**University of San Francisco**

**School of Management**

**Public and Nonprofit Administration Department Meeting**

**Meeting Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date: | 3/12/2013 | Start  Time: | 10:35am | End Time: | 12:35pm | Location: | MH 405 |

**Present**: Michael O'Neill, chair; Wilma Kay, staff; Larry Brewster, Rich Callahan, Kathleen Fletcher, Monika Hudson, Tim Loney, Gleb Nikitenko

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

**Approval of minutes:**

Larry moved, Tim seconded: the minutes of the February 22, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved as mailed.

Adding to his cover message sent with the minutes, Michael said that this year Kelly Sugrue sends weekly reports on application/enrollment data, with comparative figures for a year ago at the same date. Following are the current and 2012 (in parentheses) figures for completed applications for PNA fall graduate programs: MPA/San Francisco – 23 (13), MPA/Sacramento – 2 (4), MNA – 7 (8). There are currently 4 completed applications (all admitted) for MPA/online--this is a summer 2013 group; there was no summer 2012 group.

**MNA Faculty Search:**

Larry, chair of this search committee, reported that he will meet with Dean Webber on March 13 to discuss details, including timeline, position description, and final committee membership. Currently, the other members are Rich, Kim, and Richard W. The position description has not yet been posted.

**Program Marketing and Online MPA update:**

Tim reported on applications for the summer MPA online group. There are 26 in the pipeline. Student feedback regarding the online program has been very positive. The biggest challenge remains how to market it with all the competition and identify the “differentiators” to provide a competitive edge. Following this line of thought, Rich noted that the USC online MPA program has 60 new students, and Indiana University also has such a program. Michael commented that USC is one of the oldest and most distinguished MPA programs in the country; Rich added that IU is also very highly regarded. Tim distributed a “Faculty Information for Marketing” sheet and noted that the idea of concentrations keeps coming up; he mentioned specifically the possibility of a nonprofit online concentration. Kathleen said it might make sense to have a nonprofit concentration within the online MPA program.

In answer to a question, Michael said that there are about 200 nonprofit management education programs at the master’s level in the U.S., most of them concentrations within MPA, MBA, MSW, MEd, etc.

Monika suggested that it would be useful to talk to employers on how the degree is perceived. She said there is a danger of cannibalization among USF degrees.

Tim, Michael, and others noted the fact that many of our online MPA students are local (15 of the 20 in the first two cohorts live and work in the SF Bay Area), and that Dean Webber and Associate Dean Horiuchi have expressed concern about this. It was suggested that we check with the nursing school about their program’s geographic reach. Michael noted that Embanet has said that it’s common for new online programs to draw primarily from their local area at first and that the geographic spread tends to broaden as the program develops.

Rich suggested that the Jesuit framework of our MPA program might be a differentiator.

Tim said any thoughts from the group on marketing and concentrations would be appreciated.

**Finalize Program Evaluation Plan:**

Gleb and Michael presented the action plan for program evaluation, which was sent to the department on March 11. Gleb noted that program evaluation meets not only NASPAA but also WASC demands. USF has not yet received from WASC the 5 competencies that are to guide program evaluation, but he has aligned our proposed program evaluation plan with both NASPAA competencies and expected WASC competencies. Michael thanked Gleb for his “heroic” work on the program evaluation plan.

Monika moved and Tim seconded that the action plan be approved. There were 5 votes in favor. Kathleen abstained, stating that the issue was out of her program area. Rich voted no because of his concern that the plan had not been cleared with Catherine Horiuchi. In response, Monika mentioned the importance of the process being faculty driven; she said AACSB criticized SOM for the relative absence of faculty involvement in the MBA program evaluation plan.

**Preliminary Discussion of Graduate Survey Results:**

Michael shared what he learned from Bill Murry regarding the survey. It was developed by a small committee and first used in fall 2010. It is based on a long-used undergraduate survey, which Michael said may explain why many questions are so general and oriented to personal development. Apparently no associate deans or graduate program directors were involved in the revision. Graduating students are asked to respond to the survey when they file their petition to graduate. Murry said the overall response rate is about 30%. Michael that, while he’s delighted there is such a survey, he feels the instrument is far too long and includes many questions that are not directly relevant to graduate program objectives. He plans to meet with Murry to request all the responses to the open-ended questions. Later there will be a meeting involving Michael, Gleb, Ron, and possibly others with Murry to discuss possible changes in the instrument and procedures. Michael noted that, among other things, the data from this survey will be valuable for our annual reports to NASPAA.

Larry commented on some of the qualitative data: Our students feel a lack in both career services and networking but are generally happy with the programs. He also questioned the level of advising to the students, saying that the student advising system in CPS was much superior to what our students are getting now.

**Teaching, Faculty Conferences and Proposals:**

Rich mentioned that several relevant conferences are coming up: the one we’re hosting on teaching public administration, the annual ASPA conference in New Orleans that he, Catherine, Ron, and Gleb will be attending; and the Jesuit business education conference.

Rich said that we should do more to get better publicity internally for department activities, e.g., the conference here on teaching public administration. Such events need to be better publicized to students, alums, and prospective students.

**Ideas on the Future:**

There followed an off-the-record discussion of various possibilities for the department’s future.

**Other Announcements:**

Gleb reported that the joint celebration of MPA’s 35th anniversary and MNA’s 30th anniversary will take place on May 30, beginning 5 p.m., at 101 Howard. The idea of having Nancy Pelosi as the main speaker is being pursued, probably through President Privett’s office. Michael repeated his earlier suggestion that, if this didn’t work out, another excellent candidate would be Jim Canales, president of the James Irvine Foundation. He said Jim is an articulate and highly regarded figure in California and U.S. philanthropy and that the Irvine Foundation has a long connection with USF, including many grants to the Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management, companion program to MNA. Other suggestions and ideas for the event were solicited.

Larry complimented Michael’s hard work and dedication “to the bitter end.”