

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

Master of Science in Organization Development Program

Self-Study

February 2007

Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary	4
2.	Overview of the Program	4
	2.1 Mission of the Program, College, and University	4
	2.2 Structure of the Program	5
	2.3 Brief History of the Program	6
	2.4 Program Goals, 2003-2007	7
3.	Curriculum	9
	3.1 Overview	9
	3.2 Ethics in the Curriculum	10
	3.3 Diversity in the Curriculum.....	10
4.	Faculty and Staff	11
	4.1 Overview	11
	4.2 Full-Time Faculty	11
	4.3 Part-Time Faculty	12
	4.4 Staff	13
5.	Students and Alumni	13
	5.1 Overview	13
	5.2 Student Recruitment and Retention	13
	5.3 Alumni	14
6.	Program Assessment	14
	6.1 Competencies and Learning Objectives.....	14
	6.2 Grade Distributions.....	14
	6.3 Course Evaluations	15
	6.4 Student Survey Results.....	15
	6.5 Alumni Survey Results.....	15
7.	Challenges and Opportunities for the Future of MSOD	15

List of Appendices

- Appendix A: External Reviewers
- Appendix B: External Reviewers' Preliminary Site Visit Schedule
- Appendix C: MSOD Student Enrollment and Retention by Semester and Location
- Appendix D: MSOD Student Credit Hours, 2003-2006
- Appendix E: MSOD Course Descriptions
- Appendix F: Reading List and Page Count for Each MSOD Course
- Appendix G: Full-Time Faculty Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae
- Appendix H: MSOD Program Faculty and Courses Taught
- Appendix I: Overview of 2006 Adjunct Faculty Meeting
- Appendix J: Agenda for Spring 2007 Student Orientation Session
- Appendix K: Competencies by Course
- Appendix L: Program Learning Objectives by Course
- Appendix M: Grade Distributions
- Appendix N: Course Evaluation Summaries
- Appendix O: Student Survey Results: 2003
- Appendix P: Student Survey Results: 2004
- Appendix Q: Student Survey Results: 2005
- Appendix R: Student Survey Results: 2006
- Appendix S: Alumni Survey Results: 2006

1. Executive Summary

This self-study report provides a review of the Master of Science in Organization Development (MSOD) program in the College of Professional Studies (CPS) at the University of San Francisco (USF). This is the first comprehensive program review undertaken for the MSOD program, which was developed as a substantial revision and extension of the Master of Human Resources and Organization Development (MHROD) program in 2003. This review will focus on the years 2003 to 2007, but when relevant, data on the MHROD program will be provided as supplementary information.

The self-study report was written in accordance with the USF program review process, as developed and administered through the office of James Wisner, USF Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, and under the supervision of CPS Dean Larry Brewster. The report was written by MSOD Program Director Sharon Wagner, with the assistance of MSOD full-time faculty member Sylvia Flatt and MSOD Assistant Frank Gigliotti. The self-study document will be viewed by the members of an external review team in preparation for a site visit in March, 2007 (see Appendices A and B), and will thereafter be made available to the USF community along with the recommendations of the external reviewers.

The report begins with an overview of the program, followed by a description of its curriculum, its faculty and staff, and its students and alumni. Next, assessment data for the program are offered. The report ends with a statement of current challenges and future opportunities for the MSOD program.

2. Overview of the Program

2.1 *Mission of the Program, College, and University*

The mission statement of the MSOD program reflects a focus on providing master's students with a rigorous education in OD consisting of a balance of theory and practical application.

The mission of the MSOD program at the University of San Francisco is to prepare master's students in the greater San Francisco Bay Area to become skilled practitioners of organization development. The program follows a scholar-practitioner model in which students learn relevant theory, gain interdisciplinary knowledge, and develop practical skills in organizational diagnosis, intervention, and evaluation. In accordance with the Jesuit Catholic tradition, we emphasize academic rigor and ethical practice.

The MSOD program is housed in the College of Professional Studies, a college dedicated to serving working professionals with a mix of graduate programs and undergraduate degree completion programs. The CPS mission statement reads as follows.

The College of Professional Studies at the University of San Francisco responds to the unique needs of working adult students by educating leaders for established and emerging professions through its undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Synthesizing scholarship and work experience into classroom education, faculty and staff dedicate themselves to academic excellence in the Jesuit, Catholic tradition.

As noted in the University's mission statement, USF is a private, Jesuit university which emphasizes academic excellence, respect for diversity, and service to others.

The core mission of the University is to promote learning in the Jesuit Catholic tradition. The University offers undergraduate, graduate and professional students the knowledge and skills needed to succeed as persons and professionals, and the values and sensitivity necessary to be men and women for others.

The University will distinguish itself as a diverse, socially responsible learning community of high quality scholarship and academic rigor sustained by a faith that does justice. The University will draw from the cultural, intellectual and economic resources of the San Francisco Bay Area and its location on the Pacific Rim to enrich and strengthen its educational programs.

2.2 Structure of the Program

The MSOD program is a 36-unit (9-course) cohort-based program completed in 27 months. Cohorts attend class one evening per week for a 4-hour session. Each of 6 3-unit courses is completed in 7 weeks, and each of 3 6-unit courses is completed in 14 weeks.

With ten active cohorts and close to 100 students, MSOD is the largest of the seven graduate programs offered by the College of Professional Studies. This level of enrollment, however, represents a decrease of over 30% during the past several years, a decrease that has kept pace with an overall decrease in enrollment at CPS. Please view Appendix C for detailed student enrollment information and Appendix D for student credit hours recorded during the past several years.

The program is offered at the San Francisco campus and at satellite campuses in the North Bay (Santa Rosa), South Bay (Cupertino), East Bay (San Ramon), and Sacramento. Tuition rate is \$765 per unit (\$27,540 for the program). Students pay approximately \$1,200 for books and other required course materials.

2.3 *Brief History of the Program*

The MSOD program officially began during the Fall 2004 semester. Its predecessor, the Master of Human Resources and Organization Development (MHROD) program, had existed since the early 1990's with early forms of the program dating back to the early 1980's. The recent history of the program begins in 1999, when MHROD faculty member Sylvia Flatt was appointed as director and was charged by CPS Dean Larry Brewster with the task of redesigning MHROD. The program suffered from perceptions of low quality in its curriculum and instruction, and despite its title, contained little to no human resources content.

Dr. Flatt assembled an advisory task force and consulted the 1999 *Guidelines for Entry Level Competencies to Organization Development and Change* of the Organizational Development and Change division of the Academy of Management to guide her curriculum redesign efforts. These changes laid the bedrock for the current MSOD program. The new curriculum was rolled out in Fall 2000, with no course left untouched. The curriculum included new foundation courses in organizational behavior and business fundamentals, a two-course emphasis in Human Resources, and a two-course emphasis in Organization Development.

From 2000 to 2003, Dr. Flatt and her faculty and staff replaced a system of student/instructor handbooks with a more flexible system of curriculum guides and sample syllabi, and worked to improve the selection and development of adjunct faculty. In 2001 due to College-wide changes, Dr. Flatt and her faculty shortened all three-unit MHROD courses from eight weeks to seven weeks and further accelerated the program so that it would be completed in 23 months. These changes necessitated alterations to all courses, placing two courses online, and scheduling two simultaneous courses at two points in the curriculum.

Also in 2001, Dr. Flatt addressed the problem of 50-60% of MHROD students who were graduating late or not at all, because of delays in completing their final research projects. Dr. Flatt changed the project requirement to a group capstone project and altered some MHROD course content to facilitate project completion. Then she conducted weekend capstone seminar workshops in San Francisco and Oakland, which allowed lapsed students to refocus and complete their research projects in exchange for one additional unit of tuition. In all, 113 students took advantage of this option to earn their MHROD degrees.

In 2003, Sharon Wagner became MHROD program director. With Dr. Flatt's assistance, Dr. Wagner designed and proposed the MSOD program, to further bring the program in line with top national standards and better serve the needs of the students. The 27-month MSOD program was approved by the USF Board of Trustees in December of 2003 and was launched in September of 2004. At that time, first year MHROD students were

provided with the option of transitioning to the MSOD program, and most students took advantage of that option.

From 2003 to present, Dr. Wagner and her faculty and staff have continued to work on improvements to program planning and operations; curriculum and instruction; and communication and feedback with part-time faculty, students, and alumni. Advancement in these areas can be assessed by examining progress that has been made on MSOD program goals.

2.4 Program Goals, 2003-2007

At the start of each academic year, the full-time faculty and staff of the MSOD program (program leadership team) set program goals for the year. At the end of each year, the team evaluates the progress made on the goals. The primary goals of the MSOD team since 2003 have been to a) develop and initiate the MSOD program, b) continuously improve the curriculum, c) continuously improve instruction, d) track and improve student satisfaction and success, e) improve the administrative efficiency of the program, and f) reach out to alumni. Progress made in each of these areas is summarized below.

a) Develop and Initiate MSOD Program.

- The new MSOD program was conceived, proposed, and approved.
- Program learning objectives and a program mission statement were developed.
- Students, San Francisco staff, regional staff, and faculty were transitioned to the new program, and the first incoming cohort of the MSOD program began coursework in Fall 2004.
- Voluntarily withdrawn students who had completed at least a year of coursework were recruited for reentry to the program.
- The “teachout” of the MHROD program is nearly complete, with one last student due to complete the program during Spring 2007.

b) Continuously Improve the Curriculum.

- Three new courses: MSOD 680, Leadership for Organization Development; MSOD 681, Contemporary Topics in OD; and MSOD 682, Culminating Project in Organization Development were created. (MSOD 681 was subsequently dropped from the curriculum.)
- Three courses: MSOD 600, Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change; MSOD 611, Applied OD Research and Statistics; and MSOD 646, Group Process, Communication and Facilitation underwent major revisions.
- Refinements were made to the remaining four courses in the curriculum.
- Two online courses have been redesigned so that all MSOD courses are delivered face-to-face.

