To: Faculty Senate  
Curriculum and Programs Committee (CPC)

From: Academic Program Working Group (APWG)  
Mark Greenwood, Doug Downs, Bill Brown, Kirsten Ostergaard  
Michael Babcock (Chair)

Date: October 9, 2015

Re: Level II proposals for a Bachelor’s Degree Program in Hospitality Management, and an Associate Degree in Culinary Arts.

Overview:

The revised proposal from the College of Education, Health, and Human Development (EHHD) is for the creation of a Hospitality Management Degree that would include options in Restaurant Management: Farm to Table, Lodge Management & Rural Tourism, Food Enterprise, and Sports & Recreation Administration. This request is linked to a proposal from Gallatin College that plans to offer a two-year Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree in Culinary Arts.

Each of the four Hospitality Management Degree options are designed to require 120 credits with coursework in areas of business management, hospitality (lodging, tourism, food, and recreation), and internships. One noteworthy feature of the curriculum is that students can complete the degree in six academic year semesters and three summer sessions. Thus, the program can be completed in three years.

The Culinary Arts program will train students for culinary and food service positions in the food services industry. The curriculum consists of 60 credits. The AAS program includes Kitchen Garden Management field work and/or an internship that is planned for the summer. Of the 20 courses to be offered, 16 are currently offered in the MUS system and 4 will be unique new offerings and 8 will be shared courses with the Bachelor’s Degree in Hospitality Management.

History: The Culinary Arts and Hospitality Management program proposals were initially reviewed by the Curriculum & Programs Committee (CPC) in October of 2014. The proposals were referred to the Academic Programs Working Group (APWG) for preliminary evaluation. A revised proposal was then submitted in November 2014, and APWG met with Dr. Alison Harmon.
and Dean Robert Hietala in January of 2015. More revisions were made, and the proposals were approved by the CPC.

Next, the proposals were forwarded to Faculty Senate for consideration. Faculty Senate discussed the proposals at several meetings with a final vote called on April 8th, 2015. The programs failed to receive a majority vote and were not endorsed by Faculty Senate.

Revised versions of the *Hospitality Management* and *Culinary Arts* proposals were submitted for consideration on October 1st 2015. The interval between the April 8th vote and the current revision represented extended and delayed discussions with the University of Montana about the program. The CPC approved the revised proposals and forward them to Faculty Senate on October 6th, 2015. The proposals were announced at the October 7th Faculty Senate meeting and materials posted on the website. Discussion and potential vote are planned for the October 14th meeting.

The previous APWG report (2/26/15) described several positive aspects and strengths of these proposals. They are presented below in *italic*. Additional positive features of the proposal generated by the current secondary APWG report are also note (not in italic).

1. Students who are seeking careers in culinary arts, restaurant or foodservice management, catering, or value-added agriculture would be served by a degree in Hospitality Management that integrates more business and management coursework and provides additional hands-on experience with developing and managing a foodservice or value-added enterprise.

2. Coordinating a Bachelor’s degree program in Hospitality Management with a Culinary Arts program offered by the Gallatin College will improve opportunities for students who might have discontinued their education with a two-year degree by creating a clear pathway to a BS.

3. The proposed Hospitality Management Program proposal builds on existing programs, most notably the SFBS degree program, the Montana Dietetic Internship (MDI), and Towne’s Harvest Garden (THG). A Hospitality Management Degree Program would also incorporate coursework currently offered in the College of Business, the Health and Human Development Department, the Agriculture Education Department, and the School of Architecture. The MSU and Gallatin College programs also propose to share several courses.

4. The proposed programs has many letters of support (posted on FS web site) from local high schools (2), Montana hotels/lodges (3), local food producers (2), MSU partners, Department of Commerce, Department of Agriculture, industry organizations (3), and a community development corporation. Many have offered to serve on the programs advisory board and a few said they could support internships.

5. Recent comments have been sent in to support the programs by MSU colleagues including 8 letters from EHHD, 2 from JJCBE, 1 from Gallatin College, and 1 from ASMSU.
6. With the growth in tourism in Montana and particularly in Gallatin Valley, the expected opening of 3 downtown hotels in Bozeman in next year, and growth in agritourism in Montana, training students for jobs in hospitality [management] would support Montana industry and help graduates get good paying jobs.

