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Introduction

MSU-ADVANCE TRACS project is in its third year of implementation. This mid-year evaluation report covers TRACS activities from June through November 2014. The activities described here include: a mini-conference, a webinar, and a grant writing boot camp for faculty. Both, mini-conference and webinar focused on dual career hires and family friendly policies that benefit the climate in academic units, and faculty recruitment and retention. The faculty boot camp focused on grant proposal writing and submission process. These activities address TRACS Objective 1: “Transform the culture of the MSU-Bozeman campus“ by implementing sustainable strategies, programs, and policies that allow diverse faculty to flourish”, Objective 2: “Foster psychological need support for women STEM/SBS faculty,” and Objective 3: “Broaden the participation of women faculty in STEM/SBS.” The first section focuses on the mini-conference and webinar, and the second section addresses findings about the Grant Writing Boot Camp.

The evaluation findings are based on field observation notes, interviews, and satisfaction surveys. Findings reported here resulted from five observations, seven interviews, and 50 participant surveys. In order to assure internal validity or credibility, and reliability or dependability triangulation of findings and interview member checking criteria were applied.
Section 1

Mini-conference: Turning the Two Body Problem into the Two Body Opportunity

This mini-conference was offered face-to-face at MSU campus in Bozeman. Faculty and dual career partners, Department Heads, and Deans were invited to attend. The mini-conference was conducted on October 7, including a morning session and lunch discussion panel.

Focus: Presentation of different angles of Dual Career Hiring process. The presentation included an analysis of the cost and benefit of dual career hiring applying Economic Theory, joint-hire productivity research, and work-life integration policies as strategies for faculty recruitment and retention.

Format: The morning session consisted of three presentations: 1) Dr. Kelly Ward in “Faculty Recruitment and Retention: Why Work-Life Integration Matters.” 2) Dr. Wendy Stock presentation of “Dual Career Challenges – Economic Theory and (Anecdotal) Evidence”, and 3) Dr. Ben Cowan’s in “Evaluating the Two-Body Problem: Joint-Hire Productivity within the University.” The lunch panel included MSU-Bozeman Family Advocate, Dr. Sara Rushing, Dean Brett Gunnink of the College of Engineering, Dr. David Eitle Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and Dr. Susan Dana Associate Dean of the College of Business. They shared their experience about MSU policies and dual career hires. The mini-conference concluded with remarks of Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dr. Martha Potvin. New faculty, some with their partner, MSU’s Human Resources administrative staff, graduate students, Department Heads, and Deans, attended this event. After each presentation attendees had the opportunity to ask questions. Evaluation findings were obtained from field observation notes, interview of faculty benefited by work-life integration policies, and mini-conference participant’s satisfaction survey—including Likert and open-ended questions. Surveys were completed on-site at the end of the event.

The first presenter used scenarios to provide examples and facilitate discussion. Participants engaged in discussing the scenarios, leading to many questions regarding “academic couples.” Participants share their experience at MSU and their difficulty to find academic accommodation for spouses.

The second presenter focused on Economic models of integration, dual career hires from the employer’s perspective, and incentives for dual career hires. This presentation steered a discussion on issues of college “sovereignty”, dual hires fatigue, and depletion of resources. Several solutions were proposed, including: collaboration among colleges to search for dual career accommodations, faculty search specialist that will know all about departmental hire needs, having a policy in place, and leveraging founds and centralized resources for the purpose of dual hires. Also was suggested a retroactive policy when the time is right and opportunities come up. Difficulties about academic dual career hires were brought up such as extra financial resources for start up packages and laboratory space.
The third presentation focussed on research about the implication of dual career and partner quality. The audience was introduced to a website, dualhire.org with research and resources related to dual hires. Audience questions about data sources and sampling methodology followed the presentation.

The panel expanded on the challenges and benefits of dual career hires. One attendee suggested rewarding the departments that contribute to dual hires. The audience identified money as the main obstacle for dual career hires. Even if secondary hires are NTT, lack of stability and benefits, such as maternity leave, and a perceived NTT “stigma” are difficulties that would need attention.