- The curriculum has been reviewed for its inclusion of ethics content. As a result, changes have been made to several courses.
- The curriculum has been reviewed for its coverage of ethnically diverse thought leaders and practitioners, with resulting recommendations for curricular revisions.
- Learning objectives for each course are under review.
- Curriculum guides/syllabi are in the process of being further standardized.
- Additional curricular refinements are underway this year for MSOD 600, Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change; MSOD 645, Fundamentals of Business Practices; and MSOD 680, Leadership for Organization Development.

c) Continuously Improve Instruction.

- An MSOD adjunct faculty manual has been developed and distributed to all adjunct instructors.
- Learning objectives, course descriptions, and lists of readings for all courses have been provided to adjunct faculty to help provide them with a “big picture” view of the program.
- An online Blackboard site has been launched so that instructors may share experiences, information, and recommendations across courses.
- Instructors teaching the same course have been placed in email contact with each other.
- The pool of adjunct faculty has been improved with sustained effort in the areas of recruitment, selection, coaching, monitoring, feedback, and when necessary, removal of faculty from the pool. More work is required in this area.
- Yearly adjunct meetings have been institutionalized; adjunct feedback has been incorporated in developing the agendas for such meetings.

d) Track and Improve Student Satisfaction and Success.

- A student survey has been administered each year since 2003. The feedback from these surveys, along with feedback from course evaluations has been invaluable in helping to shape program improvements.
- A study is underway to assess predictors of student success in the MSOD program.
- To help with early identification of students who struggle to complete the MSOD program, an advancement to candidacy policy was implemented in Fall 2006 requiring students to earn a 3.0 GPA at 12 units to proceed in the program.
- The MSOD program designed and implemented a narrative feedback form to accompany feedback provided on the University-adopted course evaluation form. This form was subsequently adopted College-wide.
- Twice-yearly new student orientation sessions have continuously improved as the program strives to provide students with useful information at the start of their program.

e) *Improve the Administrative Efficiency of the Program.*

- A number of systems and procedures have been developed to increase administrative efficiency, including the following:
 - Database for tracking the assignment of instructors to courses and cohorts
 - Database for recording student admissions at each campus
 - Program metrics for tracking students, cohorts, instructors, and courses
 - Bench strength matrix for determining at a glance which instructors are available for a given course
 - Cohort visit record for tracking which cohorts have received visits from the program director and which instructors have been observed in the classroom in a given year

f) *Reach Out to Alumni.*

- The MSOD program seeks to improve contact and relationships with alumni. Much remains to be done in this area, but the following steps have been taken:
 - All MSOD graduates have been provided with the opportunity to register with an MSOD alumni database.
 - The program regularly sends job announcements to the attention of alumni who have registered with the database.
 - Preliminary meetings have been held to discuss the development of an MSOD alumni network.
 - The first annual MSOD alumni survey was administered in 2006.
 - Social events with current students and alumni have been conducted.
 - Alumni have been invited to faculty speaking engagements, MSOD open houses, and new student orientation sessions.

3. Curriculum

3.1 Overview

The sequence of courses in the MSOD program is as follows. (Please see Appendix E for course descriptions.)

- MSOD 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change (6 units)
- MSOD 601: Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change (3 units)
- MSOD 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices (3 units)
- MSOD 646: Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation (3 units)
- MSOD 611: Applied Organization Development Research and Statistics (6 units)
- MSOD 680: Leadership for Organization Development (3 units)
- MSOD 633: Foundations of Organization Development Practice (3 units)
- MSOD 634: Organization Development Interventions (3 units)
- MSOD 682: Culminating Project in Organization Development (3 units)

As part of the current program review, the program faculty and staff decided to closely examine the readings required across MSOD courses. The results of this examination, provided in Appendix F, have so far confirmed plans to focus on improvements to the quality and quantity of readings in MSOD 600, MSOD 645, and MSOD 680, and to balance course requirements of MSOD 633 with those of MSOD 634.

3.2 Ethics in the Curriculum

Ethical behavior is consistent with both the Jesuit tradition of education and with the foundations of OD practice. It is therefore critical that the MSOD program incorporate the study and application of ethics in the curriculum. Content related to ethics has been included in seven of the nine MSOD courses. Topics covered in each course are listed below.

MSOD 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change

- Ethical issues related to power and politics

MSOD 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices

- Business ethics from historical and contemporary perspectives
- Ethical decision making in a business context, including case analyses

MSOD 611: Applied Organization Development Research and Statistics

- Ethical issues in collecting and reporting data

MSOD 680: Leadership for Organization Development

- Perspectives on ethical leadership
- Principles of ethical leadership

MSOD 633: Foundations of Organization Development Practice

- Ethical standards as a foundation of OD practice
- Articulating one's own ethical code

MSOD 634: Organization Development Interventions

- Ethical application of OD interventions

MSOD 682: Culminating Project in Organization Development (3 units)

- Ethical collection and reporting of data

3.3 Diversity in the Curriculum

Respect for curricular diversity is an important part of USF's approach to education. In fact, one of the core values of the University is "a belief in and commitment to advancing...diversity of perspectives, experiences and traditions as essential components of a quality education in our global context" (<http://www.usfca.edu/mission/>).

In 2006, Sharon Wagner examined the extent to which diverse perspectives are included in the MSOD curriculum, as a result of a Curriculum Diversification Mini-Grant from

the Irvine Foundation. The grant work was focused on examining the coverage of underrepresented ethnic groups in the curriculum.

Dr. Wagner undertook a systematic review of the curriculum, examined historical and contemporary contributions of ethnic minority groups to theory and practice relevant to OD, and made recommendations as to which courses should include additional or altered content. These recommendations included adding an empirical article by Anne Tsui and colleagues on relational demography and organizational attachment to MSOD 600; adding an article from *Fortune* magazine on the contributions and accomplishments of minority business leaders to MSOD 680; planning to involve ethnic minority OD practitioners as guest lecturers in MSOD 633, and adding readings from Eduardo Salas (on training interventions), and from R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr. and Christopher Anne Easley (on diversity management) to the MSOD 634 curriculum.

The MSOD program faculty plan to incorporate these recommendations into the curricular revisions to be accomplished in 2007. Dr. Wagner will present the results of the grant work at the 2007 conference of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

4. Faculty and Staff

4.1 Overview

The MSOD program is staffed by three full-time faculty members, (one of whom serves as program director), and one office assistant. These individuals constitute the “MSOD Leadership Team”, which is responsible for the administration of the MSOD program. The January, 2006 departure of one full-time faculty member leaves the program with a vacancy at present; a search is underway for a replacement.

The program is supported by 20-30 adjunct faculty members, who teach the majority of MSOD course sections. The operations of the program are supported by additional staff in San Francisco and at the four regional campuses.

4.2 Full-Time Faculty

Sylvia Flatt and Sharon Wagner serve as full-time faculty members in the MSOD program. Dr. Flatt joined USF in 1994, and served as MSOD Program Director from 1999-2003. Dr. Wagner joined the USF in 2001 and has served as MSOD Program Director from 2003 to present. Both faculty members are tenured.

Dr. Flatt conducts research in the areas of corporate reputation and culture, and top management teams. She has served CPS and USF in a number of capacities, most recently as chair of the CPS Curriculum Committee, member of the CPS Tenure Peer

Review Committee and faculty search committees, and member of the USF Assessment and Student Academic Honesty Committees. Dr Flatt attends the annual meetings of the Organizational Development and Change (OD&C) division of the Academy of Management as well as yearly meetings of OD&C program directors. She also serves as a reviewer for the annual Academy of Management conference.

Dr. Wagner conducts research in the areas of quantitative measurement in OD, organizational citizenship behavior, and teaching effectiveness. In recent years, she has served CPS as Faculty Council Chair and member of the Strategic Planning Committee, and has participated as a member of USF's WASC Accreditation Steering Committee and Academic Integrity Task Force. Dr. Wagner frequently attends the Organization Development Network and Bay Area Organization Development Network conferences. She also serves as a reviewer for the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

Abbreviated curriculum vitae for Drs. Flatt and Wagner are provided in Appendix G; full curriculum vitae will be made available during the program review site visit.

4.3 Part-Time Faculty

The MSOD program is presently supported by 23 part-time (adjunct) faculty members. (Please see Appendix H, Table H.1 for a list of the adjunct faculty and the courses that they teach.) At any time, the number of adjunct faculty ranges from 20-30. The full-time faculty design and oversee the curriculum, but the majority of course sections are taught by adjunct faculty (65% during the past four semesters).

Adjunct faculty are recruited and selected for the MSOD program based on three primary factors: a) academic credentials (doctorate in OD or a related area preferred), b) teaching experience (experience at the graduate level preferred), and c) work experience related to OD. The MSOD full-time faculty and staff conduct a yearly adjunct faculty development meeting (please see Appendix I for an overview of the 2006 meeting) and assist individual faculty with their development throughout the year.

Eight of the adjunct faculty members on the current roster have terminal master's degrees. These individuals have taught 22% of the MSOD course sections during the past four semesters, mostly in two courses: MSOD 645, Fundamentals of Business Practices, and MSOD 646, Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation. These course assignments are considered to be a good fit, given the content of these courses and the expertise of the faculty. (Please see Appendix H, Tables H.2 and H.3 for summaries of sections taught by full-time vs. part-time faculty members and by faculty with doctorates vs. terminal master's degrees.)

4.4 Staff

Although the smooth operation of the MSOD program depends on the coordination of many staff members at the San Francisco and regional campuses, one staff member is most essential to the effectiveness of the program. Frank Gigliotti serves as MSOD Assistant, coordinating the program's day-to-day operations and serving as a central point of contact for students, faculty, and staff. Mr. Gigliotti, M.F.A. has worked for USF since 1990, and has held his current role with MSOD since 2002.

