     | 286     | 359     | 389     |
| Civil Engineering           | 314     | 298     | 292     | 312     | 302     | 307     | 330     |
| Computer Engineering        | 63      | 58      | 73      | 72      | 81      | 100     | 108     |
| Electrical Engineering      | 153     | 160     | 172     | 170     | 202     | 217     | 220     |
| Industrial Mgmt Syst Eng    | 104     | 89      | 78      | 73      | 69      | 89      | 80      |
| Mechanical Engineering      | 386     | 415     | 499     | 600     | 710     | 818     | 886     |

  

| Graduates                 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| BS Chemical Engineering   | 34      | 25      | 37      | 43      | 31      | 55      | 74      |
| BS Civil Engineering      | 43      | 52      | 43      | 45      | 45      | 42      | 53      |
| BS Computer Engineering   | 13      | 6       | 8       | 7       | 9       | 4       | 11      |
| BS Electrical Engineering | 21      | 23      | 31      | 20      | 26      | 26      | 42      |
| BS Ind & Mgmt Syst Eng    | 18      | 19      | 15      | 10      | 15      | 15      | 17      |
| BS Mechanical Engineering | 73      | 45      | 62      | 41      | 82      | 98      | 118     |

Source: MUS Data Warehouse

**Montana University System**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW**

Institution: **Montana State University**

---

Program Years: **2015-16**

---

**List of the programs reviewed:**

Engineering Technology Programs

- Bachelor of Science in Construction Engineering Technology
  - Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology
- 

**Decision(s) concerning the future of the program(s), based on the program review criteria established at the campus:**

The programs remain strong and will be continued.

---

**Rationale or justification for the decision based on the program review process established at the campus. Include graduation numbers and student majors for each of the last seven (7) years for every program under review.**

The BS programs in Engineering Technology were reviewed by the Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET during 2015-16. Both programs were accredited to September 30, 2022, the best possible result.

The following program strength was identified (paraphrased from the ABET report to the institution):

- The CET program is highly supported by local industry resulting in a significant endowment for scholarships and instructional support. This has led to increased student access and program quality.

The ETAC had one concern about adequacy of resources. Increases in faculty and staff have lagged student enrollment. The College of Engineering is aware of this issue and will be working with the Provost to address this concern.

| Enrollments (Undergraduate)         | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Construction Engineering Technology | 287     | 262     | 221     | 213     | 195     | 197     | 195     |
| Mechanical Engineering Technology   | 141     | 149     | 167     | 180     | 218     | 256     | 244     |

  

| Graduates                              | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| BS Construction Engineering Technology | 56      | 56      | 47      | 48      | 34      | 43      | 49      |
| BS Mechanical Engineering Technology   | 27      | 26      | 27      | 30      | 19      | 39      | 38      |

Source: MUS Data Warehouse

**Montana University System**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW**

Institution: **Montana State University**

---

Program Years: **2015-16**

---

---

**List of the programs reviewed:**

- BA English
  - MA English
- 

**Decision(s) concerning the future of the program(s), based on the program review criteria established at the campus:**

Both programs are strong and well subscribed, and will be continued.

---

**Rationale or justification for the decision based on the program review process established at the campus. Include graduation numbers and student majors for each of the last seven (7) years for every program under review.**

| Enrollments   | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Undergraduate | 232     | 203     | 252     | 267     | 261     | 256     | 236     |
| Graduate      | 21      | 20      | 18      | 17      | 17      | 13      | 16      |
| Minors        | 29      | 21      | 25      | 20      | 20      | 38      | 53      |

  

| Graduates  | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| BA English | 49      | 40      | 49      | 57      | 62      | 66      | 47      |
| MA English | 7       | 7       | 6       | 6       | 6       | 6       | 8       |

An external review of the programs offered by the Department of English was conducted in May 2016 (attached). The general conclusion was that “the Department of English is a strong department that is poised to grow and flourish. The department is serving the needs of students, of CORE 2.0, and of their majors. The Writing Center serves a growing number of students. The faculty are productive in terms of their scholarship and several associate faculty have recently been promoted to full professor. The faculty are active and valued participants in professional and university service.”

The recently instituted Writing Option has proved to be popular, and the department is planning to develop an MA in English Education.

## Montana University System

### PROGRAM REVIEW

One concern, unrelated to student enrollment and graduation, was identified: The Yellowstone Writing Project has been hosted by the Department, and benefits teachers across Montana. However the project has been funded using federal dollars that are matched with institutional resources. The reduction of federal funding and concomitant institutional match is making it increasingly difficult to offer the program under its current structure.

Recommendations from the program review are as follows:

- The department needs to establish a close partnership with MSU's Department of Education to ensure that the development of the MA [in English Education] program is aligned with any and all appropriate institutional standards for accreditation.
- The dean and department need to identify whether the [Yellowstone Writing Project] program should continue, and if so, devise a rational procedure for funding a quality program.

Attachment: English Programs External Reviewers' Report

To: Martha Potvin, Provost  
Ron Larsen, Associate Provost  
Nicol Rae, Dean, College of Letters and Science  
Kirk Branch, Chair, Department of English

From: Anna Neill, Professor and Chair, Department of English, University of Kansas  
Patricia A. Simpson, Professor of German Studies, Department of Modern Languages  
and Literatures, Montana State University  
Irwin Weiser, Professor of English, Immediate Past Dean College of Liberal Arts, Purdue  
University

Date: May 11, 2016

Re: Department of English Review, May 3-4, 2016

**Introduction:**

We want to begin our review of the Department of English at Montana State University by acknowledging the collegiality and hospitality of the administrators, faculty, staff, and students we met during our visit. Strong attendance and lively participation at the meetings with faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and students spoke well of the Department's investment in the review process and allowed for maximum input. We learned a great deal about the English Department and the justifiable pride its members take in its achievements.

Our report follows the outline provided to us in the Montana State University Guidelines for Program Reviews, though we have adjusted it to fit the context of the review, as the Guidelines recommend.

The comments and recommendations that follow are based on our reading of the self-study and supporting materials provided prior to our visit and on our conversations with many people during the day and a half we spent on site. In suggesting ways to make an already strong department still stronger, we recognize that our understanding, especially that of the external reviewers, of the Department and the University is necessarily limited. In pointing out certain overarching issues and concerns, we acknowledge that some of these are common to English departments across the country, including our own.

**Process:**

We received a substantial department self-study in mid-April, which we were able to review prior to our visit on May 3-4. During our time on campus, we had the opportunity to meet with a number of administrators as well as faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students from the Department of English. We are including a copy of our itinerary.

## Scope of the Review:

As suggested above and in the itinerary, the self-study and the site visit enabled us to evaluate the graduate and undergraduate curriculum, faculty productivity, department plans and opportunities, and challenges the department faces, both those perceived institutionally and those recognized by us.

