

**Insufficient Evidence**

Insufficient Evidence

Average: **7.000**

Range: **1.050**

Reviewer	Alignment		Demand		Productivity		Quality		Efficiency		Opportunity		Total
	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	
Reviewer: 1	7	1.4	7	1.05	6	1.2	7	1.4	6	0.6	6	0.9	6.55
Reviewer: 2	6	1.2	5	0.75	8	1.6	6	1.2	9	0.9	8	1.2	6.85
Reviewer: 3	8	1.6	7	1.05	8	1.6	8	1.6	7	0.7	7	1.05	7.6

**1. ALIGNMENT**

**Reviewer: 1** Score: **7** Weighted Score: **1.4**

**Strengths:** - The program engages students across all four points of UM2020 of leadership, engagement, sustainability and diversity.  
 - WGSS program offers the only major and grad program in MUS system related to Women Studies.  
 - The program encourage students to be interdisciplinary in their approach

**Weaknesses:** none apparent

**Reviewer: 2** Score: **6** Weighted Score: **1.2**

**Strengths:** 1) demonstrates its strong connections to the UM 2020 Strategic Plan across the areas of leadership, sustainability, engagement, and diversity.  
 2) program demonstrates strong ties to local organizations (via internships and other working relationships), and contributions to programs like GLI and issues such as sexual assault on college campuses.  
 3) cites student exit interviews and scholarly articles to emphasize the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to solving social and cultural challenges in the 21st century. The program focuses on its ability to address critical problems such as LGBT+ rights, homelessness, and sexual violence by teaching students to acquire different perspectives and lenses to understand our changing world.

**Weaknesses:** 1) does not explain how it educates students in half of the 2020 plan areas (leadership and sustainability).  
 2) does not address how a reduction of resources would prevent the university from achieving its mission.

**Reviewer: 3** Score: **8** Weighted Score: **1.6**

**Strengths:** Program clearly aligns with key components of UM 2020.  
 Importance in supporting campus groups like SARC and efforts like DiverseU.  
 Interdisciplinary nature allows different academic approaches to be unified into a cohesive academic program.  
 Program is unique within MUS.

**Weaknesses:** Connections to workforce needs is somewhat opaque. Program makes a strong case for why it is good for the student as an individual, but connection to working world is less clear.

**2. Demand**

**Insufficient Evidence**

<b>Reviewer: 1</b>	<b>Score:</b> 7	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.05
<b>Strengths:</b>	- Program is naturally interdependent and focused on depending classes offered in other programs/departments to exist. - Students and faculty are involved in student groups and civic groups across UM and Missoula.	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	- Author conflates data between UG and G courses and students so a little confusing.	
<b>Reviewer: 2</b>	<b>Score:</b> 5	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 0.75
<b>Strengths:</b>	1) top quintile for SCH for GE courses per instructional FTE and also ranks in quintile 5 for the ratio of non-majors to total– this is likely due to 100% rates for FY13-FY15. 2) strong tie to other programs due to its interdisciplinary curriculum, which requires students to take courses in the following areas: humanities, social sciences, and the arts. 3) core curriculum for this program is taught by a variety of faculty from across campus in different departments. The program explains that reductions would result in lost classroom presence from its interdisciplinary students, as well as a loss of programming in response to sexual assault.	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	1) program ranks in the second lowest quintile for SCH for Gen-Ed courses (at an average of 330) but does show increasing numbers in SCH for GE courses in the most recent years (2016=549 and 2017=462). 2) No financial impacts or core courses in other majors are listed as detriments to reducing resources to the program. 3) Many claims go unquantified in this section.	
<b>Reviewer: 3</b>	<b>Score:</b> 7	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.05
<b>Strengths:</b>	Retreats creating a unified academic program across units seems effective. The article generated from those retreats demonstrates their benefit on faculty research. The self-starter nature of the unit clearly inspires faculty affiliated with the program.	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	Although the program is relatively new, it remains fairly small in terms of minors and majors.	