7. As stated in proposal, the skills sought by employers (job listings) in the local area predominantly include employee training, merchandising, cash register operation, repair, cooking, event catering, food safety and food service experience. These listings suggest that an Associate’s Degree in Culinary Arts should include business management content and skill development. Top job titles for graduates with culinary arts degrees include cook, store manager, and restaurant shift supervisor. “Regarding growth and decline in the demand for Associate’s Degree graduates with a Culinary Arts skills, the report states that the number of positions requiring a Culinary Arts Associate’s Degree declined 17.5% from 2010-2013, but that positions requesting either high school or an associate’s degree grew by 24.8% during the same period.”

8. While the proposed Culinary Arts degree at Gallatin College has significant overlap with Missoula’s Culinary Arts degree, this is not a conflict given the roles of the community colleges to serve the local communities.

9. Considerable thought was put into the coursework for the 4 BS options and the AAS, including common courses and distinctions between the proposed four BS options.

10. The University of Montana offers a BS in Parks, Tourism and Recreation Management which currently enrolls 100-120 students. A similar program here could potentially attract the same enrollment.

11. [New APWG input] The updated version of the proposal has eliminated the concept of housing the program in a new School. This change addressed a previous concern and reduced the investment of additional faculty/administrative lines.

12. [New APWG input] The proposals articulation of the bachelor’s degree as blending management education with content knowledge related to food, hospitality management, and recreation is valuable. The proposal is talking about degree now, instead of a school/department.

13. [New APWG input] It is obvious that the upper administration views this as a high priority program and will certainly support its success if established.

14. [New APWG input] A new letter has been submitted by representatives of the Montana hospitality management industry (State Tavern Owners and Restaurant Assoc.) supports the programs. It includes some data supporting the development of a Hospitality Management program.
The previous APWG report (2/26/15) presented concerns that are included below in italic. Some have been omitted from this report since the updated version no longer includes these item (i.e., certain number of FTEs). After submission of the previous APWG report, a written response was communicated by the sponsors of the proposals. These responses are also included to provide some context to changes made in the current version. Please note that some of the sponsor’s responses to the APWG report generated additional conversation at Faculty Senate meetings that is not included in this report. Please see Faculty Senate minutes for some of these comments. A summary of concerns raised by the current APWG members begins on page 10.

1. *The proposal is not in line with the Faculty Senate’s prioritization plan.* Adding 3 FTE TT and 1 FTE NTT MSU faculty at the cost of adding 3 FTE in MSU administration, as well as other major investments in program start-up and maintenance makes it harder to achieve a 18 to 1 student to faculty ratio within the constraints of MSU’s budget. While donations could be sought to fund the kitchen and hotel, the prioritization plan calls for a priority on fundraising for endowed chairs and student scholarships, not more infrastructure without faculty to support it. This program also does not boost our graduate program or research mission. The addition of more administration will exacerbate the problem of insufficient funding of our current departments.

[3/2/15 reply] Achieving an 18:1 student to faculty ratio doesn’t seem like a logical criterion for evaluating new programs. It is difficult to say whether these programs will move us in the direction or not. The need for new faculty to offer such programs has been well-considered, and included in the proposal such that we have adequate human resources to develop and offer an excellent program. The proposed program is in line with MSU’s strategic plan goals (see explanation on pages 12-13 in Version 11 of full proposal). Since the proposed BS degree program is integrated with both dietetics and SFBS, a graduate program is certainly in the realm of possibility, though we need to establish the undergraduate program first. There may be a misconception that hospitality faculty won’t be “research faculty”... New TT Faculty hired to develop and teach courses in the program will certainly have research appointments, which could certainly contribute to the research mission of MSU. Below is a listing of academic and professional societies and journals....

Travel & Tourism Research Association
http://www.ttra.com/

World Research Summit for Tourism and Hospitality
http://www.tourismandhospitalitysummit.com/

**Sampling of Academic Peer-Reviewed Journals:**
International Journal of Hospitality Management
http://www.journals.elsevier.com/international-journal-of-hospitality-management/
Journal of Foodservice Management and Education
http://fsmec.org/journal/
Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management
Journal of Sustainable Tourism
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rsus20#.VPD3IfnF81Q
Journal of Food Science
2. Reviews and approvals by departmental and/or college curriculum committee are required for new program and are also very helpful in assessing the appropriateness of the coursework development and the coursework requirements for each options. There is no report from or approval by any committees before the proposals were submitted to CPC. Such a review, particularly from the College of Business’ curriculum committee, would be very helpful in assessing the proposal.