## Assessments:

### a. Academic Programs

#### a. Undergraduate

##### i. Literature Option--Major

The literature option in the major consists of several introductory courses at 200-level (including an introduction to literary studies, a course in the classical or biblical foundations of literature, and a language or linguistics course); a 300-level course in literary criticism/theory; two upper-level courses in world literature, mythology, women's literature, or multicultural literature; two courses in British or American literature before 1900 and two after 1900; two in topics, genres, or authors; and one in writing. This is a sound curriculum that largely aligns with changing emphases in the field, and that endeavors to balance coverage of traditional fields with representation of new and emerging ones. Although the number of literature majors has dropped significantly in recent years (consistent with national trends) enrollment in literature courses remains very healthy, perhaps because of the literature requirements for other options, but also suggesting an appeal to non-majors. Three new courses have recently been developed for the University Core 2.0, each of which promise to attract strong enrollments and which may draw more students to the literature option in the major.

The undergraduate students we spoke with were generally positive about the program and praised their instructors and advisors—in some cases, they were nothing short of adoring! They expressed frustration about the irregular offering of some courses and concern that gaps in literary history would not be filled during their time in the program. Clearly, this is an enormous challenge with a relatively small faculty (8). It is particularly acute because the traditional survey has been replaced by period/national literature requirements that don't allow for the same coverage efficiency. Students also indicated difficulty navigating a pathway through the major outside

of the formal requirements, adding that advisors had not typically been able to help them in this respect (in some cases this involved taking courses that were too advanced for them). Literature faculty talked about major pathways and so are clearly aware of the problem. However, it is difficult to advise students about how to choose literature electives for a coherent learning route through the field when faculty are stretched very thin across a wide range of courses and when many electives are open topics courses.

It may be an opportune time for the literature faculty to talk again about the option and rearticulate what they want students to learn in it as a way of guiding further decisions about curriculum priorities. A department with strong programs in three distinct areas offers a particularly energizing context for such articulation. Some specific questions that came up for the team were: 1) Would a return to a survey model (perhaps less bound to the traditional separation of British and US literary histories) make coverage more streamlined and allow students to make clearer decisions about more focused study of particular periods, movements, and/or genres? 2) Given how stretched faculty are across so much material, perhaps “World Literatures” should be revised to “Anglophone Literatures” (particularly given that literature in translation overlaps with course offerings in Modern Languages)? 3) “Multicultural Literatures” is probably being asked to do too much as a single course, especially since it must include representation of Montana writers. 4) Could literature-focused courses in other departments such as Native American Studies be regularly cross-listed with LIT offerings so that students can recognize where they have options beyond the courses taught by faculty in English?

ii. Writing Option

Since its institution in 2011, the writing option has been enormously successful, almost tripling its number of majors. The curriculum represents professional, academic, and creative writing as well as literature courses. WRIT classes for the major are typically enrolled at or beyond capacity. Professionalization is enhanced through for-credit opportunities to publish in *Young Scholars in Writing* (edited by the Director of Composition).

The students we met from the program spoke very highly of their instructors. They appreciate the amount of one-on-one time that professors give to students and the way faculty guide them through



research and towards professionalization. They also reported a good balance in advising and through work done in class between careful direction and independent learning. They sometimes have difficulty getting into classes they need because they are oversubscribed, but instructors will often let additional students in over the cap. They expressed a wish for more linguistics/language classes and for a course on collaborative/team writing.

Faculty who teach in the writing option are stretched very thin. Sections are filled to capacity. (They are generally capped lower than literature classes, but this is as it should be for writing-intensive classes—indeed at a cap of 33, both WRIT 201, proposed as a second writing requirement for the Core, and WRIT 221 are significantly higher than the maximum of 20 students recommended by most professional organizations: See for example the Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing (<http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/postsecondarywriting>). Additionally, with only 4 tenure lines (plus one tenure-track professor in creative writing), faculty must cover all the required courses in the writing major and minor while almost all of them have administrative loads (some of which come with a teaching reduction). The faculty plans to reduce the number of required literature courses from 4 to 3 and require an additional writing course in place of the lit one. They would also like to develop additional courses in reading and writing, a research methods course in Rhetoric and Writing, and a 200-level introductory creative writing course. These plans all make sense within the framework of the major but raise questions about staffing if an additional tenure-track writing faculty member is not hired in the near future. Our specific recommendation for such a hire appears later in this report.

iii. Teaching (English Education) Option

The English Education option of the English Major combines carefully sequenced courses in EE (including a year-long service-learning component for preservice teachers involving collaboration with high school students and their teachers and a capstone course integrated into the senior-year practicum), Writing, Literature, and required School of Education classes. The combination of methods courses with preservice experience in area high schools seems especially powerful, as it extends the outreach component of the program (represented in faculty research and teaching), gives students experience in classroom mentoring prior to their senior year

placement, and provides students with research opportunities that will prepare them well for careers in the field. This work is further enhanced by grant-supported digital collaborations with high school teachers. Three new courses have recently been added to the curriculum (Introduction to English Education, Introduction to Rhetoric and Composition for English Education, and Special Topics in English Education). These, along with the addition of writing course requirements, a 3 credit elective in a desired area of interest (e.g. Native American Studies) and a restructuring of literature course requirement to allow for more flexibility in topic selection, offer more concentrated knowledge of content and methodology in the field with room to design individual foci for research and classroom practice. We were also impressed by the opportunities for undergraduate research professionalization. In recent years, 8 students have presented at the NCTE annual conference and several more at the Montana Education Association annual conference.

Students spoke to us glowingly of the program and their EE instructors. They emphasized that Drs. Petrone and Wynhoff Olsen “really care” about their success at MSU and beyond, and that they do a terrific job preparing them for their professional futures as well as building community among current and former EE students (This includes facilitating writing marathons in the Bozeman community, a Facebook group, and social gatherings.). They appreciate the way that research, preservice mentoring opportunities, and placement are integrated in the program so that they can truly produce original research in the field.

Both faculty and students in the program expressed concern about the alignment between EE and the Department of Education. Students felt that the approaches and expectations in Education often directly contradict what they are learning in their EE classrooms; the kind of critical thinking and social justice pedagogy emphasized in EE is not recognized in Education. Even more seriously, they have had trouble finding placements through Education, and in at least one case a student was advised in the College of Education to drop the major and switch to the literature option because placement was so difficult. Since there are currently only two of them, EE faculty are already enormously overloaded with advising and service, and are therefore unable to assume the additional administrative load of placement. The planned search for another tenure track faculty member to begin in Fall 2018 might

make this more feasible, but with the likely launch of the M.A.E.E. (see below), it remains unlikely. Administrative course releases, which would probably be necessary to accomplish this additional work, will take faculty out of classroom teaching, thus reducing required course offerings. And students are asking for more EE classes!