5. Students and Alumni

5.1 Overview

Students are admitted to the MSOD program in the fall and spring semesters of each academic year, and are introduced to CPS and MSOD with a student orientation session. (Please see Appendix J for the agenda from the most recent MSOD student orientation session.) Limited scholarship support is available for graduate students, including a new MSOD Alumni Scholarship which has been funded by an anonymous MSOD alumnus.

The admission standards for graduate programs in CPS are a 2.7 overall undergraduate GPA, a 3.0 GPA in the last 60 units of graduate work, and at least two years of full-time professional work experience. Exceptions to these admissions requirements may be made on a case-by-case basis. In a given semester, 5-10% of applicants are denied admission by the MSOD program director. This proportion, however, does not reflect applicants with low GPAs or insufficient work experience who are pre-screened and counseled out of applying for the MSOD program by recruiting personnel. Ninety-four students are currently enrolled in the MSOD program.

Reliable data on the qualifications of incoming MSOD students are available for the past two semesters. Students admitted in the Spring '06 semester had an average overall GPA of 3.08 and a GPA of 3.22 in their last 60 units of undergraduate work; their work experience averaged 6.0 years. Fall '06 admissions had an average overall GPA of 2.94 and a GPA of 3.04 in their last 60 units, with 5.6 years of work experience on average.

5.2 Student Recruitment and Retention

Students are recruited for two MSOD cohorts per year (fall and spring) in San Francisco and at the Cupertino campus. One cohort a year is recruited for each of the Santa Rosa, Sacramento, and San Ramon campuses. Groups were previously recruited for an Oakland campus; the last MSOD group in Oakland began in Fall 2003.

The average starting cohort size for the current MSOD cohorts was 11.1. Average cohort sizes have decreased in recent years, with a greater proportion of cohorts starting with

less than 10 students. Please see the previously referenced Appendix C for a summary of cohort starts since 2003.

Retention information is also provided in Appendix C. On average, 2-3 students leave an MSOD cohort during the course of the program, due to personal or work schedule conflicts, or academic dismissal. For the Fall 2003, Spring 2004 and Fall 2004 starts (the MSOD and MHROD-MSOD transition groups that have completed the program to date), the attrition rates have been 74%, 79%, and 89%, respectively.

5.3 Alumni

A total of 96 students have graduated with the MSOD degree to date, along with hundreds of students who earned the MHROD degree. All MSOD graduates have had an opportunity to register with the MSOD alumni database, and virtually all alumni have taken advantage of this opportunity. The program remains in regular contact with these individuals. Work remains to be done to locate MHROD alumni so that they may be included in future alumni activities.

6. Program Assessment

6.1 Competencies and Learning Objectives

The MSOD program is designed to meet the 1999 *Academy of Management Guidelines for Entry Level Competencies to Organization Development and Change*, which the current and previous MSOD program directors consider to be the top standards for OD education at the master's level. Each course in the curriculum has been carefully designed to address foundation knowledge, foundation skills, core knowledge, and/or core skills as outlined in the *Guidelines*. A summary of the knowledge and skills addressed by each MSOD course is provided in Appendix K.

The MSOD program has six learning objectives, each designed to be addressed by two or more courses in the curriculum. Please see Appendix L for a summary of program learning objectives by course.

6.2 Grade Distributions

During the past two years, MSOD full-time and adjunct faculty members have turned their attention to the issue of grade inflation. On a case-by-case basis, instructors who have tended to grant very high grades were counseled and advised, and expectations have been made clear about factors which tend to inflate grades, such as group work, credit for participation, and extra credit. The grade distributions for the past several semesters are reported in Tables M.1 and M.2 of Appendix M. While progress has been

made in the area of grade inflation, more can be done to identify and correct inflated grade distributions among certain courses and instructors.

6.3 Course Evaluations

Instructors in the MSOD program typically receive favorable course evaluations from the students. The results of course evaluations from the Fall 2004 semester through the Summer 2006 semester are provided in the tables of Appendix N.

6.4 Student Survey Results

Each year since 2003, a student survey has been distributed to students in the MSOD program. These surveys have been very helpful in maintaining communication with students and identifying areas of strength and weakness in the program. The results of the surveys show a steady increase in response rate from year to year, as well as a pattern of improvement on student ratings of their experience in the MSOD program. Please see Appendices O, P, Q, and R for the results of the student surveys.

6.5 Alumni Survey Results

The first annual MSOD alumni survey was distributed to 63 graduates of the program in 2006 (please see Appendix S for the results). Twenty-seven alumni responded to the survey, for a response rate of 42.9%. Alumni were asked about the extent to which the MSOD program had met its learning objectives; the majority of responses to these items were positive. Many students also reported interest in future alumni activities, as well as encouraging information about increases in salary they have experienced during and after graduation from the program.

7. Challenges and Opportunities for the Future of MSOD

A review of the MSOD program would not be complete without examining some of the challenges and opportunities currently faced by the program. Although the program has a sound curriculum, dedicated full-time and part-time instructors, and committed students, a primary challenge is delivering a program of consistent high quality given certain structural constraints. These constraints include the seven-week, 28 contact-hour cohort-based model, operations in five greater Bay Area locations, no admissions deadlines, and reliance on a shifting adjunct faculty base.

Another major challenge faced by the MSOD faculty is lack of time. The administrative demands of the program and the College reduce the time available for research, faculty development, and other service activities. Increased faculty involvement during the past

three years in student marketing and recruitment activities has further exacerbated this problem.

The primary opportunity for the MSOD program in the future is to build upon its strengths, given these constraints and challenges. During the next five years, the faculty and staff of the MSOD program plan to continue focusing on excellence in curriculum and instruction, student satisfaction, and alumni development. The program will also pursue opportunities to collaborate with other USF departments and colleges; one such opportunity is a possible joint MSOD/MBA program, currently under discussion with the USF School of Business and Management.

Appendix A

External Reviewers

David Jamieson is previous co-director of the M.S. in Organization Development program, founding academic director of the doctoral program in Organization Change, and current adjunct professor at Pepperdine University. He teaches group development, strategy, organizational design and change. Dr. Jamieson also is an active organizational consultant. He is co-author of *Managing Workforce 2000: Gaining the Diversity Advantage*, and *The Complete Guide to Facilitation: Enabling Groups to Succeed*. He is past president of The American Society for Training and Development, and is active in the Organization Development Network, serving as a member of its board of directors and editor of its online journal. He earned his Ph.D. in management from UCLA.

David A. Jamieson, Ph.D.
President
Jamieson Consulting Group
2265 Westwood Blvd., Suite 310
Los Angeles, CA 90064
email: djamieson@pepperdine.edu
phone: (310)397-8502

Donald Palmer is a professor in the Graduate School of Management at the University of California, Davis, which offers MBA programs for day students and working professionals. His past administrative experience includes service as department chair at Reed College. Dr. Palmer is a distinguished researcher; among his areas of expertise are organizational behavior, the role of power and politics in executive succession, and mergers and acquisitions. He teaches graduate seminars in group dynamics, and power and influence. Dr. Palmer serves as the editor for *Administrative Science Quarterly* and also serves on the editorial board of *California Management Review*. He earned his Ph.D. in sociology from the State University of New York, Stony Brook.

Donald A. Palmer, Ph.D.
Professor, Organizational Behavior
University of California
Graduate School of Management
109 AOB IV
One Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
email: dapalmer@ucdavis.edu
phone: (530)752-8566

Larry Starr is executive director of the Center for Organizational Dynamics and Director of the Organizational Dynamics Graduate Programs at the University of Pennsylvania. One of the programs he directs is a M.S. in Organizational Dynamics program designed for working professionals. Dr. Starr previously created and directed the M.S. in Organizational Development and Leadership program at Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine. Dr. Starr teaches administrative decision making and problem solving, and organizational consulting. His current research concerns organizational and individual characteristics in medical settings. Dr. Starr is active in the Academy of Management's Division of Organization Development and Change. He earned his Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Windsor.

Larry Starr, Ph.D.
Director Organizational Dynamics Degree Programs
Executive Director, Center for Organizational Dynamics
University of Pennsylvania
Organizational Dynamics Program, 328-A
3401 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6228
email: lstarr@sas.upenn.edu
phone: (215)898-6967

Appendix B

External Reviewers' Preliminary Site Visit Schedule

Tuesday, March 20, 2007

- 11:00-11:30** Presentation of self-study findings and additional materials by MSOD faculty Sharon Wagner and Sylvia Flatt
- 11:30-1:15** Discussion with Sharon Wagner, Sylvia Flatt, and MSOD Assistant Frank Gigliotti (catered lunch provided)
- 1:30-2:30** Interview with CPS Dean Larry Brewster and CPS Associate Dean Richard Beer
- 2:45-3:15** Telephone interview with regional directors
- 3:30-4:00** Telephone interview with MSOD alumni
- 4:15-4:45** Interview with Claudia Gillingwater, CPS Director of Student Support Services and Frank Gigliotti, MSOD Assistant
- 5:00-6:00** Interview with part-time MSOD faculty members
- 6:00-7:00** Interview with MSOD cohort Q0806
- 7:00-9:00** Dinner with MSOD faculty Sylvia Flatt and Sharon Wagner

Wednesday, March 21, 2007

- 10:00-10:30** Q&A as needed with Sharon Wagner
- 10:30-1:00** External reviewer meeting time (catered lunch provided; Sharon Wagner and Frank Gigliotti will be available as needed to answer questions or obtain additional information)
- 1:00-** Reviewers depart for home

Appendix C

*MSOD Student Enrollment and Retention
by Semester and Location*

Cohort*	Location	Number of Students Registered for First Course	Number of Graduated Students**
FALL 2003 STARTS			
Z0804	San Francisco	17	15
Z1904	Oakland	12	8
Z2604	San Ramon	11	7
Z3104	Cupertino	10	7
TOTALS		50	37 (74%)
SPRING 2004 STARTS			
Z1004	San Francisco	14	12
Z3404	Cupertino	9	7
Z6104	Sacramento	10	7
TOTALS		33	26 (79%)
FALL 2004 STARTS			
Q0805	San Francisco	16	14
Q2605	San Ramon	13	11
Q8505	Santa Rosa	8	8
TOTALS		37	33 (89%)
SPRING 2005 STARTS			
Q1005	San Francisco	8	6
Q3405	Cupertino	9	9
Q6105	Sacramento	20	18
TOTALS		37	33 (89%)
FALL 2005 STARTS			
Q0806	San Francisco	13	12
Q2606	San Ramon	11	6
TOTALS		24	18 (75%)
SPRING 2006 STARTS			
Q1006	San Francisco	9	7
Q3406	Cupertino	11	7
Q6106	Sacramento	7	5
TOTALS		27	19 (70%)

* Cohorts labeled with "Z" are MSOD transition groups (cohorts that began with the MHROD program and transitioned to the MSOD program). Cohorts labeled with "Q" are MSOD groups.

