

**University of San Francisco**  
**School of Management**  
**Department of Public and Nonprofit Administration**

## **Meeting Summary**

Date:	12-02-14	Start Time:	11:20 a.m.	End Time:	12:35 p.m.	Location:	MH 405
-------	----------	-------------	------------	-----------	------------	-----------	--------

**Attendance:** Rich Callahan, Larry Brewster, Kim Connor, Frank Gigliotti, Ron Harris, Monika Hudson, Tim Loney, Tony Ribera, Marco Tavanti

**Agenda:** Introductions and welcome; approval of meeting notes for Dept. Meeting of November 4, 2014; discussion of Carnegie Requirement for additional class time; On-line MPA program: revisions, quality, and seat time requirement; opportunities for classroom interaction among students from different campuses; Internship Operationalizing; restarting action items.

### **Materials distributed in advance of the meeting to all faculty:**

- 1) Draft minutes of November 4, 2014 meeting
- 2) Dean Davis' Chart on Class seat time requirements
- 3) Regional Campus new policy for San Francisco semester
- 4) Vice Provost Mike Webber's Response – on regional campus changes

**I. Approval of Meeting notes for Dept. Meeting of November 4, 2014:** with the revisions, Marco motioned to accept the minutes and Tim seconded. All approved.

**II. Exploring MNA FT Program with the Religious Department at USF:** Kim mentioned that Georgia State University's Andrew Young School is offering an M.A. with a concentration in Nonprofit Management. The summary of the program, per the University's Fall 2014 newsletter, is as follows: *Many students who have taken Religious Studies courses express interest in a career in non-profit work or with faith-based organizations. The new 2-year MA in Religious Studies with a concentration in Nonprofit Management combines coursework in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies with a program in cultural studies offered by the Department of Religious Studies, including internship experience. Students will develop expertise in both nonprofit management skills and diverse religious and cultural systems that will prepare them for employment in metropolitan Atlanta as well as in national and international nonprofit organizations.* Marco noted that most universities are opting for a 4 + 1 model, and said that management for religious studies/theology students is needed. Kim said that the Andrew Young School's model is one we can follow because we have an MNA Program. Marco asked what theology degrees are offered at USF and Kim said that we only offer one degree, an undergraduate degree (major and minor) in Theology and Religious Studies. Rich asked that this discussion be added to the agenda for our next meeting.

**III. Discussion of Carnegie Requirement for additional class time:** this issue has come to the attention of the Provost's Office; now all of the School of Management is under scrutiny. Per the Provost's office, 15 hours of seat time equals one credit hour; this pertains to the entire University, not just to our School. According to Laura Camara, our syllabus should demonstrate the additional work students are doing to make up the difference between 12.5 and 15 hours. We have increased our classroom time to 11 sessions for a 4-unit course but this still falls short of the required hours. Dean Davis sent out a spreadsheet and Rich distributed it to all prior to the meeting. A discussion followed as to the exact number of hours we fall short for our courses. We are currently at 32 hours (4 units x 8 sessions). We need to be at 45, which means that we are 13 hours short per course. Rich pointed out that only 50 minutes of class time is required for one hour of class time; therefore, we pick up an extra 40 minutes of class time for every 4 hour course we teach. Rich had asked Richard Waters about this prior to the meeting, and Richard told him that no one wants to meet for 15 individual class sessions (neither faculty nor students). Larry brought up the fact that Dean Davis, at the last staff/faculty meeting, had encouraged faculty to explore offering hybrid courses. In response to a question, Kim said that online interaction does count as seat time; for BSM courses, we require 32 hours in class and 14 hours online (not synchronistic). The problem is that we need to show what we're doing with those hours (outside of class). Rich said, according to Mike Duffy, the problem is that in order to meet this requirement, students are expected to do an additional 2 -3 hours of classwork at home each day. This is not realistic given the already compressed classroom schedule. Rich asked how we are holding our on the ground courses to the 60-hour requirement (as opposed to our On-line program). Tim indicated we calculated the times of various course activities, including discussions, and would be happy to share these. Rich said that although we designed the courses with this in mind, it does not hold up to scrutiny. Rich proposed a 4.5-hour class session (from 8:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., and an afternoon class session from 1:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.). Each session would equal 5 Carnegie hours if we take one 20-minute break. If we met 12 times at 4.5 hours per session, we would make the 60-hour requirement and continue to meet 3 out of 4 Saturdays a month. This would also reduce travel time for students. An alternative for the summer semester is to offer 6 full-day sessions (instead of 12 half-day sessions) and each session would last 9 hours (plus an hour for lunch). Per Rich, Richard Waters likes this idea; he has trouble with hybrid classes.