One very successful and creative way that EE faculty have already approached their staffing/service problem is to institute group advising sessions. The students spoke very positively about these sessions, which presumably enable them to informally peer-advise between sessions as well.

iv. Core Writing Program

The CWP provides University-wide instruction, serving approximately 3,000 students annually. Its mission is *“to create and offer writing and literacy instruction and experiences that help MSU students learn ways of writing and reading, and ways of being as writers, that help them create powerful and useful writing throughout their college experience and beyond.”* This mission drives the learning outcomes for WRIT 101—currently the single writing course in the Core—which include reflection about writing, exploring a variety of writing situations, rhetorical analysis, situation-appropriate conventions of writing, collaboration, and writing with source material. Instructors are free to develop any form of pedagogy that aligns with these outcomes, but are encouraged to use “Writing about Writing” approaches.

Since many units and programs on campus require a second writing course, CWP also serves the University with WRIT 201, broadly conceived as a course in critical reading and research-based writing course. However, with sections being taught very differently and with an outrageously high cap of 33, this course does not begin to approach 101 in coherence or in its realization of effective learning outcomes. CWP committees are currently at work designing a new 200-level writing curriculum. It will be essential that a cap of no more than 25 be placed on these courses. At the same time, WRIT 221 Intermediate Technical Writing, which also has the same high cap, needs to be expanded to meet campus-wide demand. As the Department has indicated in its hiring plan, this will require the addition of a full time tenure-track professor of technical writing/new media studies. There is currently no one among the research faculty who can update this course and oversee its ongoing development and staffing/staff development.

CWP courses are staffed 80% by NTT staff and 20% by GTAs. The Director of Composition mentors and informally supervises all instructors, but while the position remains unrecognized by the University, they remain formally supervised by the Chair. We consider this to be an untenable situation and offer a recommendation for addressing it later in this report. We are also concerned about the very low compensation for many NTT faculty, who earn as little as \$3,556 per course. Similarly, the GTA stipend of \$10,582 is extremely low, particularly given the cost of living in Bozeman. We urge the Department, CLS, and University to address these salary issues and provide transparency about compensation levels. Another area of concern is the issuing of letters of appointment to NTT faculty as late as August, so that they cannot plan for the upcoming year.

A large program serving a huge percentage of students across the University should receive full administrative support. We consider the current compensation for the Director (one course release per year, \$5,000 summer salary--with no guarantee that this will continue in future years--and \$1,000 in travel funds) to be inadequate. A formal contract that identifies the position in the context of the University would acknowledge the supervisory, program development, and budget-managing (among other) duties of the Director. This would in turn point to the need for additional course releases, summer salary, and an assistant director who could help with the clerical and other aspect of the supervisory load. Such a person might be recruited from among the NTT faculty, as in the case of the Assistant Director of the Writing Center. In fact, the Writing Center offers a very good model for the administrative agreement and support that could be applied to the Writing Program.

b. Graduate

i. M.A. in English

The M.A. in English is accurately described in the self-study as focusing “on the interconnectedness of writing, teaching, and literary studies.” It is very much a general M.A. degree with the potential of preparing students to enter Ph.D. programs, to teach in community colleges, and, as evidenced by our conversations with several graduate students, to enhance the knowledge of people who have taught in high school and may either return to that teaching or pursue positions in post-secondary institutions.

The program requires students to complete 30 hours of graduate work, the norm at most institutions. Those hours include either a thesis for 10 hours of credit or a professional paper for 6 hours of credit. These options provide flexibility for students, which is admirable. However, one graduate student told us that he was required to switch from the thesis option to the professional paper because he would otherwise exceed the maximum number of credits permissible. In a conversation with Dean of the Graduate School Karlene Hoo, we were told that had the student sought advice from her office, a solution could have been found. A follow-up with the Graduate Director Susan Kollin also indicated that credit/GTA/tuition waiver issues need not have dictated such a decision. We would encourage increased communication about policy among the Department and Graduate School and the students.

The curriculum includes three required classes: Studies in Critical Theory, Writing Theory and Practice, and a recent addition for GTAs, Teaching College Composition. We were particularly pleased to see the addition of the Teaching College Composition course, which provides new GTAs with an introduction to pedagogy and mentoring and supervision as they teach Writing 101 for the first time.

All of the courses in the graduate program have broad titles, allowing for a range of foci and content depending on who is assigned to teach the course. Given the small number of faculty available and the desire to rotate graduate teaching among the faculty, this arrangement makes sense. We note, however, that some graduate students feel that when a particular course, especially one of the required courses, has a narrower focus, it means that their experience may vary significantly from that of students who take the same course with a different professor. We suggest that it may make sense for faculty who teach the required courses agree on some fundamental content, reserving more specialized topics for English 580, Special Topics.

Graduate students brought up another concern about curriculum. While they are permitted to take courses outside the Department (e.g. in American Studies or Native American Studies), it can feel uncomfortable approaching a professor in another unit about taking her/his class when the student has had no formal introduction to the faculty member and has no particular background in the field.

Moreover, students reported being subtly discouraged from taking classes in other units because doing so would jeopardize enrollment in English graduate classes. Perhaps a more formalized linking of courses with other units and cooperation with those units in graduate course scheduling so that (to the degree possible) courses with similar topics are not competing for students could help to address this situation. It does seem likely that the planned new centers in Environmental Humanities and Western Lands and Peoples (which is to be directed by an English faculty member) will generate courses attractive to MA students and to which there is more formalized access.

The program currently has 14 students, a smaller number than the 16-27 which has been more typical over the previous five years. We were told that the number of applicants for the coming year is down, so it appears that the program will remain at its current size or perhaps become a bit smaller. There may be some specific reasons for this decline, including the fact that the small number of funded GTA appointments mean that not all graduate students are admitted with funding for their initial year, and the very low stipends of just over \$1,000 per month, minus required fees. One student commented on the obstacle to taking summer courses because the tuition waiver for GTAs does not carry over into the summer, so students who take the occasionally offered summer graduate course must pay full tuition. We note that at one of our institutions any student funded and receiving a tuition waiver during the previous year may take summer courses with tuition waived.

This year, the DGS and Graduate Committee will consider whether the M.A. should parallel the undergraduate major, with the same three emphases (literary studies, pedagogy, and writing). This examination will likely have to consider whether the current small number of faculty, especially in writing and English Education, could fulfill their current responsibilities and take on additional teaching, advising, and mentoring responsibilities. The examination should also consider ways to attract more M.A. applicants, though we expect that it will require increased funding to allow for more GTA appointments and to increase the GTA stipends.

Finally, we were told that the new summer funding model requires that classes, including graduate classes, must enroll well enough to cover the salaries of their instructors. As we understand it, the

model puts in jeopardy the ability to offer summer graduate classes, since it would require that virtually all of the graduate students enroll in any summer course offered or that the courses are somehow able to attract students from outside the department.

ii. Proposed M.A. in English Education (M.A.E.E.)