**Groups that began in Spring 2005, Fall 2005, and Spring 2006 are still enrolled in the program.

Appendix D

*MSOD Student Credit Hours
2003-2006*

Year*	2003	2004	2005	2006
Student Credit Hours**	3024	3232	2482	2015

*Fiscal year: June 1 through May 31

**Source: Dean's Office, College of Professional Studies

Appendix E

MSOD Course Descriptions

MSOD 600 Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change (6)

Explores the phenomenon of organizational change through the lens of micro (individual-level) organizational behavior. Topics include perception, decision-making, motivation, and diversity/individual differences. Using a diagnostic approach, students explore the nature and impact of change.

MSOD 601 Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change (3)

Uses a diagnostic approach to introduce major macro (organization-level) concepts, perspectives, and theories to analyze organizations, large-scale change, and the problems inherent in implementing change. Topics include organizational strategy, structure, culture, innovation and globalization.

MSOD 645 Fundamentals of Business Practices (3)

Provides an overview of business and economic concepts for an understanding of how organizations use financial information to make strategic decisions. Topics include: human capital, tools for productivity analysis, economics of globalization, and economics of competitive (strategic) advantage.

MSOD 646 Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation (3)

Students are introduced to major theories of group process and team dynamics, as well as practical techniques for facilitating productivity as a team member or outside facilitator. Topics include group structure; cohesion; power, conflict, and negotiation; decision-making; and group facilitation.

MSOD 611 Applied Organization Development Research and Statistics (6)

Students are introduced to research methods and statistical methods relevant to the practice of OD (qualitative and quantitative). The emphasis is on applied research methods and statistical techniques to develop research methodology and perform data analyses utilizing a statistical software package.

MSOD 680 Leadership for Organization Development (3)

Students explore, critique, and synthesize various theory-based and popular approaches to leadership using a case analysis approach. Topics include: team leadership, transformational leadership, virtual leadership, approaches to leadership, leadership and power, and leadership development.

MSOD 633 Foundations of Organization Development Practice (3)

Explores the three foundations of OD practice: a) the emergence and development of the field of organization development; b) values and ethics underlying OD as applied to business practice; and c) essential skills for the OD practitioner, including entering, contracting, developing client capability, and managing unplanned events in the change process.

MSOD 634 Organization Development Interventions (3)

Focuses on the design and implementation of a variety of organizational interventions. Students learn to design/choose appropriate interventions to move an organization from a current to a desired future state.

MSOD 682 Culminating Project in Organization Development (6)

Students conduct an applied research project within an existing organization. Students use a diagnostic and data-based approach to analyze the organization's current state and recommend strategies for change.

Appendix F

Reading List and Page Count for Each MSOD Course

Course*	Reading List	Pages**
MSOD 600 (6 units) Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change	<u>Texts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Burke, W. (2002). <i>Organization change: Theory and practice</i>. Thousand Oaks: Sage. ◆ Greenberg, J. & Baron, R. (2003). <i>Behavior in organizations</i> (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. <u>Readings Accessed Via Harvard Business School Online</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ <i>Empowerment: The emperor's new clothes</i> (Argyris, 1998) ◆ <i>The hidden traps in decision making</i> (Hammond, Kenney & Raiffa, 1998) ◆ <i>Learning by the case method</i> (Hammond, 1976) ◆ <i>The necessary art of persuasion</i> (Conger, 1998) ◆ Case: <i>Cirque du Soleil</i> (DeLong & Vijayaraghavan, 2002) ◆ Case: <i>Managing diversity at Cityside Financial Services</i> (Ely & Vargas, 2004) ◆ Case: <i>Transformation at the IRS</i> (Edmondson, Frei, & Hajim, 2002) 	606
MSOD 601 (3 units) Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change	<u>Texts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Daft, R. (2004), <i>Organizational theory and design</i> (9th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western. ◆ Tushman, M., & O'Reilly, C. (2002). <i>Winning through innovation: A practical guide to leading organizational change and renewal</i>. Boston: Harvard Business School Press. <u>Readings Accessed Via Harvard Business School Online</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ <i>The ambidextrous organization</i> (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2004) ◆ <i>Cracking the code of change</i> (Beer & Nohria, 2001) ◆ <i>Designing organizations that are built to change</i> (Worley & Lawler, 2006) ◆ <i>Leading by leveraging culture</i> (Chatman & Cha, 2003) ◆ <i>Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail</i> (Kotter, 2007) (republished 1995 article) ◆ <i>Organization design of owner-managed companies</i> (Davis, 1999) ◆ <i>What is strategy?</i> (Porter, 1996) ◆ Case: <i>GE's digital revolution: Redefining the E in GE</i> (Bartlett & Glinska, 2002) ◆ Case: <i>General Electric: Jack Welch's second wave (A)</i> (Bartlett & Elderkin, 1991) ◆ Case: <i>People Express Airlines: Rise and decline</i> (Beer, 1990) ◆ Case: <i>Southwest Airlines (A)</i> (O'Reilly, & Pfeffer, 1995) ◆ Case: <i>Southwest Airlines (B) Using human resources for competitive advantage</i> (O'Reilly, 1995) ◆ Case: <i>USA Today: Pursuing the network strategy (A)</i> (Tushman, Roberts, & Kiron, 2001) <u>Readings Accessed Via the Web (SWOT Analysis)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ www.marketingteacher.com/Lessons/lesson_swot.htm 	678

Course*	Reading List	Pages**
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ www.netmba.com/strategy/swot/ 	
MSOD 645 (3 units) Fundamentals of Business Practices	<u>Texts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Charan, R. (2001). <i>What the CEO wants you to know</i>. New York: Random House. ◆ Fraser, L., & Ormiston, A. (2003). <i>Understanding the corporate annual report: Nuts, bolts and a few loose screws</i>. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. <u>Readings Accessed Via Harvard Business School Online</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Case: <i>Accounting fraud at WorldCom</i> (Kaplan & Kiron, 2004) ◆ Case: <i>Sears Roebuck and Co. vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> (Miller & Noe, 2000) <u>Readings Accessed Via the Web (Business Ethics)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ A history of business ethics.htm ◆ Framework for ethical decision making.htm ◆ The link between moral and market values.htm ◆ What is ethics.htm 	288
MSOD 646 (3 units) Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation	<u>Texts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Levi, D. (2001). <i>Group dynamics for teams</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. ◆ Schwarz, R. (2002). <i>The skilled facilitator, new and revised: A comprehensive resource for consultants, facilitators, managers, trainers, and coaches</i>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. <u>Reading Accessed Via USF Online Library</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Baugh, S., & Graen, G. (1997). Effects of team gender and racial composition on perceptions of team performance in cross-functional teams. <i>Group and Organization Management</i>, 22, 366-384. 	550
MSOD 611 (6 units) Applied OD Research and Statistics	<u>Texts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2003). <i>Business research methods</i>. New York: Oxford University Press. ◆ Salkind, N.J. (2007). <i>Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics: The Excel edition</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <u>Statistics Modules Accessed Via Harvard Business School Online</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ <i>Quantitative analysis: An introductory course</i> (Hammond, 2004) 	770
MSOD 680 (3 units) Leadership for Organization Development	<u>Texts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ George, B. (2004). <i>Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value</i>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. ◆ <i>Harvard Business Review on leadership</i> (1998). Boston: Harvard Business School Press. ◆ Northouse, P. (2007). <i>Leadership: Theory and practice</i> (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 	482

Course*	Reading List	Pages**
MSOD 633 (3 units) Foundations of Organization Development Practice	<u>Texts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Block, P. (1999). <i>Flawless consulting: A guide to getting your expertise used (2nd ed.)</i>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. ◆ Cummings, T. G.. & Worley, C. G. (2004). <i>Organization development and change (8th ed.)</i>. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western. <u>Readings Accessed Via USF Online Library</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Di Pofi, A.J. (2002). Organizational diagnostics: Integrating qualitative and quantitative methodology. <i>Journal of Organizational Change Management</i>, 15(2), pp. 156-168. ◆ Edmondson, A. (1996). Three faces of Eden: The persistence of competing theories and multiple diagnoses in organizational intervention research. <i>Human Relations</i>, 49 (5), pp. 571-595. ◆ Grievies, J. (2000). Images of change: The new organizational development. <i>The Journal of Management Development</i>, 19(5) pp. 345-447. ◆ Weisbord, M (1976). Organizational diagnosis: Six places to look for trouble with or without a theory. <i>Group & Organization Studies</i>, 1(4), 430-447. ◆ Whooten, K. & White, L. (1999). Linking OD's philosophy with justice theory: Postmodern implications. <i>Journal of Organizational Change Management</i>, 12(1), pp. 7-20. <u>Readings Accessed Via the Web (OD Competencies and Principles of Practice)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ www.odnetwork.org/aboutod/odcompetencies.php?zoom_highlightsub=competencies ◆ www.odnetwork.org/aboutod/principles.php 	655
MSOD 634 (3 units) Organization Development Interventions	<u>Text</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Cummings, T.G., & Worley, C.G. (2004). <i>Organization development and change (8th ed.)</i>. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western. <u>Readings Accessed Via Harvard Business School Online</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Case: <i>Harrah's Entertainment, Inc.: Rewarding our people</i> (DeLong & Vijayaraghavan, 2002) ◆ Case: <i>IBM's diversity strategy: Bridging the workplace and the marketplace</i> (Thomas & Kanji, 2004) ◆ Case: <i>The new HP: The clean room and beyond</i> (Kind & Perlow, 2004) <u>Readings Accessed Via USF Online Library</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Golembiewski, R.T. (Summer, 2004). Twenty questions for our future: Challenges facing OD and ODers, or whatever it is. <i>Organization Development Journal</i>, 22(2), 6-20. ◆ Worley, C.G., & Feyerherm, A.E. (2003). Reflections on the future of organization development. <i>The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science</i>, 39(1), 97-115. 	476