These observations aligned with results from an interview, in which the faculty praised the efficacy of TRACS to accommodate his spouse “When Jessi Smith was involved all went very smooth. ADVANCE helped a lot” and acknowledged the importance the dual hire has in his professional life and productivity “My spouse is absolutely happy —she likes all the courses she teaches—and that makes me happy and we get the financial resources to stay here, like paying the mortgage. The possibility of leaving MSU was real, but because my spouse has a job we are now staying. “ However, he also described the uncertainty of the dual hire “My spouse contract is for 3 years, we hope it gets renewed after that. Jessi said that it will, but we do not have any paper that says so. We trust Jessi but she is not the one that hires.”

The mini-conference was attended by 37 faculty and staff: 24 females, and 13 males; including: 12 participants associated to a STEM discipline, 9 to SBS, 13 to other departments (Architecture, Music, Business, etc.) and 3 staff from different administrative units. Twenty-three (62%) participants completed the survey, with one attendee that only completed the open-ended questions. Survey results are shown in Figure 1.
Impacts:
- Participants found **most useful**: the data on academic productivity when couples are hired, learning about current research in this area, and learning about MSU policies and resources for supporting dual career hires.
- **Participants suggested** not focusing on recruitment and hires (most of the audience were MSU faculty and their partners) instead focus on retention, and more time for discussion and brainstorming. Topics for future events were also suggested: “A Workshop for people looking to be hired” and “Diversity in institutional policies on dual career.”
- As a result of this event, **participants will**: advocate for dual career hires; be better prepare to address comments of faculty unfamiliar with ADVANCE and affirmative action; and apply this information to search committees.

Participants were pleased with the information presented in this mini-conference “Discussion sections were fantastic and specific info that will help forming a policy about this issue” and with its content and format. Some attendees requested the slides of the presentation. Two attendees mentioned about the broad scope of the mini-conference, “Is very difficult to design a workshop for such a diverse audience. I suggest splitting it up, and only bringing dual careerers, in particular those experiencing suboptimal accommodations.” One person challenged the title of the event “Please seriously consider using ‘Dual Career’ in place of ‘Two Body’. In discussion with colleagues the phrase ‘two body’ does not present a positive image. ‘Dual career’ seems to be what people identify with.”

Lessons Learned
- **There is a great deal of awareness for cultural attunement.** This is reflected by the active participation of the audience in asking questions, proposing solutions, and acknowledge of the challenges dual career hires pose. Also audience praises for the event “Wonderful opportunity, thank you.”

- **Events that present research are overwhelmingly welcomed** – [most useful]”Learning about research”

- **Events that address different audiences have to explicitly reflect that in their content focus and resources** “Would be good to have people knowledgeable on university policies to answer participant’s questions.”

- **Provide time for brainstorming with and among audience members.** “More time to brainstorm”

Webinar: Is Cheaper to Keep Her

This webinar is product of AWIS, Association of Women in Science. It was offered at MSU campus in Bozeman, on November 7. Faculty –mostly Equity Advocates–, Department Heads, and Deans were invited to attend.

Focus: The cost of attrition of female faculty members to the academic institution.
Format: Webinar lecture followed by audience discussion.

Evaluation findings were obtained from field observation notes and webinar participant’s satisfaction survey—including Likert and open-ended questions. Surveys were completed on-site at the end of the event.

The webinar caught participants interest, in particular the presentation of a website, ToolforChangein stem.org, with research and resources for family-friendly policies in academic institutions, including a cost simulator of women faculty attrition. The webinar last for about forty minutes, and was followed by audience discussion about the nature of the data presented in the webinar and how the ideas of the presentation apply to MSU. The webinar was attended by 21 faculty and staff: 4 males and 17 females. Seventeen (81%) participants completed the survey. Survey results are shown in Figure 2.
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**Figure 2. Is Cheaper to Keep Her webinar survey results**

**Impacts:**

- **Participants found most useful** the presented research—“Straightforward presentation with many compelling statistics which was effective in highlighting issues that need to be addressed,” data on bias and gender bias, and presentation of legal and illegal aspects. The simulation of the cost of female faculty attrition was also noted as a valuable resource.