No topic was more widely discussed during our visit than the proposed Masters of Arts in English Education (M.A.E.E.). The proposal was developed by the two English Education faculty members, Professors Petrone and Wynhoff Olsen, both very enthusiastic, committed, and as we learned from students, popular teachers and productive scholars. As they describe the goal of the M.A.E.E., they note the need for graduate-level education for current Montana secondary (5-16) English teachers, particularly those in rural parts of the state. The proposal, while not yet formally approved, is receiving support from the College, which has approved the recruitment of a third English Education faculty member in 2017-18, with an appointment starting in 2018-19.

We believe that this proposal has merit. We are particularly attracted to the goal of providing graduate education for teachers in remote areas of the state and to its connection to the Yellowstone Writing Project, an outstanding, well-established educational engagement program we will discuss in more detail later. However, we recognize that a number of issues still need to be addressed before the program should be formally approved and initiated.

Among those issues are:

1. Specifics of the curriculum: The proposal outlines a number of courses, all of which appear to be pedagogical, but we were also told that the degree was to be focused on the “content” of English, not teaching methods. The content focus would allow for faculty from across the department to participate by offering graduate courses in literature and rhetoric and composition, for example a graduate-level Shakespeare or a Literature of the American West course or a technical writing course that could provide teachers with deeper background in these specific areas. It is not clear, however, whether this is actually the proposed focus of the degree. If it is not, we are concerned that even with a third faculty member, it may be difficult to staff both the M.A.E.E. courses and the existing courses in the English Teaching Option and the M.A. program. Clarifying this question should

help clarify the role of the English department as a whole in the proposed program.

2. Availability of technology and technological expertise to deliver the online component of the curriculum: It would be appropriate to investigate both institutional and corporate sources of technological support. What support is available from the MSU office of Extended University? Can the online Masters degree in Math Education provide a model? As corporate partnership examples, Purdue University offers two professional Masters programs at Purdue supported by Deltak, one in Learning Design and Technology offered through the College of Education and one in Strategic Communication offered by the Brian Lamb School of Communication.
  3. Assessment of the potential constituency for the program: Has there been a study of the interest in this program? While it seems very likely to us that a constituency exists, is there evidence to support this supposition?
  4. Budget projection: Beyond the addition of a third English Education faculty member (needed regardless of the outcome of this proposal but vital to its success), what other costs are anticipated in developing and maintaining the program? What projections are there for revenue to support the program?
- iii. We want to note that the report from the 2010 review (which Irwin Weiser participated in) addressed the question of whether the department should pursue a Ph.D. degree. The report advised against this, and most faculty who mentioned this possibility at all during the current review were not in favor of pursuing it. One faculty member did speak quite strongly in support of a Ph.D. program, particularly in light of MSU's recent drop in the Carnegie categories, but as reviewers, we agree with the former report and the majority of the faculty: a Ph.D. program in English would only add to the burden of an already stretched-thin faculty. Furthermore, the prospects for employment of Ph.D.s in English, with the exception of students specializing in Rhetoric and Composition, are no better now than they were in 2010, and a new program would take years to establish its reputation to the point that its graduates would be competitive. We do not intend for our position to be critical of the quality of the Department of English at MSU; we would



find it hard to support the creation of any new Ph.D. program in English at any university.

b. Department Productivity

- a. Based on details provided in the self-study, our review of faculty c.v.s, and data from Academic Analytics provided by Associate Provost Ron Larsen, there is ample evidence that the faculty of the Department of English are highly productive as researchers. The Academic Analytics data shows that the department exceeds the national median in the percentage of faculty with an article; citations per faculty member, citations for publication, and total citations; and book publications per faculty member. Currently, book chapters, an important medium of publication for scholars in the humanities, is not included in the Academic Analytics data, though we understand that this data point will be added. Faculty c.v.s indicate high productivity in this category as well. We are also impressed by the success of faculty in securing internal and external grants to support their work, including prestigious Spencer and Gates Foundation grants.
- b. The department has been able to provide funding for faculty travel in the amount of \$1,000 per year. While this amount is modest, often not enough to cover the expenses of a three-day conference trip, it is also not atypical for humanities departments. We understand that pre-tenure faculty receive a semester of research leave, a critically important form of support, as well as some additional travel and research funding. We did not have a clear sense of how the department will cover administrative and staffing needs while these faculty are on leave, so we want to emphasize how crucial it is to the careers of junior faculty and the future of the department that such leave time not be compromised.
- c. We are impressed by the attention given to supporting undergraduate research by several faculty: Professor Downs who edits *Young Scholars in Writing*, a national peer-reviewed journal of undergraduate research and Professor Miley who has mentored several undergraduate students who have presented papers or posters at national conferences are two notable examples.
- d. The department has hired well. Junior faculty are making significant contributions in all fields of teaching, research/creative work, and service. We worry about heavy service loads for junior faculty. However, in one case (Professor Miley), course releases partly offset the time consumed by an administrative load; in another case, (Professor Wynhoff Olsen) service, teaching, and research are very integrated. Every effort should be made, however, to ensure that course releases are adequate to the administrative contributions that junior faculty are making to department and department-

sponsored programs (see our recommendations for support to the Yellowstone Writing Project).

c. Department Learning Outcomes Assessment Program

The Department's approach to assessment has been quite thorough. In the initial plan, assessment was to begin with capstone courses involving 1) the reading and scoring of randomly collected student papers; 2) surveying of students in capstone courses; 3) surveying faculty teaching senior capstone classes and then move to gateway courses in each of the options. Although it appears that data has been gathered so far only from the capstone courses and then only from the scored student papers, it should be acknowledged that assessment is a slow and labor-intensive process that takes many years to complete. However, some useful information has been distilled from the process and the Department has made collective decisions about ways to improve overall student learning.

In 2013-14, all three options were assessed for Learning Outcome 3: "students will be proficient in producing writing that is focused, well-elaborated and supported, and well-edited." The results were strong and the Department concluded that its courses are generating a learning environment in which students are able to produce proficient writing. In 2014-15, Learning Outcome 2 was assessed for all three options: "students will be able to critically interpret, analyze, and synthesize texts, culture and/or communication." Results showed strength in critical ability, interpretative creativity, ability to recognize and enact strong rhetorical positions, strong interpretation of and critical and synthetic use of data. There was evidence of some weakness among the bottom third of student papers, and the Department concluded that it should strive for the success of students in this category. In the same year, goals 5 and 6 of the literature option were assessed: 1) knowledge of literature (foundations, history etc.); and 2) familiarity with literary theory and proficiency in applying theory to literary analysis. Again the results showed that an easy majority of students had mastered both the material and the skills, but some of the weaker papers suggested that instructors should foster a more uniform level of excellence in, especially, theory classes. We assume that the data for 2015-16 is yet to be presented to the Department for discussion. So far, there is insufficient clear information to guide curricular revision.