Course*	Reading List	Pages**
MSOD 682 (3 units, transitioning to 6 units) Culminating Project in Organization Development	<u>Texts</u> ♦ Tushman, M., & O'Reilly, C. (2002). <i>Winning through innovation: A practical guide to leading organizational change and renewal</i> . Boston: Harvard Business School Press. <u>Readings Accessed Via Harvard Business School Online</u> ♦ <i>SWOT analysis I: Looking outside for threats and opportunities</i> (HBS Press Chapter, 2005) ♦ <i>SWOT analysis II: Looking inside for strengths and weaknesses</i> (HBS Press Chapter, 2005) ♦ Case: <i>People Express Airlines: Rise and decline</i> (Beer, 1990) <u>Readings Accessed Via the Web</u> ♦ http://www.managementhelp.org/evaluatn/intrview.htm ♦ http://www.roguecom.com/interview/module4.html ♦ http://www.roguecom.com/interview/module5.html <u>Additional Reading (Distributed in Class)</u> ♦ SWOT Analysis: Community Tool Box Practice	126

*MSOD 600, 645, and 680 are currently under revision.

**Page counts are approximate, due to some web-based material. Page counts do not include additional readings that students must obtain for term papers, research projects, or special assignments.

Appendix G

Full-Time Faculty Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae

ABBREVIATED CURRICULUM VITAE

SYLVIA J. FLATT

EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, Ph.D. Sociology, 1993
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, M.P.H., Public Health, 1985
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, M.A., Sociology, 1981
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, B.A., Political Science, 1974

EXPERIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, September, 1994 to present

Current Rank: Tenured Associate Professor (Former Program Director 1999-2003)

- Teaching responsibility at the San Francisco campus and four out of five regional campuses: Organizational Analysis, Organization Theory, Organizational Behavior and Change, OD Research Methods and Statistics, Capstone Project, Culminating Project, Thesis, Planned Change, Organizational Behavior.
- Developed curriculum for Organizational Analysis and project designs for the Capstone Project and Culminating Project and coached part time faculty teaching these courses.
- As Program Director (1999-2003) implemented revised program to meet OD&C Academy of Management suggested guidelines for approximately 200 students, 2 -3 faculty, and 30-40 part-time faculty members.

GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY, September 2004 – December 2004

Part Time: Adjunct Professor, School of Business, Doctoral Program

- Taught Organizational Behavior and Theory

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY, September 1997 – August 1999, Summer 2006

Part Time and Visiting Professor (January 1998-June 1998): Leavey School of Business (MBA Program)

Taught Organizational Analysis, Organizational Innovation and Change, Organizational Behavior, Teams in Organizations

SELECTED SERVICE ACTIVITIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

- USF Assessment; Student Academic Honesty; Development Committee, Plan 2005 Strategic Planning (Task Force: Broader Community)
- College of Professional Studies: Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee (Chair); Associate Dean Search Committee; Peer Review Committee; Faculty Handbook Task Force; Faculty Search Committees

SELECTED PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES

- Reviewer, *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*; Prentice Hall Business Publishing Division; Academy of Management Conferences (Organization, Change and Development; Business Policy and Strategy; Organization and Management Theory)

- Member: Dissertation Committees (University of San Francisco, School of Education; Golden Gate University, School of Business)
- Internal Management Consultant, University of California, Berkeley and San Francisco (1983-1992)

SELECTED HONORS

- Two Western Academy of Management (WAM) papers were nominated for best paper
- Dissertation Research Grant: Smith-Richardson Foundation Grant to the Consortium on Competitiveness and Cooperation

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Flatt, S., Kowalczyk, S. (2006). Creating competitive advantage through intangible assets: the direct and indirect effects of corporate reputation and culture. (In review, *Advances in Competitiveness Research*).

Flatt, S., Kowalczyk, S. (2006). Indirect and direct effects between financial performance and two intangible resources: corporate culture and reputation. Presented at the Strategic Management Society Conference, Vienna, Austria.

Flatt, S., Kowalczyk, S. (2006). Corporate reputation as a mediating variable between corporate culture and financial performance. Presented at the Reputation Institute Conference, New York, New York.

Kowalczyk, S. and **Flatt, S.** (2005). A preliminary study on the relationship between corporate reputation and the external perception of culture. Presented at the Western Academy of Management Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada (nominated best paper).

Flatt, S., (2005). Achieving top management team innovativeness: striking a balance between quality decisions and implementation. Presented at the Western Academy of Management Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Kowalczyk, S. and **Flatt, S.** (2004). Corporate reputation and financial performance: the emergence of reputation persistence. Presented at the Western Academy of Management Conference, Alyeska, Alaska.

Flatt, S. and Kowalczyk, S. (2000). Do corporate reputations reflect external perceptions of organizational culture? *Corporate Reputation Review*, 3(4).

Kowalczyk, S. and **Flatt, S.** (1999). An empirical exploration of the relationship between organizational culture and reputation. Presented at the Western Academy of Management Conference, Long Beach, California (nominated best paper).

Philips, K., **Flatt, S.**, Morrison, K. (1995). Who will use the new home access HIV test? Estimates from the 1992 National Health Interview Survey. *New England Journal of Medicine*, May 11, 1995.

ABBREVIATED CURRICULUM VITAE

SHARON L. WAGNER

EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, Ph.D. Industrial/Organizational Psychology, 1989
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, B.A. Psychology and English, 1985

EXPERIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, September, 2001 to present
Current Rank: Tenured Professor and Director, MSOD Program

- Leading accelerated (27-month, 36-unit) graduate program of 120-150 students, 3 full-time faculty members and 20-30 part-time faculty members.
- Teaching responsibility at the San Francisco campus and five regional campuses: Organizational Behavior and Change, Group Dynamics and Team Development, Designing Organizational Change, Foundations of OD Practice, OD Interventions, Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation, OD Research Methods and Statistics, Capstone Project, Culminating Project.

GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY, August, 1998 to August, 2001
Final Rank: Tenured Professor and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, School of Professional Programs and Undergraduate Studies

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY, January, 1992-July, 1998
Final Rank: Tenured Associate Professor, Department of Psychology

SELECTED SERVICE ACTIVITIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

- USF WASC Accreditation Steering Committee; Academic Integrity Task Force; University Curriculum Committee; Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
- College of Professional Studies Faculty Council (Chair); Curriculum Committee; Associate Dean Search Committee; Strategic Planning Committee; Peer Review Committee

SELECTED PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES

- Organization Development Consultant (1985-present)
- Reviewer, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, *Academy of Management Review*, *Academy of Management Journal*
- Coordinator (President), Tennessee/Kentucky OD Network

SELECTED HONORS, CERTIFICATIONS, AND GRANTS

- Irvine Curriculum Diversification Grant
- GGU Scholarship of Integration and Application (Research) Award
- MTSU Research, Faculty Development, and Instructional Technologies Development Grants

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Wagner, S., Lusnar, M. (2006). Adding value to group dynamics courses with student-facilitated experiential learning. Poster presentation at the 2006 Association for Psychological Science Conference, New York, New York.

Wagner, S., Moffett, R., & Westberry, C. (2006). Performance appraisal feedback: A role-play exercise. In T. Duening & J. Ivancevich (Eds.) *Management: Skills, application, practice, and development* (1st ed.). Cincinnati: Atomic Dog.

Jerden, E., & **Wagner, S.** (2004). Organizational roles and perceptions of organizational citizenship behavior. Poster presented at the 2004 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, Chicago, IL.

Wagner, S., Hammond, C., & Fulton, K. (2004). Results-oriented communication techniques that reinforce OD impact. Presentation at the 2004 Organization Development Network International Conference, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Wagner, S., Goodin, N., & Hammond, C. (2003). The chrysalis flower. In E. Biech (Ed.), *The 2003 Pfeiffer Annual*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Wagner, S., & Hammond, C. (2003). Demonstrating the ROI of OD. Presentation at the 2003 Organization Development Network International Conference, Portland, Oregon.

Jones, S., McCarthy, P., **Wagner, S.,** & Hein, M. (2002). Effectiveness measurement for a knowledge work group of industrial organizational psychologists. In R.D. Pritchard, H. Holling, F. Lammers, & B.D. Clark (Eds.), *Improving organizational performance with the Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System: An international collaboration*. Huntington, NY: Nova Science.

Wagner, S. (2002). Using the power of quantitative measurement to demonstrate OD results. Workshop presented at the 2002 Organization Development Network International Conference, Montreal, Canada.

Wagner, S., Martin, N., & Hammond, C. (2002). A brief primer on quantitative measurement for the OD professional. *OD Practitioner*, 34(3).

Wagner, S., & Moffett, R. (2000). Assessment methodology, context and empowerment: The ACE model of skill development. *Journal of Management Education*, 24(4).

Wagner, S., & Rush, M. (2000). Altruistic citizenship behavior: Context, disposition and age. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(3).