[3/2/15 reply] Memos from each review curriculum committee and record of two email communications with College of Ag Dept Heads have been submitted to Randy Babbitt, including information from the following: Susan Dana for the JJCBE, Debby Haynes for HHD, and Tracy Dougher of Ag Education, John Sherwood (PSPP), Wendy Stock (Ag Econ/Econ).

3. While the curriculum seems to be well structured for the various BS options and AAS, the programs require 20-21 new courses to be developed, 5-6 per year. This is a significant number of courses and reflects the fact that the proposed curriculum is significantly outside our current curriculum.

[3/2/15 reply] While offering the degree program in 4 options would require the development of 18 new courses and 2 internships, MSU currently offers 37 courses listed as required by one or more of the options, and 41 courses list as electives. This suggests that although new courses are needed, the degree program is not substantially outside our current curriculum. In addition, the coursework and degree programs were currently offer that stand to make an important contribution to the new degree program also stand to be substantially enriched (food and nutrition, family & consumer sciences, health and human performance, health enhancement, agriculture education, sustainable food and bioenergy systems etc.)

4. MSU currently does not have faculty with expertise in the major disciplines of this program. While MSU has one existing faculty who teaches culinary management, we have no faculty who list hotel management, tourism management, recreation management, or hospitality management as their expertise. The plan is to hire 3 TT faculty, including one with expertise in hotel, tourism and recreation management and one with expertise in hospitality management. These new faculty members will be relied on to organize and lead the program as it develops, in addition to having to be major players in developing most of the 20 new courses programs required for this degree, as well as teach these new courses.
Having new faculty develop coursework in their area of expertise seems like a reasonable expectation. However, all of the faculty currently in the programs listed above have some expertise that will be useful in new course development. For example, all food and nutrition faculty and instructors have had hospitality management as part of their academic training. Currently no faculty would list this as their top academic expertise. It makes more sense to hire an expert in hospitality management to develop and teach those courses in a new degree program, with input and guidance from currently faculty.

5. The argument for housing the Hospitality Management Degree under EHHD is weak. The only argument given in the proposal is “After meeting with faculty and curriculum committees in the Colleges of Education, Health, and Human Development; Agriculture, and Business, it seems like the most logical home for the School of FAB is the College of EHHD.” This needs better justification.

[3/2/15 reply] The proposal was developed in HHD, and all the enthusiasm and innovation in the proposal originate in HHD. (We would not typically propose a new degree program that would be housed in a different college). Please see pages 32-33 in the full proposal for a listing of hospitality programs. This list includes top programs in the country, programs in the region, and other programs we have visited. On the list you can see that of the 31 programs related to hospitality and tourism, 5 are housed in Business colleges or schools while 10 are housed in colleges of Health and Human Development, Human Science, Health etc. The other 16 are in differently named units. Additionally, the MSU JJCBE doesn’t currently have the capacity to house such a program or school. Support from JJCBE is needed in the form of providing courses already offered by the school, not for the development of the new aspects of the curriculum.

6. Other US universities should be used as models on how to guide the design of a hospitality management degree. It is not clear from proposal which type of US degree program would serve as the closest model for the MSU program. A few examples of US hospitality management programs are discussed here. [several links included in original report are omitted here] This strongly suggests that a successful hospitality management program relies very heavily on faculty from the College of Business, Finance, and Management, and not as strongly from Health and Human Development. While the experiences in the courses taught by Health and Human Development are good background training for the different degree options in Hospitality Management, the predominant emphasis in successful hospitality management degree should emphasize the management aspect of the degree. Thus, a better argument is needed to why a predominately management oriented degree program like that proposed for Hospitality Management Program is not housed under the College of Business.

[3/2/15 reply] There are a large variety of Hospitality/Tourism/Recreation management programs across the US (see pages 32-33 in the full proposal). Of the three named by the Faculty Senate APWG, our most closely resembles the hospitality management program at Penn State, as it has a strong emphasis on both foodservice management and hotel management. However, the proposed program was not modeled after any single other program, multiple programs informed its development. Degree options were designed to
address specific industry, stakeholder, and student demand. This program was developed with MSU’s assets in mind (existing curricula and innovative successful programming—food and nutrition, SFBS, THG MDI etc.), while also acknowledging that this is Montana’s Land Grant University with a College of Agriculture, and attention to the uniqueness of Montana. Tourism looks different here than it does in the Northeast, on the East Coast or on the West Coast. The degree program was designed to reflect that unique qualities and needs of a large rural state.