**Strengths:**

- a. Department Leadership: Although Professor Branch has only been chair for a short time, we heard from numerous people that he is a respected leader, emphasizing transparency and participation in policy and decision making. He is consulting regularly with the relatively new Chair's Executive Committee, currently composed of Literature Option Coordinator Gretchen Minton, Director of Composition Doug Downs, and former chair Linda Karrell. Other department administrators, Susan

Kollin, Director of Graduate Studies; Michelle Miley, Director of the Writing Center; Robert Petrone, Director of the English Education program; and Kate Ryan, Coordinator of the Writing Option, also provide thoughtful, professional, and enthusiastic leadership in their respective roles.

- b. The Writing Center: The 2010 review noted that “This is the ugliest writing center we have seen.” We are very pleased to report that this is no longer the case. The new space in Wilson 1-114 is bright and inviting. More importantly, the Writing Center is able to assist more students and has seen large annual increases in student contacts—7,488 in FY 2015. And most importantly, the university has recognized the importance a professionally led writing center can play in the success of students from across the institution and approved the recommendation from the 2010 team that a tenure-track faculty member be hired to serve as director. We are very impressed with Professor Miley and her staff. We met with Professor Miley, assistant director Jess Carroll, tutor coordinator Kayla Grimm, and two undergraduate tutors, Kelsey and Kinsie. The latter were particularly impressive for their understanding not only of the benefits of the Writing Center for its clients, but how working in the Writing Center has contributed to their own education and shaped their professional goals. We are also impressed that tutors in the Writing Center come from many disciplines across campus, not exclusively from English.

This is not to say that the Writing Center no longer needs attention from the university. While the office and tutoring space are much improved, the additional space committed to the Writing Center in Wilson 1-115 has not been made available. This space was supposed to serve as a computer classroom and in anticipation of that use, the previous computer classroom that was part of the Writing Center was decommissioned. This leaves the Writing Center unable to serve students in ways it previously could. We strongly recommend that a well-equipped computer classroom be made available to the Writing Center as soon as possible, ideally in Wilson 1-115. While we understand that there are plans to relocate the Writing Center into a remodeled former gymnasium in the future, we recommend that the computer classroom be made available as soon as possible.

We also support the change in the use of GTAs in the Writing Center from the current model of having all GTAs work 3-5 hours per week in the Writing Center to having two GTAs assigned to the Writing Center as their full assistantship responsibilities. This change would enable the Writing Center to develop its programs of support for graduate student writers from across the university and provide a valuable professional development opportunity for the GTAs.

- c. The Yellowstone Writing Project: We view the Yellowstone Writing Project (YWP) as an extremely valuable service to educators across Montana. It is the kind of engagement program that is consistent with MSU's land grant mission, with an impact that goes beyond those teachers who participate in it to affect not only their students but also their peer educators who benefit from the leadership participants provide. The YWP also serves as a research site for its co-directors. Additionally, the Yellowstone Writing Project is projected to play a role in the M.A.E.E. by offering students who enroll in that degree program with an on-site complement to the otherwise online course offerings.

Thus, we were very disappointed to learn that a reduction in support, both from the National Writing Project, which has cut back support to all NWP sites, and from MSU, could lead to the closing of this project after one or two years. During our visit, we had the opportunity to discuss what it would take to sustain the YWP. The costs appear to us to be very modest, especially in light of the good that the YWP does, its potential to bring new students to MSU, and the stature having a NWP site provides a university. According to co-directors Kirk Branch and Allison Wynhoff Olsen, they are continuing to seek external funding for most of the costs of the program. In addition to continued status as a sponsored program so that it remains affordable for participants, what they need from the university is the \$500 annual fee to the National Writing Project, only half of which we understand to have been provided by the College this year, and one course release for Professor Wynhoff Olsen—approximately \$8,600 at present (although less in real terms given the cost of a NTT replacement instructor). An investment from the College or University of under \$10,000 per year in addition to the modest cost associated with continued sponsored program status strikes us as a bargain to sustain a program that has had direct impact on approximately 60 Montana teachers as well as their students since 2009.

- d. The Writing Program: As noted above, both the Core Writing Program and the Writing Option are well designed and well taught. The growth of the Writing Option over the past few years has helped the English Department maintain enrollments at a healthy level during a time when numbers of English majors, especially in literary studies, have dropped both at Montana State University and nationally. The program is led by a faculty member, Doug Downs, who is a prominent national figure in Composition Studies, known especially for his work on writing transfer and the Writing about Writing pedagogical approach that has been adopted by many first-year writing programs across the country. Along with Professor Downs, the recent additions of Michelle Miley as Director of the Writing Center, and Kathleen Ryan, currently serving as coordinator of the writing option and soon to become Director of Graduate Studies, and the continued though now limited contributions

of Department Chair Kirk Branch give Montana State an enviable though small core writing faculty.

- e. Undergraduate Enrollment. While in some ways this might be listed under “challenges” given the dip in literature majors in recent years, we note that the department has been very successful overall in continuing to recruit English majors during a difficult time for most humanities programs nationwide. In large part this is owing to the growth and success of the Writing Program, which has balanced the loss of majors elsewhere. Nonetheless, literature classes continue to enroll well, despite a downward national trend. Fewer students from the other options may be taking literature classes as their requirements change, but inviting new lower-level literature courses incorporated into the University Core should offset that drop and perhaps draw more students to the literature major itself. We think the new 200-level course in “The Environmental Imagination” is especially promising in this regard.
- f. The department has truly excellent staff in Business Operations Manager Mandy Hansen and Administrative Assistant Teresa Klusmann (half time). Their efficiency and depth of institutional knowledge are clearly an asset to the chair and enable the smooth functioning of the department. They also seem to have very good rapport with faculty and students.

**Challenges:**

- a. Faculty Size: The small number of faculty limits course offerings and creates a need to carefully balance the number of undergraduate and graduate courses offered each semester. For example, it is difficult to have two faculty from writing studies teaching graduate courses in the same semester because of the need to cover undergraduate courses.
- b. Workload Balance:
  - a. Increase in teaching load for Director of Graduate Studies:  
We learned that the course load for the Director of Graduate Studies is being increased from the current 2-2-1-2 to 2-2-2-2. We are not aware of the reasoning behind this change, but we are concerned that if the graduate program is to grow, both through more aggressive efforts to recruit new M.A. students and the proposed M.A.E.E., the work of the Director of Graduate Studies will increase.
  - b. High workload for Director of Composition:  
The Director of Composition teaches a very heavy load (2-1-2-2) given his responsibilities for curriculum development, supervision of instructors, assessment, scheduling, placement, etc. He has, in the past, received an

additional month of summer salary, though we understand that this may not continue. The self-study refers to the Director of Composition's appointment is a "handshake arrangement," in contrast to the contractual appointment held by the Director of the Writing Center. In the next section, we will offer specific recommendations for addressing this very important position.

c. Technology and Web Presence:

We repeatedly heard of issues related both to technology needs and the Department's web page. In addition to inadequate computer resources in the Writing Center, mentioned above, we learned during our meeting with Non-Tenure Track faculty that some of the classrooms in which they teach lack any sort of computer or projection technology and that in a number of other classrooms, the technology is outdated. We were pleased to learn during our meeting with the Provost that technology needs can be met and that she has recently hired a person to work on technology issues. We recommend that the Chair and Dean work together with the Provost on this matter.