Larry said that we need to settle this soon if we are to market to prospective students. Currently, for fall and spring we meet 12 out of 16 weeks, and we meet 12 weeks for summer. Per Rich, Intersession is a separate conversation; we need to pick up 6 more hours of seat time from what we currently offer. Ron asked if we could do 13 class sessions instead of 12 for fall/spring. If so, we would be one hour short at 59 hours of seat time. Tony asked if 8 a.m. – 6 p.m. is viable for our students; this makes for an awfully long Saturday. Rich said that he has no problem with this and added that he could teach for 9 hours, although it is important to consider the students' issues with this change. Ron had asked students if they preferred Saturday classes to weekday classes and there was an even split – different reactions. Single people like Saturdays and those with kids do not like Saturdays; they would rather do parenting on Saturdays. The problem, per Rich, is that the people we're asking chose the weekday option when they joined the program, so we're not getting a good sample of those who may have preferred the alternative. Also, with weekday classes, other than two nights a week, there are not enough sessions available to teach each semester. Marco said, in other programs part-time students take classes two times a week. Monika asked about a weeknight and then a full Saturday option. Rich said that this is the worst of both worlds (anecdotally). Ron

added that if all of us are teaching on Saturdays then there is less flexibility for assignments. Rich said that for weeknights we have to do two nights per week to meet the requirement and to finish in two years. Marco asked, when the shift was made from weekday eves to Saturday, how was that determined? Larry replied that we surveyed San Francisco students and that they overwhelmingly preferred Saturdays, though that survey was administered a long time ago. Rich said that our Saturday sessions in San Francisco are working; we have good students in large cohorts. Plus, the students like 101 Howard. Therefore, let's not mess with something that is working. Larry, referring to Dean Davis' push for hybrid courses wondered how much time students are devoting to the online piece; also, even if we are holding classes on the ground, learning does fall off after a time. Can't we take some components from the On-line program and incorporate them? Rich asked why do we assume that students who chose face-to-face courses want the online experience? Marco said that there are some components that we may use for our courses; for example, we could use Camtasia to pre-record a lecture. Students like the flexibility of this because they can watch the lecture anytime. Camtasia, or something similar, would be helpful in our toolkit. Larry said that this may be more challenging for him but it may be more attractive for students. Kim said that she had to miss one 4-hour session of an on the ground course, PA 620. She used an online component (via Canvas) in her absence and the students were very happy with this approach. Kim made the work meaningful and there was no assessment (no grade point) attached. Kim added that we cannot do this if there is a lot of content but there are ways, and added that she is collaborating with a designer to create 14 hours of content online. Tim said that this would help our marketing – a trade-off for us. Larry asked where the pressure is coming from to have 60 hours of seat time. In the past, we justified the seat time outside the classroom by giving students reading assignments early (prior to the class start, etc.). Marco said that WASC's upcoming visit is the reason, and added that we have been sliding but now we need to meet the requirement. Larry asked about the possibility of an intensive weekend format, and Rich said that we would put this on next month's agenda.

Marco said that with either 12 or 13 weeks, our faculty should spell this out in their syllabi. Rich said that he has reviewed Adjunct Faculty syllabi and the syllabi of Full Time faculty, who have shared their syllabi with him, and we are very good at outlining the students' outside work requirements; therefore, the classroom focus is simple math. For the January agenda we will discuss how we want to proceed with the weekend courses. One option is 13 weeks (or 60.58 seat hours); we've dropped the requirement for students (from the regions) to come to San Francisco. Rich will ask Mike Duffy about options for weekday classes, and added that Mike Duffy's departure was a big loss to us. Ron suggested that the first class session could be a hybrid. Rich said that if we choose the 13-week option then we do not have to do a hybrid model. In the regions, if students take class two nights a week then they would graduate in 22 months. Larry said that this would put more pressure on the faculty to teach in the regions where they live. Rich said that we would do two concurrent courses for the semester, for example, PA 611 on one night of the week and PA 613 on another night of the same week. This would work and it keeps the syllabi in line. Frank and Rich will write this up and send to all. In addition, Rich said that we need to come up with a hybrid model for the department; to shift into this we would need support. Kim said, in order to build online content we need to go to people with experience. Rich said that the problem is we went to an On-line program and did not receive additional resources; as a result, our faculty is now stressed. Kim said that it is not that demanding to put 14 hours of content online. Marco added that it is very simple, e.g., record a You Tube video of yourself, etc. He does not see this as a big problem. Tim said that the tools are there

