**University of San Francisco**

**School of Management**

**Public and Nonprofit Administration Department Meeting**

**Meeting Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date: | 02/12/2013 | StartTime: | 10:05am | End Time: | 11:56pm | Location: | MH 310 |

**Present**: Michael O'Neill, chair; Andrew Heitman, staff; Larry Brewster, Rich Callahan, Kathleen Fletcher, Ron Harris, Monika Hudson, Tim Loney, Gleb Nikitenko.

**Excused**: Kim Connor (on sabbatical), Richard Johnson, Tony Ribera, Richard Waters

**Approval of minutes:**

The minutes of the January 22, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved as mailed.

**Program Evaluation:**

Gleb orally summarized the written proposal he sent to department members and used a handout on program assessment process to walk faculty through the issues. He made several points:

* Program evaluation/ assessment is one of the central components of WASC and NASPAA maintenance of accreditation reviews.
* In order to complete the Assessment Loop (see the handouts), program goals and outcomes should be identified/ mapped, evidence gathered, and used to justify and implement program assessment. Direct and indirect measures of student learning assessment can be used for the program evaluation/ assessment process. The proposed direct measures consist of 3 major elements: 1) course-embedded tools which are essentially major projects and other assignments used to assess student performance in select courses 2) capstone- project/paper based assessment/ evaluation (formative), and 3) a student portfolio process that would include student reflections, career plans, select term papers, etc.
* Gleb says that the program, as reflected in the handout, has 5 goals and 14 learning outcomes.
* Course outcomes should be mapped onto program outcomes to see connections, gaps, and overlaps between courses, and to facilitate the assessment by using imbedded course assignments.
* Mapping of course outcomes can be periodically adjusted to be used effectively. Mapping will promote collaboration among faculty, especially those teaching sections of the same course, and will make course outcomes clearer to students.
* The risk that mapping carries is that a perceived gap or problem may be decided to be “closed” by simply offering a new course. Such a solution doesn’t always fix the problem. It also takes time to identify and remove outcomes that can’t or shouldn’t be achieved.
* The loop doesn’t get closed because data are often not used or ignored, and there may be philosophical resistance to implement some evidence-based solutions, conflict with other faculty duties, “assessment fatigue,” some faculty discomfort with collaboration, and cynicism about the whole enterprise.
* Gleb will explain the whole process/assessment loop to anyone who has more questions.
* The loop should be closed not only to achieve a more successful accreditation review, but also to improve student learning, have fewer silos and more integration within the curriculum, more faculty collegiality, stronger courses and programs, happier students (better retention/graduation rates), happier employers, and, as a result, more willing donors.
* There may need to be a particular focus on the PA 620 (Leadership Ethics) given its unique nature and relevance to the MPA core values, goals, and distinctive capabilities. First, we start with foundational courses 620, 613, and 670 in the fall-spring, and then have a mid-program assessment in PA 644, 632, 633 or 623 (as well as the Health Admin track for HSA students) capped by the summative assessment performed on the basis of the final analysis project in PA 650 This process should be done again in the spring and would be ongoing with yearly reports compiled, analyzed and presented to faculty for review and curriculum changes.
* To measure and hence improve student perceptions of learning, students should take surveys before and after the program (entrance and exit surveys).
* Alumni should take the survey either every year or every other year. Employer surveys could be conducted every other year. The suggested time-line in the proposed plan should provide details about the sequence of course-embedded assessment culminating in the capstone analysis assessment.

There were several comments and questions from members:

* Ron asked if there are curriculum committees. Michael said that there are two, the Undergraduate Program Committee and the Graduate Program Committee. Proposals for new degrees, majors, concentrations, etc. go to these committees after departmental review. Each department is represented on these committees. Monika is on the UPC and Michael is on the GPC.
* Larry asked if the assessment process has already started with the new fall cohort if spring is the same cohort.
* Larry suggested that everyone assess the program and that, based on the wonderful work that Rich did with the Intro course, including MPA 611 in the assessment plan is important.
* Ron asked if the outcomes were checked in the proposal and said that competencies in courses can be checked as well.
* Larry supported the use of surveys but said that having the employer survey every other year is too frequent.
* Larry expressed concern about course-imbedded evaluation and said that leaving it to individual faculty runs the risk of not knowing how students compare with other students.
* Ron asked if capstone instructors grade papers together. Gleb clarified that all faculty who teach the capstone in a given semester form a reviewing/grading panel often doing a blind review.
* Monika stated that a requirement and a written oral presentation are usually given and that maybe there should be an equivalent for MPA. Monika also wanted to know exactly what tasks and steps would need to be taken to implement the program assessment/evaluation plan.
* Rich said that we must evaluate what are the mechanisms in place to allow us to learn how to teach courses better. He also said that we need mechanisms that allow us to teach students what they are working toward to enter professional field. Students must be able to apply what they have learned in the MPA courses to their professions, and faculty need to evaluate how well this goal is being achieved.
* Ron suggested that students be screened first before they enter an introductory class. Rich agreed and said that screening would help evaluate if students are meeting professional standards.
* Rich proposes that a set of action steps be made and said that having Catherine Horiuchi’s feedback would be important.
* Tim suggested the possibility of a department retreat to discuss the program evaluation issue further.