Wagner, S. (Chair), Geehr, J., Fulton, K., Baker, M., & Morrow, C. (May, 1999). Using competencies as the basis for integrating human resource systems. Practitioner forum presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Gailbreath, R., **Wagner, S.,** Moffett, R., & Hein, M. (1997). Homogeneity in behavioral preference among U.S. Army leaders. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 1(3).

Appendix H

MSOD Program Faculty and Courses Taught

H.1: Courses Taught by Each MSOD Faculty Member

Full-Time MSOD Faculty	Courses Taught
Sylvia Flatt, Ph.D.	Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change; Applied OD Research and Statistics; Culminating Project in OD
Sharon Wagner, Ph.D.	Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change; Applied OD Research and Statistics; Foundations of OD Practice; OD Interventions; Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation; Culminating Project in OD
Part-Time MSOD Faculty*	Courses Taught
Jackie Alcalde-Marr, MHROD	Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation; Leadership for Organization Development
Hilda Carpenter, Ph.D.	Applied OD Research and Statistics; Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation
Lee Edwards, Ed.D.	OD Interventions
Frawley, Stephen S. Ed.D.	Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change
Jamen Graves, Ph.D.	Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation
Michael Horne, Ph.D.	Foundations of OD Practice; OD Interventions; Leadership for Organization Development
Mike Jacobson, M.A.	Applied OD Research and Statistics
Patricia Johnson, M.B.A.	Fundamentals of Business Practices
Claire Laughlin, M.A.	Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation
Timothy Loney, D.P.A.	Foundations of OD Practice; OD Interventions; Leadership for Organization Development; Culminating Project in OD
Mark P. Lusnar, Ph.D.	Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change; Leadership for Organization Development; OD Interventions
Brian Moffitt, Ed.D.	Foundations of OD Practice; OD Interventions
Brad Morrison, M.A.	Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation; Foundations of OD Practice; OD Interventions
Kathleen Nakfoor, Ed.D.	Foundations of OD Practice
Grant Pritchard, M.B.A.	Fundamentals of Business Practices; Leadership for Organization Development
Ed Rimer, D.P.A.	Organization Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change; Culminating Project in OD
Gregory Robinson, Ph.D.	Applied OD Research and Statistics
Michael Semler, Ph.D.	Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change
Dan Sevall, M.B.A.	Fundamentals of Business Practices; Leadership for Organization Development
Christie Struckman, Ph.D.	Applied OD Research and Statistics
Sue Thompson, MHROD	Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation
Gayle Yamauchi-Gleason, Ph.D.	Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change; Leadership for Organization Development
Ron Young, Ph.D.	Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change

* Includes all part-time faculty members who have taught at least one course since the Fall 2005 semester.

H.2: Sections Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Members

	Course sections taught by full-time faculty	Course sections taught by part-time faculty	Totals
Fall 2005	7 (35%)	13 (65%)	20
Spring 2006	5 (31%)	11 (69%)	16
Summer 2006	3 (27%)	8 (73%)	11
Fall 2006	9 (41%)	13 (59%)	22
Totals	24 (35%)	45 (65%)	69

H.3: Sections Taught by Faculty with Doctorates and Faculty with Terminal Master's Degrees

	Course sections taught by faculty with doctorates	Course sections taught by faculty with terminal master's degrees	Totals
Fall 2005	14 (70%)	6 (30%)	20
Spring 2006	14 (87.5%)	2 (12.5%)	16
Summer 2006	10 (91%)	1 (9%)	11
Fall 2006	16 (73%)	6 (27%)	22
Totals	54 (78%)	15 (22%)	69

Appendix I

Overview of 2006 Adjunct Faculty Meeting

 **2006 MSOD Faculty Meeting**

University of San Francisco
College of Professional Studies

February 11, 2006



Agenda

9:00-9:20	Introductions
9:20-9:40	Updates on Items from 2005 Meeting
9:40-11:15	Sharing Practices and Approaches
11:15-12:00	On the Horizon for MSOD



Introductions

Updates on Items from 2005 Meeting

- ◆ Program Learning Objectives
- ◆ Course Learning Objectives
- ◆ Grading in MSOD Courses

MSOD Program Description

The MSOD program is geared toward professionals seeking to build expertise in designing and implementing effective organizational change.

In becoming leaders of change, MSOD students learn relevant theory, practical applications, and the latest OD techniques and interventions for addressing contemporary organizational challenges.

MSOD Learning Objectives

- ◆ *Develop master's level competence in the design, facilitation, and implementation of organizational change.*
- ◆ *Understand and apply concepts from the fields of organizational behavior, change leadership, group dynamics, and organization theory.*
- ◆ *Demonstrate skill in group facilitation and communication.*

MSOD Learning Objectives

- ◆ *Communicate the impact of OD in a business context.*
- ◆ *Use systematic techniques to gather and interpret organizational data.*
- ◆ *Use theory to guide practice in diagnosing, designing, and implementing successful organizational change.*

Sharing Practices and Approaches



1. What techniques, practices, or approaches have worked well for you in teaching the course?
2. What are the challenges in teaching the course?
3. What suggestions do you have for improving the value of the course to students?

On the Horizon for MSOD

- ◆ MSOD Program Review
 - ◆ Communicating about the Curriculum
 - ◆ Culminating Project
 - ◆ Adjunct Manual
 - ◆ MSOD Faculty Blackboard
-
- ◆ Feedback on Today's Session, Your Suggestions for Next Year's Meeting

Lunch



Thank you!!!

Appendix J

Agenda for Spring 2007 Student Orientation Session

**Spring 2007 CPS Student Orientation
MSOD Program Session Agenda**

- Welcome, Introductions, and Raffle
- Administrative Information
- Selected Policies
- The Cohort Model
- Expectations of Faculty and Students
- Assessment
- Program Overview, Course Sequence

Appendix K

Competencies by Course

	MSOD 600	MSOD 601	MSOD 645	MSOD 646	MSOD 611	MSOD 680	MSOD 633	MSOD 634	MSOD 682
IA. FOUNDATION KNOWLEDGE									
1. Organizational behavior (organization culture, work design, interpersonal relations, power and politics, leadership, goal setting, conflict, ethics)	X			X		X			
2. Individual behavior (learning theory, motivation theory, perception theory)	X								
3. Group dynamics (roles, communication processes, decision making processes, stages of group development, leadership)				X		X			
4. Management and organization theory (planning, organizing, leading, and controlling; problem solving and decision making; systems theory; contingency theory; organization structure; characteristics of environment and technology; models of organization and systems effectiveness)	X	X							
5. Research methods/statistics (measures of central tendency, measures of dispersion, basic sampling theory, basic experimental designs, sample inferential statistics)					X				
6. Comparative cultural perspectives (dimensions of national culture, dimensions of industry culture, systems implications)		X						X	
7. Functional knowledge of business and management principles and practice			X						

	MSOD 600	MSOD 601	MSOD 645	MSOD 646	MSOD 611	MSOD 680	MSOD 633	MSOD 634	MSOD 682
1B. FOUNDATION SKILLS									
1. Interpersonal communication				X			X		
2. Collaboration/working together				X			X		X
3. Problem solving			X		X				
4. Using new technology					X				
5. Conceptualizing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6. Project management									X
7. Presenting/educating/coaching	X			X			X	X	

	MSOD 600	MSOD 601	MSOD 645	MSOD 646	MSOD 611	MSOD 680	MSOD 633	MSOD 634	MSOD 682
1C. CORE KNOWLEDGE									
1. Organization design: decision processes associated with formulating and aligning the elements of an organizational system (e.g., structural systems, human resource systems, information systems, reward systems, work design, political systems, and organization culture.		X						X	
2. Organization research: field research methods, interviewing, content analysis, questionnaire and interview protocol design, designing change evaluation processes, longitudinal data collection and analysis, understanding and detection of alpha, beta, and gamma change, quantitative and qualitative methods.					X			X	X

	MSOD 600	MSOD 601	MSOD 645	MSOD 646	MSOD 611	MSOD 680	MSOD 633	MSOD 634	MSOD 682
1C. CORE KNOWLEDGE, CONTINUED									
3. System dynamics: description and understanding of how systems evolve and develop over time and respond to exogenous and endogenous disruption and planned interventions (e.g. evolution and revolution, punctuated equilibrium theory, chaos theory, catastrophe theory, incremental vs. quantum change, transformation theory).	X	X					X		X
4. History of OD&C: understanding of social, political, economic, and personal forces that led to the emergence and development of OD&C, including key thought leaders, values underlying their writings and actions, key events and writings, and related documentation (human relations movement, NTL/T groups/sensitivity training, survey research, quality of work life, Tavistock Institute, humanistic values, statement of ethics).	X						X		
5. Theories and models for change: basic action research model, participatory action research, the planning model, change typologies (e.g., fast, slow, incremental, quantum, revolutionary), Lewin's model, transition models, etc.	X	X					X		X

	MSOD 600	MSOD 601	MSOD 645	MSOD 646	MSOD 611	MSOD 680	MSOD 633	MSOD 634	MSOD 682
1D. CORE SKILLS									
1. Managing the consulting process: the ability to enter, contract, diagnose, design appropriate interventions, implement those interventions, manage unprogrammed events, and evaluate a change process.							X	X	X
2. Analysis/diagnosis: ability to conduct an inquiry into a system's effectiveness to see the root cause(s) of a system's current level of effectiveness. The core skill is interpreted to include all systems, individual, group, organization, and multi-organization, as well as the ability to understand and inquire into one's self.	X	X		X			X		X
3. Designing/choosing appropriate/relevant interventions: understanding how to select, modify, or design interventions that will effectively move the organization from current state to desired future state.				X				X	
4. Facilitation and process consultation: ability to assist an individual or group toward a goal. The ability to conduct an inquiry into individual and group processes such that the client system maintains ownership of the issue, increases their capacity for reflection on the consequences of their behaviors and actions, and develops a sense of increased control and ability.				X			X	X	