There are strong feelings that the Department's web page can be improved and that such improvement would assist in recruiting additional majors and minors. We were told that the Department is limited in its abilities to modify the web page. Given the interest in improving the web page, we hope that any limitations can be addressed and that the Department can find resources to revise the web page to meet its needs.

d. Graduate Student Stipends and Workload:

- a. As mentioned earlier, stipends for graduate students are very low. In our conversation with Dean Hoo, we learned that the peer average is approximately \$14,000 per year, nearly \$4,000 more than the stipend for English GTAs at MSU. We encourage the department and college to do all they can to increase the stipend. We support the recommendation of the 2010 reviewers who suggested that as NTT faculty resign or retire, funds be shifted to graduate student lines and stipends. We encourage the college to work on behalf of the department to seek additional support for graduate students.
- b. The change in the staffing model of the Writing Center exacerbates this situation because GTAs will be teaching 3 courses per year starting next fall instead of 2 courses plus tutoring in the Writing Center. We support the Writing Center's plans to have a more stable tutoring staff, but we

recognize, as did several graduate students we met with, that teaching an additional class is more time-consuming than tutoring.

e. Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTT) Working Conditions:

As is increasingly the case nationally, the Department of English relies very heavily on Non-Tenure Track faculty to meet its teaching needs. Several of the NTTs have served the Department for many years; others have been hired more recently. We were impressed with the professionalism and commitment of this group of faculty, 9 of whom attended our scheduled meeting.

Because of the central role NTTs play in undergraduate teaching, they are, unsurprisingly, attuned to a number of issues regarding the department and their status within it. As mentioned in the section on technology, NTTs are concerned that they and their students do not have access to current technology in many of the classrooms where they teach. They also indicated that some of the classrooms to which they are assigned are too small for the number of students enrolled, and one person referred to a small windowless room which she said, we hope hyperbolically, can be as hot as 115 degrees in the summer. They also are concerned about a relocation they have just learned of which will move most if not all of them to Linfield Hall, where apparently they will have cubicle space with NTTs from other departments. They raised concerns about being physically separated from the English Department, which they see as a diminishment of their already marginalized status. They have said that the space where they will be moving is on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of a building with no elevator, so they have concerns about accessibility for students as well as whether the cubicle arrangement will make conferencing with students difficult.

Most importantly, NTTs are concerned about what they described as a lack of “program status” for the writing program. When we probed them about this, it appeared to us that “program status” served as an umbrella for a number of issues related to the status of writing in the department, college, and university. For example, they echoed comments we heard from faculty about the lack of a contract and formal acknowledgement of the role of the Director of Composition. In their case, one effect of this situation is that while the Director evaluates them, he is not officially their supervisor. They believe that program status would draw attention to their role as essentially permanent faculty, despite the fact that only a few of them have multi-year contracts and several are hired semester by semester. Other issues that they think program status might help include work load, which for most, if not all of them, is limited to 14 credits (4 sections at 3.5 credits per section), below

the 15 credit threshold for full-time status, and they point out that there is currently no recognition for service, which could be considered 1 more hour and move their work to full-time status. They also echoed concerns of the writing faculty about the 33 student enrollment limit in 200-level writing classes, which because they are doing much of the teaching of these courses places the burden of working with large numbers of students directly on them. We firmly believe that this issue must be addressed before the adoption of a second required writing course in the new university core, because we assume that the responsibility for teaching these courses will fall on NTTs, both those currently on staff and additional people who we assume will have to be hired to cover the new demand created by this requirement.

- f. While we understand that the State of Montana mandates that offices be open from 8-5 each day, this is simply not always possible with only 1.5 staff members. We understand that a request has been made for “floaters” from the Dean’s office to fill the gap when Mandy Hansen is not in the office, but these have not been available. The department would certainly benefit from additional staff support.

### **Recommendations:**

We offer the following recommendations, based on our reading of the self-study, conversations during our visit, and, for the two external reviewers, our experiences as administrators in our own universities and evaluators of programs at other institutions. In setting out these recommendations, we acknowledge that some of them require financial investments, but we have been told that at least in the university as a whole, recent growth of enrollments have increased resources available for strategic investments in teaching and research. Each of these recommendations will contribute to the future strength of the Department of English and by extension the College of Letters and Science and the University as a whole.

1. Faculty Recruitment: We recognize two priorities for faculty recruitment in the near term: English Education and Writing. A new position in English Education has been approved, and given both the current workload of the two faculty in English Education and the proposed creation of the M.A.E.E., that position is vital. In Writing, the increasing demand for WRIT 221 and other technical and professional writing courses warrants prioritizing the hiring of a faculty member with that specialization. We would hope that this new person would be able to devote all of her or his time to teaching and research and not have to assume administrative responsibilities, as is currently the situation for all other writing faculty.

Future recruitment in Literary Studies is more complicated. As the faculty in that area pointed out, this area has the largest number of faculty and teaches the largest number



of courses. They have added new courses to the core, which could result in additional student enrollment. However, the number of majors in the literature option has decreased and the number of applicants to the M.A. program has seen a slight decline in recent years. For that reason, we do not recommend that hiring in literary studies be among the highest priorities for near-term hiring. We hope, however, that new courses and a reconsideration of the curriculum of both the literature option and the M.A. results in increased demand for literature courses that would warrant additional hiring in the future.

2. Administration of the Writing Program: In several places in this report, we have alluded to the need to address the position of Director of Composition. Ultimately, we conclude that the work involved in this position warrants additional released time as well as a month of summer pay. We suggest that the chair and the current director develop an arrangement that is comparable to that of the Director of the Writing Center and formalize the arrangement with a contract.
3. Provide support for the DGS in the form of one course release per year so that she is able to fully engage in graduate advising, recruitment, and program development. We also assume that the proposed M.A.E.E. will require additional attention from the Director of Graduate Studies.
4. Review working conditions, including work load, pay/stipends/tuition waivers, for NTTs and GTAs. We understand that both groups have become unionized fairly recently and operate under a collective bargaining agreement, so we do not know what is possible in regards to these issues, but we hope that the assessments of both of these valuable contributors to the life of the department presented earlier in this report suggest specific areas for review. An important component of this review should be the reduction of the maximum course sizes for writing classes. As noted previously in this report and in the last external review report, writing classes with more than 25 students (and ideally no more than 20), rob students of an appropriate learning environment and place an exceptionally heavy burden on instructors.
5. Continue the consideration of the proposal for the M.A.E.E. We recognize that this new degree program has potential to benefit 5-16 teachers across the state of Montana and potentially beyond. It is certainly consistent with the land-grant mission of Montana State University and fits very well with the already excellent Yellowstone Writing Project.
6. Maintain support for the Yellowstone Writing Project. As our last recommendation notes, the Yellowstone Writing Project has the potential to play a role in the proposed M.A.E.E. Its future, however, should not be linked to that new degree program because it has an outstanding history on its own, benefiting teachers who participate directly, teachers who learn from the participants, and the students who learn from all of those teachers. It should be a source of pride for MSU, well worth the very small cost of continuing it.