**3. Productivity**

<b>Reviewer: 1</b>	<b>Score:</b> 6	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.2
<b>Strengths:</b>	- The faculty affiliated with WGSS are very scholastically active and publishing large amounts of papers. - WGSS professors are involved in a wide range campus activities and clubs that represent gender, sexuality and equality.	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	Not apparent	

**Insufficient Evidence**

<b>Reviewer: 2</b>		<b>Score:</b> 8	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.6
<b>Strengths:</b>	<p>1) data shows that 23 students majored in WGSS in FY16, and that number more than doubled in FY17.</p> <p>2) ranks in the second highest quintile for number of minors, at an average of 9 awarded per year (though it notes in the comments that its records show at least 15 minors awarded for the entire timeline).</p> <p>3) top quintile for 5YA of student FTE to instructional FTE ratio at an average of 29.7.</p> <p>4) research output is not a part of its only faculty member's assigned duties, but lists its extensive contributions to research that far exceed its set benchmark of "no research required". Some of these research initiatives and achievements include: six major publications (1 book, 5 articles), 31 presentations at national/regional conferences and symposia, hosting an annual writing retreat, and strong productivity from tenured affiliated faculty.</p> <p>5) some of the achievements made towards service include: university committee service, academic press/journal reviews, law enforcement consulting, DiverseU and public lectures across the region.</p> <p>6) program lists and quantifies its extensive instructional achievements, such as high numbers of internships, graduate certificates offered (average of 10-12 per year), number of independent study courses offered (average of 8 per year) by director, and contributions to graduate committees across other disciplines.</p>		
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	<p>1) lists a graduation rate of 3 students in FY16 and FY17 (though the comments show a record of 12 B.A. graduates in 2017).</p> <p>2) does not site service and outreach components of its mission.</p> <p>3) achievements are not quantified.</p>		
<b>Reviewer: 3</b>		<b>Score:</b> 8	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.6
<b>Strengths:</b>	<p>Program clearly attracts faculty with strong academic and publishing backgrounds.</p> <p>Student internships, academic achievements after graduation and feedback seems impressive.</p> <p>Impact of the program on the response to the sexual assault crisis is impressive.</p>		
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	<p>Program claims publication output of all faculty associated with WGSS. Unclear if all publication output is in the area of WGSS or fueled by the program.</p> <p>Unclear why the unit must produce so many independent study. Is this something the unit cannot address through courses on the books.</p>		
<b>4. QUALITY</b>			
<b>Reviewer: 1</b>		<b>Score:</b> 7	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.4
<b>Strengths:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Professors involved are some of the most accomplished and wildly acclaimed for its research and scholastic work.</li> <li>- Received positive feedback from students and outside evaluators.</li> <li>- Its alums are involved in many leading civic groups contributing to leadership.</li> </ul>		
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to have full time staff to constantly manage quality control of WGSS output.</li> </ul>		

**Insufficient Evidence**

<b>Reviewer: 2</b>	<b>Score:</b> 6	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.2
<b>Strengths:</b>	<p>1) Due to its status as a new official major, the program has excessively strong time to degree and retention rates (4.3 years and 100% respectively).</p> <p>2) program lists the number of graduates who attended graduate/professional school after receiving their degree (16) and lists a few local and state organizations (such as EmpowerMT, Planned Parenthood, and Open Aid Alliance) where graduates have found jobs.</p> <p>3) lists several awards and recognitions for its faculty, including a regents professorship.</p> <p>4) received a glowing review from an outside evaluator from the National Women's Studies Association.</p>	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	<p>1) program does not go into much detail on student assessment, test scores, or alumni surveys and instead focuses on faculty quality instead of student outcomes.</p> <p>2) does not address faculty outcomes for scholarship or performance and provides no comparisons to peers</p>	
<b>Reviewer: 3</b>	<b>Score:</b> 8	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.6
<b>Strengths:</b>	<p>External participation in the development and assessment of the program is impressive and critical given its lack of a clear academic home.</p> <p>Faculty that participate in some level of WGSS are clearly qualified, well-respected academics.</p>	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	<p>The structure makes it difficult to separate the quality of the component parts -- teachers, internships, etc. -- from the quality of the WGSS program itself.</p> <p>Anecdotal reviews of faculty are less illustrative of the entire program.</p> <p>The program itself does not generate much of its own scholarship (as with most interdisciplinary programs)</p>	

