

Consider for Development and/or Modification

Ranking Category:	Priority for Development and Growth:	0
	Consider for Development and/or Modification:	16
	Priority for Substantial Modification:	0
Total Count:		16

Average: **5.450**

Range: **4.150**

Reviewer	Alignment		Demand		Productivity		Quality		Efficiency		Opportunity		Total
	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	Score	Weight	
Reviewer: 1	2	0.4	5	0.75	3	0.6	4	0.8	4	0.4	3	0.45	3.4
Reviewer: 3	8	1.6	8	1.2	8	1.6	7	1.4	7	0.7	7	1.05	7.55
Reviewer: 2	6	1.2	6	0.9	6	1.2	6	1.2	3	0.3	4	0.6	5.4

1. ALIGNMENT

Reviewer: 1 **Score:** 2 **Weighted Score:** 0.4

Strengths: The English program teaches diverse courses, the department chair is a former President of the National Council of Teachers of English. Other faculty were also mentioned as being leaders in there field.

Weaknesses: Did not demonstrate how reducing the department would negatively influence the institution or how the department is well aligned with the institutions mission. Rather the author suggests that UM should be aligned with the English departments mission.

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

Strengths:

- Course offerings and areas of inquiry align to areas of Diversity, Sustainability.
- English teaching program serves a great number of students in K-12 preparatory areas.

Weaknesses:

- Leadership and engagement are not directly addressed beyond faculty contributions through service and research but do not directly address how students are educated in these areas. They speak to the importance of the skills and modes of thinking that an education in literature and English foster, but do not demonstrate specifically how their program, as structure currently, prepares students for 21st century workforce.

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

Strengths:

- Fourth largest program in the College of Humanities and Sciences
- Teaches a large number of students in GenEd
- Diversity in course offerings
- 240 students pursuing a BA in English

Weaknesses: -None seen

2. Demand

Consider for Development and/or Modification

Reviewer: 1	Score: 5	Weighted Score: 0.75
Strengths:	In FY 17 English had 28.7 contract faculty for 240 majors and SCH of 7,803 and total general funds budget of 3.6 mil. The amount of money spent per major and credit hour is higher for English than all other departments this reader reviewed. That said, there is clearly a demand for general education courses, as an example all UM students are required to take ENG 101. Based on the SCH, reductions to the majors General Education offerings would negatively impact the institution.	
Weaknesses:	The impact of reductions on other majors was not discussed, just the impact on general education. Further it was discuss that the time to degree for students across the university would be impacted by cuts to English as it would directly impact general education requirements. If funding was reduced it was not clear why English would have to make cuts to the General Ed areas, especially since it expressed as being the institutions greatest need.	
Reviewer: 2	Score: 6	Weighted Score: 0.9
Strengths:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong contribution to General Education and non-majors across campus. They saw seeing an increase in numbers until resources to support sections declined. • They are intrinsically linked to majors throughout humanities and sciences, and are creating unique collaborations with professional and research programs in other colleges. • They have made reductions to the credit load in their majors and minors to encourage double-majors and minors. 	
Weaknesses:	• The link, vitality of other programs in the Department of English, especially the embedded BA options outside of General UG Literature could be better established.	
Reviewer: 3	Score: 8	Weighted Score: 1.2
Strengths:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Significant contribution to Gen Ed, especially for non majors -Collaborates with a number of other departments -Revised curriculum to make it easier for students to take on a double major or minor in English -Provides numerous Honors courses 	
Weaknesses:	-None seen	
3. Productivity		
Reviewer: 1	Score: 3	Weighted Score: 0.6
Strengths:	English faculty have published 13 books, co-authored 3, writing 64 articles, 61 poems, 17 short stories, and been nationally recognized. English faculty are on multiple campus committees, and are active in national associations. The film studies program supports community films, and local festivals, English faculty lead the Montana Writing Project that supports writing teachers across the state.	
Weaknesses:	Departmental Productivity as it relates to the department resources was not discussed.	
Reviewer: 2	Score: 6	Weighted Score: 1.2
Strengths:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have strong numbers of majors and degrees awarded. • The number of minors are low and completion even lower but they have already taken action to remedy this and offer a good solution. • Strong examples of community outreach. 	
Weaknesses:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research/creative scholarship numbers look impressive but are hard to measure. • Would like to better understand the various options and their contribution to the undergraduate program. Do they consume distinct resources? 	