7. Address technology issues. We were heartened to hear during our meeting with Provost Potvin that resources exist to address limitations of current technology. We urge Professor Branch and Dean Rae to consult with the Provost to learn more about how the Office of the Provost can assist. It is especially important that the Writing Center's technology needs be addressed as soon as possible.

### **Opportunities & Conclusion:**

We were impressed by the quality of the faculty, the strong leadership, and the energy and success of program development in the department. Our impressions in this regard were confirmed in conversations with (especially) undergraduate students and NTT faculty. Even where scarce resources and limited opportunities bring frustration, both TT and NTT faculty (including GTAs) demonstrate deep commitment to their students and to the success of the department as a whole.

The Department has exceptionally strong potential in the area of rural and community literacy outreach, where it is poised to achieve national recognition. With the right level of investment, the Yellowstone Writing Project will continue to transform classrooms across the state; the English Education faculty has secured external funding in the form of a \$50,000 Spencer grant to fund a research project on rural literacy; English Education undergraduates are doing pre-service mentoring work in area high schools and integrating theory and research with hands-on experiences in the schools where they are placed; and the recently proposed M.A.E.E., once it has been more fully fleshed out and issues like those we have pointed out have been resolved, will offer a graduate program for Montana teachers that is unique to the region and could become a national model. Writing and Literature faculty and students are also engaged in outreach activities, including e.g. poetry slams, and a course focused on the longstanding Montana Shakespeare in the Parks program, which takes Shakespeare's plays to underserved rural areas. All of these undertakings are consistent with the obligations of a land grant institution. Yet at the same time they feed directly and powerfully into both faculty and student research.

The Department also serves large numbers of students and programs across the University through its Core Writing Program and through the Writing Center. The appointment of a faculty member in technical writing will extend this reach even further, as will the improved technologizing of classroom spaces.

Despite its relatively small size, then, the Department is doing an exceptional job of teaching, guiding, and advising students within and beyond its majors, at the same time that it is developing a national profile through outreach projects integral to the land-grant institutional mission. We enjoyed our visit, and congratulate the faculty, staff, and students on the high quality of learning, research, and service within and beyond the University that characterizes their unit as a whole. We are confident that department members are having the right

conversations about the future of their programs as MSU English continues to build to its considerable and emerging strengths.

**Itinerary for External Review, Department of English, Montana State University, May 2016**

| <b>Day / Time</b>             | <b>Event</b>  | <b>Location</b>  |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------|
| <b>Tuesday, May 3, 2016</b>   |   |                  |
| 1:08 pm                       | Arrive at Bozeman Yellowstone International Airport   |                  |
| 2:00 pm                       | Entrance interview with Kirk Branch, Associate Dean<br>Bridget Kevane and Associate Provost Ron Larsen          | Wilson 2-288     |
| 2:30 pm                       | Meeting with Chair's Executive Committee  | Wilson 2-288     |
| 3:30 pm                       | Meeting with Robert Petrone, Teaching Option<br>Coordinator and Allison Wynhoff Olsen                           | Wilson 2-288     |
| 4:00 pm                       | Meeting with Susan Kollin, Director of Graduate Studies<br>and Kate Ryan, incoming Director of Graduate Studies | Wilson 2-288     |
| 4:30 pm                       | Meeting with Michelle Miley, Writing Center Director<br>and staff   | Writing Center   |
| 5:00 pm                       | Meeting with graduate students  | Writing Center   |
| 7:00 pm                       | Dinner with Kate Ryan, Michelle Miley, Doug Downs,<br>and Zachary Bean  | TBD              |
| <b>Wednesday, May 4, 2016</b> |   |                  |
| 7:15 am                       | Breakfast with Kirk Branch  | TBD              |
| 8:30 am                       | Meeting with English office staff, Mandy Hansen and<br>Teresa Klusmann  | Wilson 2-288     |
| 9:00 am                       | Meeting with non-tenure track faculty   | Wilson 2-288     |
| 10:00 am                      | Meeting with Provost Martha Potvin  | 212 Montana Hall |
| 10:30 am                      | Meeting with Gretchen Minton, Literature Option<br>Coordinator and Literature faculty                           | Wilson 2-288     |
| 11:00 am                      | Break   | Wilson 2-288     |
| 11:45 am                      | Meeting with Dean Nicol Rae, Dean of the College of<br>Letters and Science and Associate Dean David Cherry      | Wilson 2-288     |
| 12:15 pm                      | Working lunch with Kirk Branch and Allison Wynhoff<br>Olsen, Co-Directors of the Yellowstone Writing Project    | Wilson 2-288     |
| 1:00 pm                       | Meeting with Mark Young, Associate Vice President of<br>Research and Economic Development                       | Wilson 2-288     |
| 1:30 pm                       | Meeting with undergraduate students   | Wilson 2-288     |

|         |  |              |
|---------|--|--------------|
| 2:30 pm | Meeting with tenure track faculty  | Wilson 2-257 |
| 3:30 pm | Meeting with Dr. Karlene Hoo, Dean of the Graduate School                  | Wilson 2-288 |
| 4:00 pm | Exit interview with Kirk Branch, Dean Rae and Associate Provost Ron Larsen | Wilson 2-288 |
| 7:00 pm | Dinner with Kirk Branch, Gretchen Minton and Linda Karell                  | 14 North     |

---

**Thursday, May 5, 2016**

---

Checkout of hotel

7:06 am Depart Bozeman Yellowstone International Airport on UA 491

**Montana University System**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW**

Institution: **Montana State University**

---

Program Years: **2015-16**

---

**List of the programs reviewed:**

- Military Science Minor

Note: While only the Minor in Military Science is under review, we took this opportunity to review the ROTC programs at Montana State University.

---

**Decision(s) concerning the future of the program(s), based on the program review criteria established at the campus:**

The ROTC units were found to be doing well and contributing to academic life on the MSU campus. The Minor in Military Science will be retained.

---

**Rationale or justification for the decision based on the program review process established at the campus. Include graduation numbers and student majors for each of the last seven (7) years for every program under review.**

Each ROTC unit operates under a written agreement with Montana State University. The number of students enrolled in the ROTC programs range from 50 to 75 for Air Force ROTC, and 85 to 100 for Army ROTC. Retention and graduation rates for cadets are significantly higher than the university average. The complete assessment report is attached.