7. The industry demand studies are hard to interpret, but one study appears to say that while there is significant growth in the local (multi-county) demand in the hospitality [management] industry for high school graduates, the demand for AAS graduates is not growing. The other study suggests there is demand for BS graduates in hospitality [management], but that study surveyed many states, including Oregon and Washington. It is not clear if the results are applicable to Montana’s hospitality [management] industry. If the emphasis is on indoor hospitality, it is also not clear if these studies are applicable.

[3/2/15 reply] The needs assessment included in the proposal clearly shows a growing industry in this region (which includes Washington and Oregon). Although there are competing programs in those state, our graduates could certainly compete for jobs in those state. Regarding the Culinary Arts AAS needs assessment, we agree that the industry demand studies are hard to interpret. Other indications of demand have been used to justify the need for that program in this part of Montana, and can be addressed by Gallatin College (Stephanie Gray).

8. There are two-year culinary programs at Flathead College and Missoula College and both are not fully enrolled.

[3/2/15 reply] Stephanie Gray will address this, but Community Colleges have to respond to local demand—and there is a strong local demand for a culinary program in the Gallatin Valley, and no culinary programs in all of Eastern MT.

9. There is no evidence provided in the proposal supporting a demand for indoor recreation in Montana (gyms, fitness centers, and sports clubs), which is the concentration of one of the four options of the Hospitality degree. Such evidence would be helpful in assessing the need for that option.

[3/2/15 reply] Management of gyms was included in the needs assessment, as a category of HRTM. See page 99 of version 11 of the proposal. 24 Hour fitness is the #4 on the list of top employers and Gold’s Gym is #13. This was the original impetus for including a sports/recreation administration option in the degree program, and as faculty and other stakeholders were consulted, the strong demand for such a program was further clarified. See page 7 of the Version 11 of the original proposal for additional explanation. Students currently enrolled in the Health and Human Performance Degree Program represent 40% of the students in the Health and Human Development Department (studying exercise physiology and kinesiology). Additionally, there is quite a bit of overlap between fitness, tourisms, hotels/resorts, spas, recreation centers. Fitness and health facilities often include
foodservice. The purpose of the degree program is to provide the integrated training that graduates will need to successful in managing these kinds of ventures.

10. While the proposal states that the proposer “has been in communication with faculty at both UofM and MSU Billings to discuss the distinct niche of each program” there isn’t any documentation of the content or outcome of those discussions in the proposal. Some analysis of the overlap between UofM’s and MSU Billings’ programs is given in the proposal, but it is not clear if UofM and MSU Billings’ concur with this analysis. A summary of the conversations with UofM and MSU Billings would helpful and letters of support or non-objection from UofM and Billings would be helpful before embarking on such a grand vision. Are there areas of collaboration between UM and MSU that could be explored? While the options in Restaurant Management: Farm to Table and Value-added Food Enterprise may be unique, the options in Sports and Recreation Administration and Lodge Management and Rural Tourism seem to have significant overlap with UM’s programs. The proposal says the proposed MSU option in Lodge Management and Rural Tourism is only “somewhat” distinguished from UM’s Lodge Management and Rural Tourism. This is probably not sufficient. UM’s program concentrates on outdoor tourism and seems to overlap significantly with the proposed description of the Lodge Management and Rural Tourism. This may stem from not having a clear definition of “rural tourism” and how it is distinct, other than in name, from UM’s programs. If indoor hospitality was consistently the theme of the proposed programs, non-overlap could be argued. This would require a restructuring of the degree plans, especially Lodge Management and Rural Tourism.