- **Participants suggested** that the presentation could improve if more updated data and references were used, and if presentation of results, in particular comparisons between male and female groups, were better defined. The webinar will be more engaging if facilitators “Prepare questions for us to discuss after the presentation.” One participant indicated that the presentation was “Too general, non-MSU data on retention. [Retention]
offers here usually make money rather than costing, at least in the sciences where grant could be lost.” While other perceive it as “redundant information”

- As a result of this presentation, participants will: “Help to bolster explanations to faculty/DH/Deans”

Participants were engaged with the webinar but expected to find a more direct connection between the presentation and MSU policies. One person expressed the importance to expand the audience base “Always [I am] learning something in these, but also always stuck that only the choir attends. We need to improve engagement of those who need it.”

**Lessons Learned from Webinar**

- There is a need to connect evidence-supported trends and suggestion presented in various events to MSU policies.

- Preference for structured workshops. Including facilitation questions.
Section 2

Grant Writing Boot Camp

This program was offered to STEM and SBS faculty of MSU-Bozeman, with the purpose to “facilitate the production of a solid, review-ready grant proposal” for its submission. This program was offered during six weeks, from September 19, through October 26, 2014, and was organized in weekly two-hour sessions. During these sessions participants attended presentations of faculty that are successful with grant funding, to learn about grant writing and procedural skills to develop competitive grant proposals. The main topics included: finding funding, the grant writing process, the submission process, assembling your proposal team, the proposal narrative, and the next steps—including: Broader Impacts, Budget, Facilities & Resources, and Data Management. The boot camp was followed by one-on-one consultations with the Grant Coordinator and other campus resource personnel. Also, a mock review panel, on November 6, was offered to participants to review and critique their proposal. The structure of the sessions included a brief introduction of the Grant Coordinator, followed by presentations of invited speakers (hereafter presenters). Participants had opportunities to ask questions during the presentations, and assignments related to the grant writing process were suggested to attendees.

The evaluation findings result from field observation of three sessions (first, third, and fifth), attendee's survey, and interviews of five participants and Grant Coordinator. Both, surveys and interviews were collected at the end of the program. Surveys were collected online, while interviews were conducted face-to-face. The survey consisted of Likert-type and open-ended questions. Ten participants completed the survey.

Twenty-two faculty members signed up for the Boot Camp, of which four dropped out before the first session due to schedule conflicts. Out the eighteen faculty, ten attended most of the sessions, this group constitutes the “core” group. The attendance distribution number of attendees is shown in Figure 3.

![Attendance Distribution Chart]

Figure 3. Grant Writing Boot Camp attendance distribution
The number of attendees per sessions fluctuated, for example the first session had 15 participants —of which six were male—, the third session included 13 attendees, and the fifth session 10 participants —of which two were males—.

The core group is a very research-oriented group from STEM departments, including Chemistry and Biochemistry, Mechanical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Chemical Engineering, and Cell Biology and Neuroscience. All members of the core group were Assistant Professors with the exception of one Assistant Research Professor.

During the first session information about a search-engine for Request of Proposal of major federal funding agencies (e.g. NIH, NSF, USDA, etc…) was presented. Participants shared their research focus. The session was hands-on as people subscribed to SPIN (one of the search engines), made a search, and explored the return data. They used SPIN after setting their profile and doing a search. Participants asked a lot of questions about types of funding, databases —private and federal—, limiting e-mails, working on campus vs. off campus, and ways to engage mentors. Participants were encouraged to use Dropbox to post their assignments.

The third session of the GWBC focused on Budget development. Staff of the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) shared material and resources to assist grant writers, and explained issues related to indirect cost (IDC) and cost-sharing. Participants were very engaged, most questions were related to issues of budget, collaborations among MSU departments, sub-awards, course buyouts, contracted services, OSP e-clearance forms, and splitting of IDC’s. Following this presentation, participants analyzed a colleagues’ grant overview. Participants asked questions about Broader Impact and Intellectual Merit sections of NSF proposals.

The fifth session of the GWBC focused on the grant proposal description narrative: clarity in the hypothesis, difference between different types of funding (Discovery, Scale up, etc…) and how these affect the narrative, writing structure and genre —for example one presenter uses a “funnel” approach: impact on humanity, discipline, specific area—, and comments on the culture of NSF and NIH communities. Invited speakers addressed these issues sharing their experiences. Participants asked questions related to proposal’s audience, structure, delimitation of areas in interdisciplinary proposals (ex: public health vs. biofilms), and about EpScor-NSF grants. At the end, the conversation focused on specific scientific research questions.