Consider for Development and/or Modification

Reviewer: 3	Score: 8	Weighted Score: 1.6
Strengths: -A number of publications among faculty -National conference, Thinking its Presence, organized by faculty member -Faculty serves on a wide range of committees		
Weaknesses: -None seen		

4. QUALITY

Reviewer: 1	Score: 4	Weighted Score: 0.8
Strengths: Evidence of student outcomes is provided directly to students in terms of there grades and written responses to assignments. Creative Writing Faculty are well published and award winning, publications such as The New Yorker, The Paris Review, and the New York Times Book Review were mentioned..		
Weaknesses: English has not gathered information about what there majors do after they graduate,		

Reviewer: 2	Score: 6	Weighted Score: 1.2
Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Assessment of students in the program. •This answer better explains the scholarly output of the faculty. 		
Weaknesses: Poor tracking of alumni outcomes outside of English Teaching		

Reviewer: 3	Score: 7	Weighted Score: 1.4
Strengths: -Prestigious awards among faculty -Highly visible publications with major publishers		
Weaknesses: -Five year average time to degree -Lack of statistical data on alumni employment		

5. EFFICIENCY

Reviewer: 1	Score: 4	Weighted Score: 0.4
Strengths: The 5YA of SCH for all undergraduate courses per T/TT faculty FTE, is in the third quintile. The department employs 31 grad TA's to teach courses- it was mentioned as a efficiency as those TA's are paid so poorly. English has revised their curriculum and reduced credits for majors in an effort to make it easier for students to double major.		
Weaknesses: The 5YA of SCH for all undergraduate courses per instructional FTE, is in the first quintile.		

Reviewer: 2	Score: 3	Weighted Score: 0.3
Strengths: •They are open to interdisciplinary interactions to fill gaps in the curriculum caused by faculty attrition. Faculty are creating opportunities to expand offerings for distance students.		
Weaknesses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Low SCH to instructional faculty. •A great number of losses have taken place, and they speak to the breadth of the curriculum they need to deliver, but more specifics on content of that breadth needed to maintain the program would be value. •Would like to know more about the make-up of the instructional faculty versus the T/TT faculty. Why is that distribution of instructional personnel necessary? 		

Consider for Development and/or Modification

Reviewer: 3	Score: <input type="text" value="7"/>	Weighted Score: <input type="text" value="0.7"/>
Strengths:	-Has decreased number of faculty in recent years -Added more adjunct professors	
Weaknesses:	-Can English Department create any additional revenue by others means such as grants, events or conferences?	
6. OPPORTUNITY		
Reviewer: 1	Score: <input type="text" value="3"/>	Weighted Score: <input type="text" value="0.45"/>
Strengths:	Creative Writing program has connections with the Media Arts program that could surely be expanded. The new Literature and the Environment program was stated to be especially promising and it was created at zero cost to the institution. If resources were provided it is stated that the program would flourish.	
Weaknesses:	No metrics provided on how more resources would impact students, and provide significant opportunity.	
Reviewer: 2	Score: <input type="text" value="4"/>	Weighted Score: <input type="text" value="0.6"/>
Strengths:	• There is a stated openness to interdisciplinary work.	
Weaknesses:	• More specifics beyond literature and the environment would be useful. The option is new but the reported numbers are low. Currently only 5 students enrolled according to the centralized data.	
Reviewer: 3	Score: <input type="text" value="7"/>	Weighted Score: <input type="text" value="1.05"/>
Strengths:	-Potential growth in Literature and The Environment Program	
Weaknesses:	-Could have provided additional examples for Opportunity	