	MSOD 600	MSOD 601	MSOD 645	MSOD 646	MSOD 611	MSOD 680	MSOD 633	MSOD 634	MSOD 682
1D. CORE SKILLS, CONTINUED									
5. Developing client capability: ability to conduct a change process in such a way that the client is more able to plan and implement a successful change process in the future, utilizing technologies of planned change in a values-based and ethical manner.				X			X	X	
6. Evaluating organization change: ability to design and implement a process to evaluate the impact and effects of a change intervention, including control of alternative explanations and interpretation of performance outcomes.					X			X	

Note: Competency areas drawn from the *Academy of Management Guidelines for Entry Level Competencies to Organization Development and Change* (Varney, Worley, Darrow, Neubert, Cady, & Guner, 1999)

Appendix L

Program Learning Objectives by Course

	MSOD 600	MSOD 601	MSOD 645	MSOD 646	MSOD 611	MSOD 680	MSOD 633	MSOD 634	MSOD 682
1. Develop master's level competence in the design, facilitation, and implementation of organizational change.	X	X		X			X	X	
2. Understand and apply concepts from the fields of organizational behavior, change leadership, group dynamics, and organization theory.	X	X		X		X		X	X
3. Demonstrate skill in group facilitation and communication.				X			X		
4. Communicate the impact of OD in a business context.			X		X			X	
5. Use systematic techniques to gather and interpret organizational data.			X		X			X	X
6. Use theory to guide practice in diagnosing, designing, and implementing successful organizational change.	X	X		X		X	X	X	X

Appendix M

Grade Distributions

M.1 Grade Distributions for Full-Time Faculty (FTF), Part-Time Faculty (PTF) and All Faculty (All) by Semester, Fall 2004 – Summer 2006

Course Grade	Fall 2004			Spring 2005			Summer 2005			Fall 2005			Spring 2006			Summer 2006			Totals		
	FTF	PTF	All	FTF	PTF	All	FTF	PTF	All	FTF	PTF	All	FTF	PTF	All	FTF	PTF	All	FTF	PTF	All
A+	8	17	25	6	9	15	7	9	16	11	11	22	1	6	7	2	11	13	35	63	98
A	17	81	98	14	75	89	28	55	83	22	60	82	15	41	56	15	34	49	111	346	457
A+ or A	41%	77%	65%	38%	51%	48%	59%	44%	49%	42%	53%	49%	35%	41%	39%	55%	58%	57%	45%	54%	51%
A-	10	14	24	15	27	42	11	40	51	17	30	47	10	29	39	5	16	21	68	156	224
B+	8	5	13	11	28	39	6	13	19	10	17	27	5	20	25	6	12	18	46	95	141
B	2	4	6	4	15	19	3	16	19	10	11	21	5	15	20	1	3	4	25	64	89
A-, B+, or B	33%	18%	23%	58%	43%	46%	34%	48%	44%	47%	43%	45%	43%	56%	52%	39%	40%	39%	43%	41%	42%
B-	2	2	4	1	5	6	1	6	7	6	0	6	7	1	8	1	0	1	18	14	32
C+	7	0	7	0	2	2	1	4	5	1	3	4	2	1	3	1	0	1	12	10	22
C	3	3	6	0	3	3	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	7	8	15
C-	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	4
F	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	4	7
Less than B	26%	5%	12%	4%	6%	6%	7%	8%	7%	10%	4%	6%	22%	3%	9%	6%	3%	4%	13%	5%	7%
Totals	61	127	188	52	164	216	59	144	203	78	134	212	46	115	161	31	78	109	327	762	1089

M.2 GPA of All Grades Awarded by Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and All Faculty by Semester, Fall 2004 – Summer 2006*

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty	All Faculty
Fall 2004	3.26 (61)	3.82 (127)	3.64 (188)
Spring 2005	3.62 (52)	3.64 (164)	3.64 (216)
Summer 2005	3.70 (59)	3.60 (144)	3.64 (203)
Fall 2005	3.57 (78)	3.68 (134)	3.64 (212)
Spring 2006	3.43 (46)	3.59 (115)	3.55 (161)
Summer 2006	3.69 (31)	3.71 (78)	3.70 (109)
Fall 2004 through Summer 2006	3.54 (327)	3.67 (762)	3.63 (1089)

*For each GPA, the number of grades awarded is indicated in parentheses.

Appendix N

Course Evaluation Summaries

N.1: Course Evaluation Summary for HROD Courses During HROD-MSOD Transition, Fall '04-Summer '05*

item	HROD 633 (50)	HROD 634 (17)	hrod 645 (32)	hrod 650 (27)	hrod 670 (103)
1. The clarity and audibility of the instructor's speech are excellent.	4.44	4.44	4.08	4.20	4.12
2. The contents of the assignments contribute to my understanding of the subject.	4.04	4.04	3.91	4.11	3.81
3. The requirements of the course (projects, papers, exams, etc.) were explained adequately.	3.78	3.78	3.86	3.84	3.78
4. The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about this subject.	3.92	3.92	3.91	3.96	3.72
5. The instructor has adequate means for evaluating my learning.	4.05	4.05	3.99	3.89	3.86
6. The methods being used for evaluating my work (such as tests, projects, etc.) are reasonable.	4.10	4.10	3.98	3.96	3.73
7. Adequate opportunities are provided by the instructor for me to ask questions.	4.26	4.74	4.28	4.39	4.13
8. The instructor is teaching the course material or skills clearly.	3.87	4.49	4.01	4.02	3.62
9. The instructor seems to be well prepared.	4.05	4.67	4.32	4.10	4.16
10. The instructor seems to care about my learning.	4.18	4.74	4.43	4.52	3.96
11. The course appears to have been carefully planned.	3.95	4.64	4.28	3.84	3.69
12. Course objectives are being achieved.	3.91	4.43	4.06	3.89	3.67
13. During the term, I looked forward to attending this class.	3.68	4.39	3.47	4.09	2.79
14. Compared with other courses on this level carrying an equal amount of credit, the effort I put into this course is as much as in other courses.	3.91	4.56	4.09	4.15	3.59
15. Course objectives have been expressed clearly.	3.95	4.47	4.18	3.89	3.89
16. The instructor demonstrates a personal commitment to high standards of professional competence.	4.26	4.65	4.59	4.54	4.17
17. The instructor provides useful feedback on student progress (identifying strengths and weaknesses).	3.83	4.41	3.97	3.73	3.62
18. In this course I am learning much.	3.97	4.24	3.99	3.85	3.70
19. The out-of-class assignments are challenging.	4.24	4.55	4.69	4.18	4.32
20. The instructor supervises and helps in new experiences without taking over.	4.06	4.44	4.06	4.09	3.84
21. The instructor relates underlying theory to practice.	4.05	4.61	4.10	4.00	3.80
22. Overall I rate this instructor a good teacher.	3.92	4.59	4.39	4.13	4.02

N.2: Course Evaluation Summary for MSOD Courses, Fall '04-Summer '06

item	MSOD 600 (111)	MSOD 601 (109)	MSOD 611 (30)	MSOD 633 (74)	MSOD 634 (134)
1. The clarity and audibility of the instructor's speech are excellent.	4.80	4.13	4.68	4.50	4.58
2. The contents of the assignments contribute to my understanding of the subject.	4.64	4.12	4.45	4.53	4.49
3. The requirements of the course (projects, papers, exams, etc.) were explained adequately.	4.43	3.81	4.43	4.18	4.26
4. The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about this subject.	4.48	3.65	4.28	4.02	4.22
5. The instructor has adequate means for evaluating my learning.	4.41	3.84	4.34	4.29	4.30
6. The methods being used for evaluating my work (such as tests, projects, etc.) are reasonable.	4.24	3.77	4.24	4.28	4.30
7. Adequate opportunities are provided by the instructor for me to ask questions.	4.70	4.10	4.78	4.53	4.50
8. The instructor is teaching the course material or skills clearly.	4.62	3.49	4.48	4.26	4.37
9. The instructor seems to be well prepared.	4.79	3.62	4.51	4.43	4.35
10. The instructor seems to care about my learning.	4.70	4.07	4.67	4.47	4.49
11. The course appears to have been carefully planned.	4.56	3.81	4.42	4.32	4.18
12. Course objectives are being achieved.	4.59	3.83	4.38	4.41	4.21
13. During the term, I looked forward to attending this class.	4.57	3.44	3.67	4.19	4.17
14. Compared with other courses on this level carrying an equal amount of credit, the effort I put into this course is as much as in other courses.	4.26	4.01	3.86	4.13	4.26
15. Course objectives have been expressed clearly.	4.65	3.92	4.51	4.40	4.40
16. The instructor demonstrates a personal commitment to high standards of professional competence.	4.79	3.94	4.78	4.60	4.44
17. The instructor provides useful feedback on student progress (identifying strengths and weaknesses).	4.20	3.76	4.14	4.04	4.18
18. In this course I am learning much.	4.59	3.93	4.39	4.34	4.29
19. The out-of-class assignments are challenging.	4.55	4.53	4.70	4.40	4.51
20. The instructor supervises and helps in new experiences without taking over.	4.22	3.65	4.41	4.28	4.28
21. The instructor relates underlying theory to practice.	4.46	3.71	4.64	4.34	4.41
22. Overall I rate this instructor a good teacher.	4.66	3.66	4.73	4.38	4.44