Participants’ experience at the GWBC is captured in the results of the surveys. Likert questions are measured in a scale of 7, with 1 indicates “Not at all true”, 4 “Somewhat true”, and 7 “Very true”. Results are shown in Figure 4.
Impacts

Participants found most useful, all sessions “I honestly found every session useful, so it is difficult to choose a favorite/least favorite session. The proposal narrative was interesting, because it addressed many problems I have in my proposals (e.g. not making a clear hypothesis, not structuring a proposal properly, or making too many “fishing expedition” statements).” In particular the ones focused on writing “The session with input from
experienced grant writers with specifics about how they write their proposals was very useful.” Participants also acknowledged the benefits of networking, and working on proposal areas specific to NSF such as Broader Impact or Data Management Plan.

Participants suggested broadening the presentations and discussions to the SBS audience “it just seemed very focused on the sciences so not as relevant for me.” The first session was not perceived as useful “Finding grant opportunities session. I’m already a bit inundated with the number of emails I get for places to submit proposals and didn’t feel like I needed help in this area.” Also, few participants perceived session two as redundant because most of the issues presented in this session were addressed later.

Participants of the core group were very committed to the GWBC: four NSF submissions immediately resulted from the Boot Camp. They acknowledged the process involved in grant writing and submission “The speakers that I thought helped me greatly with writing were Dave Mogk, Tracey Sterling, Anne Camper and John Priscu. Maybe in part due to them coming in the later sessions where I was farther along with writing and able to take advantage of their input.” The ones that could not attend the GWBC as frequently as the core group also saw a value in it “I really wish I could’ve been more involved, but as an administrator with zero faculty appointment or expectation, I was grateful just to sit in!! LOVED getting to listen to Tracy S and Dave M talk about their experience as program officers. Very enlightening for me.”

These findings aligned with the results from the semi-structured Interviews. Five participants volunteered to be interviewed, including two males and three females; all interviewees were from STEM departments. The Grant Coordinator was also interviewed. The interviews took place on-campus and transcriptions were sent back to interviewees for member check. Participant’s interview focused on three main topics: 1) Participant experience, 2) participant recommendations to improve the Boot Camp, and 3) future plans.

Participant Experience:

The experience was very positive for all interviewees, the main aspects are: acquiring information, the facilitation of a professional community of learners, and establishing a support system for grant submission. All interviewees indicated that the GWBC was worth their time. One interviewee summarized his experience in the following way: “As a new faculty I was overwhelmed by the idea of writing grants, but after attending the GWBC I submitted an NSF grant. So I am a success story. The WBC was an amazing success.” Other interviewee added, “I learned a lot about what to avoid in a proposal preparation and ways to be organized; it [GWBC] was very open to ask questions.” The nature of the GWBC was such that facilitated networking among participants “… was very beneficial to talk to new faculty that were in the same situation as me, in order to compare ideas and share experiences of grant submission.” “I also networked with other faculty from STEM, that still I am in touch with,” and networking between participants and presenters “[GWBC] allowed me to talk to different people (presenters) that hold different ideas from the ones I had before attending the GWBC. Was very beneficial to talk to these people and ask questions, people that otherwise I would not have talk to them.” GWBC also extended this sense of community to the university as a whole: “The GWBC helped me to network with other
faculties. It is great to realize that there are other support mechanisms on campus and that there are other investigators with the same pressure."

Another aspect that positively impacted Boot Camp participants was the one-on-one opportunities they had for working with the Grant Coordinator, and Micaela (former Grant Coordinator and currently at OSP) “Jane and Micaela helped me with the writing of the grant. I sat with Michaela and went through all the parts of my proposal.” The fact that both Grant Coordinators were not from STEM disciplines was perceived as an asset because they focused with editing and writing, and the nuances of grant submission “It was good that they [Jane and Micaela] are not STEM because I can get technical help from the people of my department, and they focused on the proposal submission and administrative parts, and reviewed it. “They understand the proposal structure, and understand how to make a case.”

Some of the interviewees perceived the GWBC was geared to novice faculty with no experience of proposal submission. “At the beginning was this sense of “over-protection” from the GWBC facilitator, “writing is very stressful…. Deep breath…” Maybe because it was the sense that most attendees were novices.” “I applied to NSF and that was something new for me…. Also was very useful for novices that never sent a grant before.”