The Military Science Minor is not taken by a lot of students, but in the past the opportunity to take the minor has not been communicated to the cadets. In the past two years this communication has increased, and there has been an increase in the number of minors awarded. We anticipate that this will continue.

| <b>Enrollment</b> | <b>2009-10</b> | <b>2010-11</b> | <b>2011-12</b> | <b>2012-13</b> | <b>2013-14</b> | <b>2014-15</b> | <b>2015-16</b> |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Army ROTC         |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |
| Fall Semester     | 90             | 99             | 93             | 95             | 91             | 84             | 85             |
| Air Force ROTC    |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |
| Fall Semester*    | 56             | 60             | 73             | 72             | 71             | 48             | 75             |
| Spring Semester   | 49             | 51             | 62             | 63             | 64             | 44             | 60             |

\* Estimate

| <b>Minors Awarded</b> | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                       | 2           | 1           | 2           | 0           | 2           | 3           | 4           |

Attachment: Military Science Internal Reviewers' Report

July 13, 2016

TO: Dr Ron Larsen, Associate Provost

RE: Internal Program Review for the Minor in Military Studies

**Members of Review Committee**

Daniel Miller, Professor, Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering

Mike Shaw, Associate Teaching Professor, Jake Jabs College of Business and Entrepreneurship

**Mechanical and  
Industrial Engineering**

**Process**

The program review for the Minor in Military Studies was conducted through examination of appropriate materials followed by an onsite visit with the two departments offering the minor. This minor is part of the Army ROTC Military Leadership Studies and Air Force ROTC Military Aerospace Studies programs. A detailed self-study was not required as each program had recently successfully completed an appropriate review and inspection from their respective services (May 2016 Army ROTC, October 2015 Air Force ROTC). On July 11, 2016, the review committee interviewed Lt Col Hugh, USA (Professor of Military Studies) and Lt Col Weide, USAF (Professor of Aerospace Studies). They are the site commanders for their respective ROTC units.

**Scope of the Review**

While the review is for the Minor in Military Studies, a natural discussion on each ROTC program did arise during the site visit. The Army ROTC program produces commissioned officers for the US Army. The course requirements, outcomes, syllabi and objectives for the Military Science Program are developed by the Director of Leadership and Education and provided to the local unit. The Air Force ROTC program produces quality leaders for the Air Force through an officer commissioning program. The course requirements, outcomes, syllabi and objectives for the Military Aerospace Program are developed by Air University and provided to the local unit. Since each of these well-established programs participate in extensive curricular review through their respective services, they were not reviewed here. Rather, they provide the framework and context to offer the Minor in Military Studies. Students from either program may receive the minor by taking an additional upper division (300 or 400 level) course from the other program. This course is in addition to the respective program requirements which also must be met for the minor. As the upper division courses are only available to DoD contracted cadets, this minor is essentially available to ROTC students only.

**Assessments**

Academic Programs: Each ROTC unit operates under a written agreement with Montana State University (AFROTC 1992, Army ROTC 1992; each signed

by MSU President Malone). The Minor in Military Studies is essentially a select collection of military related courses that are developed and maintained by the respective services. These course selections give students an in-depth treatment from a single service as well as an upper division course enhancing joint (multi-service) exposure. From a DoD perspective, this is deemed very positive as future Air Force and Army officers receive enhanced exposure to a sister service that they will inevitably encounter in a military career. The minor is very relevant to the military profession and the MSU program is deemed of high quality. The coursework is kept up to date by each service and the minor provides a nice package for students interested in broader military study and application.

Department Productivity: The following is a summary of enrollments for each ROTC program. These data are given for reference only to show that each ROTC program is active and vibrant. The Minor in Military Studies is available to these students.

Table 1: Air Force ROTC Program Enrollment (by class and totals):

| AY    | Freshmen<br>Fall<br>Semester<br>(Estimate) | Freshmen<br>Spring | Sophomore<br>Spring | Junior<br>Spring | Senior<br>Spring | 5 <sup>th</sup> Year<br>or<br>Special<br>Students | Fall Total<br>Cadet<br>Enrollment<br>(Estimate) | Spring<br>Total<br>Cadet<br>Enrollment |
|-------|--|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|---|---|--|
| 09-10 | 25   | 18                 | 7                   | 10               | 9                | 5   | 56  | 49                                     |
| 10-11 | 34   | 25                 | 12                  | 3                | 7                | 4   | 60  | 51                                     |
| 11-12 | 41   | 30                 | 17                  | 8                | 4                | 3   | 73  | 62                                     |
| 12-13 | 33   | 24                 | 18                  | 8                | 7                | 6   | 72  | 63                                     |
| 13-14 | 28   | 21                 | 16                  | 14               | 8                | 5   | 71  | 64                                     |
| 14-15 | 16   | 12                 | 10                  | 9                | 12               | 1   | 48  | 44                                     |
| 15-16 | 43   | 28                 | 9                   | 8                | 9                | 6   | 75  | 60                                     |



Table 2: Army ROTC Program Fall Enrollment (all classes)

|           |    |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2009 | 90 |
| Fall 2010 | 99 |
| Fall 2011 | 93 |
| Fall 2012 | 95 |
| Fall 2013 | 91 |
| Fall 2014 | 84 |
| Fall 2015 | 85 |

The number of students that have received the Minor in Military Studies, a subset of the program students numbered above, are given in Table 3. While the numbers are not large (although they appear to be growing in recent years), Lt Col Hugh and Lt Col Weide surmised that the low numbers could be due to the high percentage of STEM majors in their programs that don't have much flexibility for the additional course work required.

Table 3: Number of students receiving the Minor in Military Studies by year

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2009 | 2 |
| 2010 | 1 |
| 2011 | 2 |
| 2012 | 0 |
| 2013 | 2 |
| 2014 | 3 |
| 2015 | 4 |

**Alignment with Core Themes and Instructional Priorities:** The Minor in Military Studies is very well aligned with each organization's goal of producing high quality professional military officers. Each program can adjust supporting the end strength goals of each service. The minor enhances the military education and training for cadets that decide to participate.

**Strengths**

- Ability to flex output capacity to meet national defense needs
- Graduation rates in excess of University average
- Significant scholarship participation with >95% retention rate
- Broad community service, outreach and support through numerous venues and functions
- Majority of cadets from STEM fields

**Challenges**

- AF ROTC: Nursing students that don't get placed in Bozeman for clinical cannot complete AF ROTC

- AF ROTC: unit manned at 80%
- Army ROTC: none identified

**Opportunities**

- The minor could benefit from additional visibility to cadets. For example, the minor is only referenced in the Army ROTC section of the MSU catalogue yet it is available for AF ROTC students also (only 2 Air Force students have received the minor since 2009).

The Army and Air Force ROTC programs continue to produce outstanding officers for the defense of our nation. Their contributions also highlight MSU's impact in the same field. The Minor in Military Studies is an excellent option for cadets to expand their education and professional preparation for the military career.



Daniel A Miller, PhD  
Professor and Department Head



Mike Shaw, EdD  
Associate Teaching Professor