Michael concluded the discussion by saying that he and Gleb and possibly others would construct a detailed plan for moving forward on the program evaluation issue: who will do what when, from now until spring 2014.

**Michael’s announcements:**

Michael reported meeting with Dean Webber on Feb. 7; some of the following items were clarified in that meeting:

* Richard Johnson is excused from attending PNA department meetings in spring 2013 and will teach in the McCarthy Center’s Master of Public Affairs program in fall 2013. No further decisions have been made at this point. Dean Webber said that if any faculty members left the department, he would seek replacement faculty lines. Michael has conveyed to the dean several times the staffing needs for the MPA (including online), MNA, and BSM/PNA programs, present and future.
* Provost Turpin has approved the MNA lead faculty position as being “open” with regard to rank, i.e., the successful candidate could come in at any rank including full professor. The possibility of tenure is an outstanding issue: there have been some cases of this recently, and it is mentioned in the CBA as a possibility. The position has not yet been posted.
* The possibility of a second MNA position is in question. USF has a policy of not replacing a resigned tenured professor’s position for a full year, due to financial arrangements. The lead position about to be posted is, for this reason, actually Kathleen’s rather than Michael’s position. The dean says he remains committed to developing a “critical mass” of 3-5 faculty members devoted to the MNA program, but the timing is a question.
* The new MNA full-time program will definitely not be launched in fall 2013--possibly spring 2014, more likely fall 2014.
* There is nothing further to report on the graduate financial aid issue. Michael repeated that there is great disparity between financial aid available to (a) MBA and other business students, and (b) MPA, MNA, MSOD, and MSIS students—i.e., the legacy-CPS programs. There was a long and vigorous discussion of this issue at the December dean’s leadership team meeting, and the dean said he would take this matter up with Ana Karaman, Vice Provost of Budget and Planning.
* Grade inflation: Tom Grossman, Laura Camara, and Fred Baldwin have complied a detailed report on grades, which has been sent to the department chairs. The report contains information on every FT and PT faculty member’s grades for every SOM course in the fall and spring terms of 2011-12. There has not yet been a discussion by the administration, department chairs, or faculty as to what to do with this information and what if any policies on grading might be implemented.
* Faculty appointments: All course assignments for summer and fall 2013 are due to the dean’s office by March 1. Rich offers to give recommendations for adjunct faculty outside of San Francisco.
* Michael said he saw signs of improvement in the school’s marketing/recruitment effort. Rich said that there needs to be more feedback from the recruitment staff.
* BSM: According to a recent memo from Richard Stackman, the BSM will be offered at each of the school’s five locations in the fall. Michael is still trying to get clarification about some aspects of the BSM program.
* 101 Howard: There is no definite word yet as to when other SOM graduate programs will move to 101 Howard. There are efforts underway to get access to the third floor, but when this will actually be done is unclear. We should assume until otherwise notified that our SF courses will remain on the hilltop campus for summer and fall 2013.
* Graduate student exit survey: Michael spoke with Bill Murry, who will give him the qualitative data on MPA and MNA graduates soon. After this, Michael and others interested (Ron volunteered) will meet with Bill to discuss the current process, instrument, etc. Bill said that the response rate is “about 30%.”

**Other reports and announcements:**

* Ron reported on his efforts to get information about possible accreditation of the MPA/HSA concentration. He asked if anyone in the department wants to join the AUPHA conference in June.
* Larry suggested inviting Charles Geschke (co-founder of Adobe Systems, former chair of the USF board of trustees, endowed professor in SOM) to speak to our students in the fall, perhaps at a Saturday lunch session. Larry, Gleb, and Michael will follow up on this.