[3/2/15 reply] There is minimal duplication in the degree program with the programs at UM and MSU Billings. Alison Harmon has met with faculty at UM, to discuss the potential for overlap, and drafted a joint support letter, which was sent as a follow-up to the meeting. I also spoke with faculty at MSU Billings about potential overlap and drafted a similar joint support letter. Neither institutions has responded to the opportunity to collaborate on a Memo of Understanding to ensure minimal duplication. The proposed degree program at MSU would likely enhance each of the programs at MSU Billings and at UM and there is certainly the potential for collaboration. There is also room for the discussion about whether all the academic institutions of Montana ought to be capitalizing on the state’s most obvious asset—that is our access to superb outdoor recreation spaces. A degree program at MSU, even if focused on the management of indoor spaces would likely grow into a program that also offers coursework and training in outdoor recreation. The demand is here, based on a survey conducted by the Outdoor Recreation Program, and on the tremendous growth in enrollment of activity classes offered through Fitness and Recreation. Rural tourism is about connecting tourism and agriculture – our state’s two most important industries. UM doesn’t have a College of Agriculture, so their tourism curriculum is different from the one we could offer. See below for a standard definition—in Montana it is about showing and involving visitors in our agricultural and ranching heritage. Rural tourism focuses on actively participating in a rural lifestyle. It can be a variant of ecotourism. Many rural villages can facilitate tourism because many villagers are hospitable and eager to welcome (and sometime even host) visitors. Agriculture is becoming highly mechanized and therefore, requires less manual labor. This trend is causing economic pressure on some villages, which in turn causes young people to move
to urban areas. There is however, a segment of the urban population that is interested in visiting the rural areas and understanding the lifestyle. This segment in the tourism industry has been rapidly growing in the past decade, leading to rural tourism becoming not just a good business prospect, but a genuine vacation trend.

11. The only stated distinction of the proposed Sports and Recreation Administration option and UM’s Recreation Management Degree is that MSU’s program will concentrate on indoor facilities. However, throughout the proposal, the proposed Sports and Recreation Administration degree option has outdoor/rural recreation included in its vision, making it ambiguous as to whether it really includes only indoor recreation in Montana (gyms, fitness centers, and sports clubs) or outdoor recreation (“sport-related tourism” in Montana is typically outdoors). This needs to be clarified. If outdoor is included, it would overlap with UofM’s program. If only indoor recreation is the concentration, it would be good to provide some evidence supporting demand for indoor recreation in Montana, in order to assess the demand and need for the Sports and Recreation Administration option.

[3/2/15 reply] It would be very difficult to draw the line between indoor and outdoor sports and recreation. We need to decide whether it is okay to duplicate curricula related to the outdoors in Montana.

12. To the question of whether a smaller version of the proposal could be envisioned, a full answer is beyond the scope of this review. The Culinary Arts AA might be able to stand alone, but currently its proposal is intimately tied to the Hospitality Management Program and cannot be assessed as an independent program based on current material. The proposed ramp up of the Hospitality Management program suggests starting with the Sports Recreation Administration option, due to it not requiring a Kitchen. However, in the “minimum resources needed” document (posted on FS web site), the 3 FTE admin are needed and thus it cannot financially stand on its own. Thus, it does not seem like the program or individual options as proposed can ramp up without a commitment to all aspects of the program. Other options for a scaled down program could be explored. One suggestion is to offer the Restaurant Management: Farm to Table and Value-Added Food Enterprise options as interdisciplinary degrees under SFBS in collaboration with business, utilizing existing business, management, and marketing courses. This would eliminate the need for the new school and most of the new hires.

[3/2/15 reply] Each of the options of the proposed degree program address separate demand from different stakeholders.... Each integrated and dependent on the others. The options were designed such that the maximum variety could be offered to students while conserving the number of faculty that would be needed to offer the degree program. Having a distinct Hospitality Management degree program allows out of state students to easily search out this program. Burying it in options under SFBS hides it, makes program marketing difficult, and would be much less attractive to potential funders.

13. Two organizations that support of tourism in Montana are the Office of Tourism and the Governor’s Tourism Advisory Council. Their assessment of the program and letters of support from them would be helpful in moving the proposal forward.
[3/2/15 reply] Currently 18 support letters have been collected from individual business owners, nonprofit organizations (agriculture and tourism) and community development corporations (food manufacturing), the MT Department of Commerce (which includes the Office of Tourism), the MT Department of Agriculture, and local chambers of commerce. Stakeholders that a support letter from Voices of MT Tourism (which is included) would be more indicative of support from the industry than one from the Governor appointed Tourism Advisory Council. Regardless, a letter from the TAC has been requested.

The revised proposals were considered by members of the present APWG membership and summarized below. Comments were also received by the chair of the APWG and included in this section of the report.