The format of the GWBC was conducive to encourage participants to work in their proposal submission “The organization of GWBC worked for me because forced me to set aside time for the proposal. I learned about campus resources and is great to know that people can help, besides mentors…. Two hours is the maximum for carving out from the day. Longer is too hard, and shorter is too easy to side-track. Once a week was OK.” “The fact that was every week helped me to stay focused, every-other-week will interrupt the flow. The assignments were very good. I completed them weekly.” One interviewee finds two hours per week for six weeks very difficult, yet she recognized that the weekly commitment allowed people to develop their grant proposal.

Participants received feedback of their assignments on early proposal drafts, upon request to the Grant Coordinator, but not from the whole group. For some participants this approach was important to keep an atmosphere of non-coercion, collegiality, and informality “We did not have weekly feedback, was more a push to get the sections written, and it was nice, was kind of informal this way. Jane offered feedback, was kind of optional feedback.” Other interviewees perceived this as a limitation of the format of the GWBC but they got feedback from the Grant Coordinator when they requested it. The mock review panel following the GWBC was a great way to get feedback from field-specific faculty. “The review of my proposal was very good for me. So, if more people of the Grant Facilitator Network will participate in the mock panel will be great!”

Participant Recommendations

**Expand the scope of the GWBC** including other federal agencies: “Present a little more background on different types of grants, like NIH, etc…..” Other interviewee suggested to have GWBC focused on one agency at a time. The Fall 2014 Boot Camp was mostly focused on NSF, future WGBC could focus on NIH, DoE, etc… “It is useful specific
information for specific agencies, for example NSF requests Broader Impact that DoE doesn’t ask for."

Focus more on writing and in-class feedback. “I had the idea that the GWBC will focused more on writing, but wasn’t the case. The first hour was reserved for presenters and the second hour for writing, but usually was no time for writing (in class and/or getting feedback) and the time was used for presenters. More time for writing will be beneficial because it will allow asking questions about writing.”

Have access to funded proposals to analyze them. “Volunteer successful proposals for their analysis. As a new faculty I never saw one.”

Provide one overview session of grant writing and submission process. “Combine the first two sessions in a general overview in the first session…. and provide a general overview of funding cycles per agency.”

Incorporate the mock review panel in the Boot Camp. “The mock review panel was very useful, maybe add this as the last session so all people will participate. This time only 4 people participated in the mock panel because people were not prepared and it was added at the end of the GWBC and some people already had commitments for the time of mock panel.”

Reach Department Heads to encourage them to support professional development of new and research faculty. “Do not assume that all GWBC participants have the same level of support from their Departments and similar support systems for faculty professional development.”

Require from participants to have in mind a funding agency for their proposal early in the Boot Camp. “It is best to come to the GWBC with an RFP already in mind; this did not happen until session 3.”

Have a Boot Camp with two tracks: for novices and people with grant submission experience. “In this version we had participants that were novices to grant writing and submission, and other participants that were more experienced. For the novices the GWBC was very good, but for the more experienced some of the sessions were obvious and few people asked questions. If we will have two tracks (novices and experienced) will be very good.”

Participant Future Plans

All interviewees acknowledged the positive impact of the GWBC and would participate in GWBC follow up activities. Having an advance version could be attractive for participants of this cadre. “I would attend a GWBC if it will be organized in a “producing structure” rather than “learning structure.” Maybe doing more intense sessions on certain section of the proposal and more opportunities for peer-peer reading.” Other idea is to expand the notion of the mock review panel “I would like to participate in a mock panel review. Also, reading successful proposals from different STEM disciplines will help to inspire more proposals.”

All interviewees would recommend the GWBC to any new faculty.

All interviewees either submitted or will submit a grant proposal in the next semester after attending the GWBC. The submission agencies included: NSF (3), DoE (1), and NIH (1).

Participants’ experiences, perceptions, and ideas are echoed by the Grant Coordinator. Three main topics were explored in the Grant Coordinator interview: 1) Grant Coordinator expectations, 2) what changes need to be incorporated to
improve the GWBC, and 3) how effective the GWBC is. Findings from this interview are included below.