**5. EFFICIENCY**

<b>Reviewer: 1</b>	<b>Score:</b> 6	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 0.6
<b>Strengths:</b>	<p>- WGSS does not have a large staff and often have to share secretarial resources with other department. Despite all this, it has successfully recruited students for major and provide a world class education.</p> <p>- WGSS undergoing a reduction of budget so busy juggling and adjusting to new budgetary environment.</p>	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	- Not apparent	
<b>Reviewer: 2</b>	<b>Score:</b> 9	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 0.9
<b>Strengths:</b>	<p>1) top quintile for SCH per instructional FTE with an average of 890.9 per year).</p> <p>2) The program has received cuts to instructional funding as well as cuts to its administrative position and has reduced its budget to a very small level (under \$100k).</p> <p>3) its one non-TT faculty member teaches six courses per year, advises all students in the program, and completes all other administrative work.</p> <p>4) expanded its curriculum and enrollment over the past five years despite a reduction of resources, and shares its only administrative assistant with two other departments.</p> <p>5) decided to offer internships to students to run the office, and they complete many of the duties of an administrative associate.</p>	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	None found in this criterion.	

**Insufficient Evidence**

<b>Reviewer: 3</b>	<b>Score:</b> 7	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 0.7
<b>Strengths:</b>	The program has maintained much of its integrity while suffering a series of difficult blows. The program seems to highlight the challenge of interdisciplinary programs in a time of budget cuts as it has been squeezed for resources. There seems little more that could be asked from a program operating with as few institutional resources.	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	Administrative centralization has hurt the program -- which seems likely -- but it is unclear how. How many hours is the office open? Has there been specific feedback from students or faculty. Although I am sure it is difficult, what services are being left behind remains unclear.	

**6. OPPORTUNITY**

<b>Reviewer: 1</b>	<b>Score:</b> 6	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 0.9
<b>Strengths:</b>	- WGSS has opportunity to become a model for multi-disciplinary , problem solving based initiative for students. - WGSS is proposing to a budget neutral interdisciplinary recruitment and outreach with native American community.	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	not apparent	

<b>Reviewer: 2</b>	<b>Score:</b> 8	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.2
<b>Strengths:</b>	1) strong ties to the new strategic vision document in the areas of engaging students where they are, investing in people, partnering with place, reinventing the heart of the curriculum, and fostering knowledge creation and innovation. 2) program argues that its strong interdisciplinary and diversity focused curriculum could serve as a model for other programs who want to create a problem-solving based learning curriculum. 3) suggests the creation of a cost-neutral Interdisciplinary Recruitment and Outreach Committee between WGSS, African American Studies, and Native American Studies to effectively reach out to and attract prospective students in these areas. 4) program offers the suggestion to add a faculty line to ensure program stability, and allow the program to reopen violence prevention efforts that it had previously engaged in when resources were available.	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	1) none of these connections to the new strategic vision are quantified with numerical data. 2) program is already serving statewide needs as the only program of its kind in Montana, but does not offer any additional explanation of this statewide need.	

<b>Reviewer: 3</b>	<b>Score:</b> 7	<b>Weighted Score:</b> 1.05
<b>Strengths:</b>	Program does serve as a potential model for how to redesign the curriculum as well as what interdisciplinary learning can look like. Obviously, the program could do more, with resources, to address the ongoing sexual assault awareness efforts and education. Developing a recruitment strategy with other interdisciplinary programs makes sense and could be expanded to other efforts like GLI, etc.	
<b>Weaknesses:</b>	Seeks to demonstrate that the program does all the major goals of the new strategic plan, which leaves it shallow at parts to show how it fulfills this. Unclear how a faculty line would help bolster the program. Obviously, it would add stability, but wouldn't more support for additional faculty to teach within the structure bolster the program more? Not explained in the narrative.	