on Canvas to do this. Kim shared an example: debate prep. She found that there was more vigorous preparation among the students then if they simply came to class and started arguing. Kim now has created an online debate template that she can use for future classes. Tim said that students get comfortable with something and it is a challenge when they need to make an adjustment. Kim said that we should make this part of the pedagogy, and offered the example of the librarians who were required to learn databases. We need to show students the opportunities inherent in doing this. Marco added that faculty who teach online could become better teachers. Rich said that this is a straw man. If you are doing 4 hours of lecture only, then online will improve teaching. But we've already flipped the classroom experience. If we are getting good outcomes, then why change? Marco said that it is Assessment of Learning. The structure of online classes helps with assessment. Rich said we're strong at assessment of learning in the classroom.

**IV. On-line MPA program: revisions, quality, and seat time requirement:** Per Tim, we have three years left on the Pearson contract; therefore, we need to think about what we want for the future. The issue of improving student participation online was discussed. Tim noted that some faculty members wait until the end of a class session to participate/comment. Rich pointed out that students go onto the discussion boards late and that several discussions are going on at the same time. Tim encourages students to post daily. They are not reading long reflections from their classmates because they are not getting graded on their responses. Rich agreed that students aren't reading what their classmates are posting and they just reply perfunctorily. Ron said that his class is divided into groups; they develop their products, and then they switch and change roles. The problem is that some students procrastinate and others want to get the work done early; this has created problems within the groups. A rubric was added but the students ended up giving themselves a 5 out of 5. Per Kim, some (face-to-face) classroom conversations are not that substantive; at least online elicits comments from everyone. She encourages her class to use other students' names in their posts. Tim said that the role of faculty is to prompt students to engage. Marco said that the faculty member needs to manage the discussion so that one student does not monopolize; best to assign leadership roles for students so they can help maintain the level of discussion. We need to set the bar for peer comments. Rich said that he has done this and yet he still gets perfunctory comments from students.

**V. Other Issues:** Rich asked if there was anything else about the On-line program (or other issues). Marco said that we should engage the technology area, CIT, and get a budget for training. Develop a hybrid model – something simple. Ron asked about the new schedule for fall. Rich said that we are on target for our on the ground program in San Francisco and Sacramento, and we are recruiting people for the new program. Ron mentioned the coverage issue; if we are all on the same schedule then we cannot cover for one another. Rich said that (for example) one faculty member would do an all day PA 611 class and another faculty member would do an all day PA 613 class to cover the missed session (for time away for conferences, etc.). Returning to the online discussion, Rich said that what we can do in the classroom (that no one can do online) makes us a stronger program. Yes, we need to make adjustments for scheduling and there are skill sets we need to learn. For our next meeting in January, we will spend 40 minutes on the Executive Education Certificate Program, including Tony's conversation with Dean Davis, and we will discuss how to integrate a hybrid model into the classroom.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

**Action Items to be addressed after the meeting:**

Rich and Frank will write up a proposal for the potential option of adding a second class session, per week, to the cohort class schedules in the regions; if approved by the department, students would take two courses concurrently each week rather than take one course during the first half the semester and the second course during the second half of the semester.

For our next meeting in January: 1) we will continue our discussion about the MNA FT Program and the Theology and Religious Studies department at USF; 2) we will discuss how we want to proceed with our weekend courses and the possibility of an intensive weekend format; 3) we will spend 40 minutes on The Executive Education Certificate Program, including Tony's conversation with Dean Davis, and we will discuss how to integrate a hybrid model into the classroom.