1. In the current proposal budget there is a startup cost of $500,000 for Culinary teaching equipment indicated as a “maximum estimate.” However the cost of the Commercial Kitchen/Restaurant lab, an “Essential Resource” for four of the five program components in the previous proposal, is listed as “($0) with a parenthetical note that there is a “feasibility study underway.” The proposers should be asked to provide a similar maximum estimate for the commercial kitchen in order to inform those trying to make a decision about this program of the potential total cost.

2. The proposal argues that considerable local and regional demand exists for graduates from the proposed programs. However, in the Senate consideration of the previous proposal faculty from our own Economics Department came forward contending that data from the Occupational Outlook Handbook does not support any need for additional hospitality and culinary arts programs in the MUS system. Because demand for graduates is a central argument in support of the proposal in the both the previous and current versions sponsors should be strongly encouraged to specifically address this disagreement.

3. The impact of this new program on existing classes has not been adequately addressed. How will new sections of courses outside of this program be paid for? The proposal only states "Resources are available from the Provost if additional sections of courses are needed." Is this available to every department on campus, or will units be responsible to re-allocate resources to accommodate the demands of these programs?

4. What is the rationale behind the choice of classes for various majors/options? The proposal doesn’t seem to address this issue.

5. Concern remains around the 3-year aspect of the program of this program and its marketing as such. The proposal implies that the subscribers of this program will be saving money and time. Although it will take less time, it will not be necessarily cheaper. It seems more accurate to say that this is a regular four-year Bachelor's degree designed to be completed in three years if students study full-time all three summers. Summer credits are more expensive and scholarships and some loans are not available in the summer - this makes the required internship credits even more expensive.
6. The proposal states that the *Restaurant Management: Farm to Table Option* would most likely attract Gallatin College students who earn their Associate’s Degree in *Culinary Arts*. The overlap of courses between these programs does not seem to accommodate such a transition. The AA could use some of their required CULA courses as CULA electives for BS, but then would not take any management courses as electives. They would be ill prepared for a management position.

7. The proposal describes the involvement of 5 GTA’s. What graduate program are these individuals coming from? Is this a relocation of resources or new commitment by the college or university?

8. The list of letters has many repeats in it. Although this is clearly a clerical error, it would be useful to reorganize this list. The letters don’t offer any financial support for the program.

9. On the proposal page 13, the 3 credits for BGEN are missing for the Farm to Table Option, on page 14 for the Lodge Management major, the total summer credits for the 3rd summer are wrong and there appears to be no room in the 120 credits listed for the D core course requirement, for the food enterprise option on page 15, the total credits listed for the 2nd year should be 31, for the Sports and Recreation option on page 16 for the 1st year, the total credits listed should be 30 but then the major requires 121 credits not 120.

10. The vision and mission statements in the program highlights do not mention education or students.

11. There appears to be some overlap with University of Montana’s Entertainment Management track, though the UM degree is much more rigorous in management course requirements. Are we the “management light” option?

12. The number of course to be developed and taught has not changed significantly. Yet the budget for faculty support for this program has dropped from 4.5 FTE to 3 FTE. Will these faculty be required to do 50% more than was previously assumed? Will they be able to teach all the courses and develop all the new courses?

13. It is challenging to assess the impact of these new programs on enrollment. It is possible that some proportion of the students in these programs would be at MSU either way and so the marginal gains in students are different from the total students in deciding where to allocate resources. Admittedly, this is difficult concern to address.

14. The MSU Library does not have information resources focused on this area of study. Because they exist in large part to facilitate student and faculty success by providing access to information, the Library will want to acquire resources in support of research in Hospitality Management. There is a Hospitality & Tourism database collection provided by EBSCOHost with an annual cost of $4,980.00 plus traditional inflationary subscription costs. This is a cost the library would incur. As we re-examine this program, APWG like
recommends including this cost in the annual operations budget as a documented additional expense.

Conclusions

The revised proposals have addressed many of the concerns communicated by various review entities. We acknowledge and thank the sponsors for responding to feedback aimed at improving these proposals.

One remaining concern that is reflected in many comments is determining if these programs represent an important and strategic investment. This is a difficult question given the existence of other competing needs on campus and the uncertainty of how successful the program will be in generating new students and revenue. At the same time, the programs could generate more attention to Montana State University and create new and unanticipated opportunities that will benefit the entire Institution.

The APWG recommends that Faculty Senate carefully consider the merits and concerns of these proposals and participate in the discussion at the October 14th meeting.