Grant Coordinator Expectations
Grant Coordinator held two main expectations: to learn how to be an effective grant writing facilitator, and to increase the number of participants in the GWBC. Attaining effectiveness in the facilitation of grant writing training, involved learning from previous experiences. “I looked at previous evaluations ... Micaela Young was a co-facilitator of the GWBC, co-planner, and was a co-presenter in some sessions. She was also helpful in suggesting presenters and senior faculty. She had more experience with faculty, they worked really well together. Micaela was more a technical coach for the participants because of her expertise with OSP; I was more the writing coach. “ In addition, the expertise gained in running the GWBC is documented in a Facilitator Guide for GWBC. The Guide was written while the GWBC was implemented, during Fall 2014. “As part of my current job expectation I wrote a Facilitator Guide for GWBC while I was doing the BC. This is one of the deliverables of the 2014 Mid Year report. This Guide will be for other ADVANCE programs, I am trying to articulate the easiest way to run the GWBC. The Guide will include syllabus, marketing plan, schedule template, budget, etc…”

Increasing the number of participants in the GWBC involved a marketing strategy. “I did increase the number of participants, by directly marketing to our ADVANCE Project TRACS client list. I wrote each new faculty and a good proportion came to the GWBC, although some had schedule conflicts and could not participate. This is how I marketed the GWBC, and I knew people wanted to attend.” The participation increased to 18 faculty instead of 12 in Fall 2013.

Grant Coordinator Recommendations to Improve the GWBC

Consider two tracks in the GWBC. “Divide the group in two groups: ‘doing a proposal’ and ‘learning about the grant world,’ and structure the program such that both groups can be served. Two different tracks at the same or different times, but have two defined tracks.”

Limit the capacity of the GWBC to 12-15 participants to facilitate the formation of a collaborative group. “Cap the number of participants and expand the time period [of the GWBC] for more than 6 weeks, maybe to 8 weeks, starting with a social event to facilitate friendship among participants, before writing and feedback…. It was a special group dynamic. We had a core group of about 10 people, they were very supportive of each other, and benefited from each other questions. The larger concentric circle [group], were not disruptive. For example, one participant from a previous year came back to attend some sessions and to polish her proposal for submission. Having her doing that make the BC feel more like a ‘club you belong to’ and gave the impression that they [previous attendees] are welcome to the GWBC.”

Provide flexible schedule options. “Maybe the format of the GWBC was a little rigid, 8 weeks at different times may be better for busy faculty? Maybe use D2L so not all sessions are face-to-face until we meet for presentations, discussion and interaction? Maybe a summer session? Two days in the summer and have the Fall to complete the proposal.”

Increase the number of co-sponsors of the GWBC and pool of presenters. A number of MSU Centers and Institutes contributed to the delivery of the GWBC, they helped with the fundina for snacks and provided connections to presenters. increasing co-sponsor
and presenters would benefit the GWBC. In addition to co-sponsors, utilize the structure of the ADVANCE-TRACS to solve the logistics associated with delivering the GWBC.

**Emphasize writing.** “More writing exercises, in a process guided by specific assignments of pieces they can use in their proposal. Work on ‘How can writing can be delivered.’"

**Effectiveness of the GWBC**

*Four participants submitted proposals one week after the GWBC.* “People learned editing, submission process, budgeting, etc… and became well-trained grant writers who know how to submit grants on their own.”

*Grant Facilitator worked with individual participants.* "The [rigid] schedule may be challenging but working with the people [in one-to-one situations] is what made the GWBC effective. The GWBC was effective because of its flexibility, it was participant-centered. I used my expertise as professional editor, this allowed a team approach: participant knows the science; I know the editing."

**Lesson learned**

- **The GWBC is valuable professional development for new faculty because it provides a context to network with peers and to learn about MSU’s support systems.** “I did learn a lot. More than anything was an intro to all the process that comes together [to submit a proposal] because is overwhelming.”

- **GWBC should emphasize writing and hands-on activities.** Time for presenters and writing should be balanced. "It would be nice to have more time to work in-session. Is like a lecture vs. hands-on, hands-on impacts more my productivity.”

- **GWBC should incorporate the critique and analysis of proposals,** including proposals under development and funded proposals. "Would be nice to see proposals for criticism and assessment. “

- **Faculty are interested on a GWBC advanced version.** Either as mock review panels or by providing sessions that are agency-specific.