N.2: Course Evaluation Summary for MSOD Courses, Fall '04-Summer '06, continued

item	MSOD 645 (83)	MSOD 646 (81)	MSOD 680 (92)	MSOD 681 (33)	MSOD 682 (61)
1. The clarity and audibility of the instructor's speech are excellent.	4.33	4.84	4.59	4.68	4.58
2. The contents of the assignments contribute to my understanding of the subject.	4.51	4.68	4.54	4.45	4.66
3. The requirements of the course (projects, papers, exams, etc.) were explained adequately.	4.05	4.22	4.41	4.54	4.44
4. The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about this subject.	4.10	4.58	4.27	4.06	4.37
5. The instructor has adequate means for evaluating my learning.	4.30	4.58	4.41	4.32	4.56
6. The methods being used for evaluating my work (such as tests, projects, etc.) are reasonable.	4.35	4.45	4.09	4.39	4.52
7. Adequate opportunities are provided by the instructor for me to ask questions.	4.53	4.70	4.44	4.67	4.74
8. The instructor is teaching the course material or skills clearly.	4.13	4.62	4.40	4.41	4.54
9. The instructor seems to be well prepared.	4.39	4.72	4.63	4.70	4.65
10. The instructor seems to care about my learning.	4.56	4.72	4.58	4.55	4.76
11. The course appears to have been carefully planned.	4.17	4.58	4.40	4.37	4.21
12. Course objectives are being achieved.	4.39	4.62	4.41	4.43	4.46
13. During the term, I looked forward to attending this class.	3.80	4.48	4.15	4.28	4.09
14. Compared with other courses on this level carrying an equal amount of credit, the effort I put into this course is as much as in other courses.	4.19	4.44	4.26	4.06	4.20
15. Course objectives have been expressed clearly.	4.28	4.62	4.46	4.41	4.63
16. The instructor demonstrates a personal commitment to high standards of professional competence.	4.49	4.73	4.61	4.40	4.71
17. The instructor provides useful feedback on student progress (identifying strengths and weaknesses).	4.14	4.45	4.35	4.20	4.56
18. In this course I am learning much.	4.42	4.61	4.36	4.19	4.55
19. The out-of-class assignments are challenging.	4.67	4.65	4.43	4.42	4.75
20. The instructor supervises and helps in new experiences without taking over.	4.27	4.66	4.32	4.36	4.59
21. The instructor relates underlying theory to practice.	4.32	4.66	4.42	4.22	4.71
22. Overall I rate this instructor a good teacher.	4.24	4.70	4.50	4.31	4.65

*Notes on Tables N.1 and N.2:

- Source: Dean's Office, College of Professional Studies
- Rating scale: 1: Strongly Disagree – 5: Strongly Agree
- The number of respondents for each course is shown in parentheses.
- CPS has employed the SUMMA course evaluation system since 2004; evaluations from 2001-2004 using a different evaluation system will be made available during the program review site visit.
- Accompanying narrative evaluations will be made available during the program review site visit.
- HROD 633, HROD 634, and HROD 645 are taught in revised form in the MSOD program as MSOD 633, MSOD 634, and MSOD 645.
- The content of HROD 650 (Organizational Change) is now taught as part of MSOD 600.
- HROD 670 is taught in revised form in the MSOD program as MSOD 611.
- MSOD 681 (Contemporary Topics) is no longer offered in the MSOD program.

Appendix O

*Student Survey Results:
2003*

TO: HROD Students
FROM: Sharon Wagner and Sylvia Flatt
DATE: September 29, 2003
RE: 2003 HROD Student Survey, Executive Summary

Greetings. We would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who completed the 2003 HROD Student Survey. We have reviewed your responses carefully and will be using your feedback in our ongoing efforts to make the program as valuable as possible for all of our students.

Forty-one students from 16 cohorts across all six campuses responded (an approximately 25% return rate). Your responses provided information in the areas of program recruitment, program format/structure, curriculum, program strengths, areas for improvement, and other themes.

Program Recruitment

A majority of those who responded to the survey were drawn to the program through referral from a friend or colleague or by conducting research about graduate schools. That is, 42% of respondents found out about the HROD program through a friend or colleague. An additional 31% indicated that their own investigation/research, including Internet searches and association with professional organizations brought them to the HROD program at USF.

Program Format/Structure

We inquired about alternate formats/structure for the program. The options of offering the HROD program on weekends (instead of on weeknights) or as a 30-month program were not endorsed by respondents. Seventy-seven percent of respondents would have been less likely to apply to the HROD program if it had been offered in a 30-month format, and eighty-five percent would have been less likely to apply to a weekend program.

Responses were mixed, however, regarding two other options. Sixty percent of respondents indicated that increasing the program's length to 27 months would have either made it more likely or would not have affected their decision to apply, while 40% indicated that they would have been less likely to apply. (Note: this question did not apply to students in certain older cohorts who are currently completing the program in 27 months.) Finally, if the program granted a Master's degree in OD, 39% of respondents would have been more likely to apply, 29% would have been less likely, and for 32%, it would not have affected their decision.

Curriculum

We asked which courses in the HROD program provide you with the most knowledge/skill acquisition, rated on the following scale: very low (1), low (2), moderate (3), high (4), and very high (5). Topping the list (mean ratings above 3.75) were HROD 620: Organizational Behavior and Change (4.08); and HROD 638: Organizational Concepts, Analysis and Change (4.05).

Courses rated the lowest on knowledge/skill acquisition (below 3.25) were HROD 650: Designing Organizational Change (3.17), and HROD 651-652: HR Emphasis Courses (2.25). Closer examination of HROD 650, 651 and 652 showed considerable variability in responses, indicating that some cohorts had more positive experiences with these courses than did other cohorts.

On another question, we asked about the value of HROD courses to your career, using the same rating scale. The highest-rated courses (above 3.75) were HROD 638: Organizational Concepts, Analysis, and Change (4.27), HROD 633-34: OD Emphasis Courses (4.09), HROD 620: Organizational Behavior and Change (3.94), and HROD 625: Group Dynamics and Team Development (3.81).

Courses rated the lowest on career value (below 3.25) were HROD 651-52: HR Emphasis Courses (3.00), HROD 671, 660, 661/671, 688: Capstone Courses (2.75), and HROD 612, 614/670: Research Methods/Statistics (2.67). Again, we found that responses to each of the courses receiving low mean ratings were quite variable.

Program Strengths (as identified by three or more respondents)

We asked: “what is the one best thing about the HROD program?” Seventeen respondents mentioned convenience of the program (e.g., meeting once a week, manageable workload for working adults, regional sites, and not having to enroll each semester). Twelve respondents identified the cohort model as a strength (e.g., support and networking). Curriculum was mentioned by 11 individuals (e.g., the level at which courses are offered, models, readings, and the practical applicability/relevance of courses). Finally nine individuals mentioned professors/instructors (e.g., expertise, experience, and variety of instructors).

Areas For Improvement (as identified by three or more respondents)

Nine individuals mentioned individual professors as an area for improvement (e.g., ability to engage students, practical experience, teaching skills). Six students requested more application in addition to theories. Five respondents suggested that more guidance through program would be helpful (e.g., overall program plan, guidance on capstone), and five suggested that courses should be longer (e.g., to allow completion of assignments).

Other Themes

In a final question, we asked for additional comments about the HROD program. While we received many comments specific to students’ experiences in individual cohorts (e.g., size and cohesiveness of cohorts, experiences with individual instructors), there were no consistent themes beyond those mentioned above. We are matching your responses with the cohort numbers you provided on the survey to track areas of strength and weakness specific to regions, cohorts, and instructors.

Conclusions

The overall curriculum and certain individual courses are seen as rigorous and rich in practical application, and many of the HROD instructors do an outstanding job in the classroom. We need to continue to improve our track record in delivering consistent instruction across instructors and regions, however. Alternate program models (e.g., 27-month model, Master’s in OD), merit consideration for the future. Finally, we should continue to improve our communication with you as you move through the program. This survey is one vehicle for that communication; we plan to make it a yearly effort and look forward to your responses in 2004.

Appendix P

*Student Survey Results:
2004*

TO: HROD/MSOD Students
FROM: HROD/MSOD Leadership Team:
Sharon Wagner, Sylvia Flatt, Mark Lusnar, Frank Gigliotti
DATE: September 27, 2004
RE: 2004 HROD Student Survey, Executive Summary

We have had an opportunity to review and compile your responses from the second annual HROD Student Survey, completed during the summer of 2004. As we did after last year's survey, we will carefully consider your feedback in our ongoing efforts to maximize the value of the program for all HROD/MSOD students. This year, we asked about what drew you to the HROD program, and we asked for your input on strengths and areas for improvement in the curriculum.

Fifty-six students across our 17 cohorts and six campuses responded (for an approximate return rate of 31%). This return rate is up from 25% in 2003. We hope to hear from even more of you next year; incentives for participation will be provided in 2005! Average responses across cohorts and campuses are reported in this summary, but we also have examined campus-specific and cohort-specific responses.

HROD Program Recruitment Sources

First, we asked “**How did you find out about the HROD program?**” (Please see Table 1.) **Fifty-two percent of respondents had heard about the program from a friend or colleague and an additional 23% had learned about the program through their own research efforts.** It's great to see in these results that there is so much positive word-of-mouth out there about HROD/MSOD. We're also pleased to see that many of you had researched graduate programs and had found that the HROD program at USF compared favorably with programs at other universities.

Table 1: HROD Program Recruitment Sources

Source	Number of Respondents (Percent)
Friend or Colleague	29 (52%)
Personal Research, Including Web Research	13 (23%)
Newspaper Advertisement	8 (14%)
Information Meeting	5 (9%)
Direct Mail	4 (7%)
Other (e.g., attended USF as an undergraduate student)	4 (7%)

Note: Percents are rounded to whole numbers and do not sum to 100%, because multiple answers were provided by several respondents.

Knowledge/Skill Gained Through HROD Courses

Next, we asked about the **amount of knowledge/skill you believe you have gained during each course in the HROD program**, on a scale ranging from 1 (very low) through 3 (moderate) to 5 (very high). (Please see Table 2.) **Earning high ratings (mean ratings at or above 3.75) were HROD 651 and 652: HR Management and Strategic HR (4.20); HROD 620: Organizational Behavior and Change (3.98); and HROD 633 and 634: OD Diagnosis and OD Interventions (3.82).** We note that three course areas (representing five courses) are rated at or above 3.75 this year; in 2003 there were just two courses with mean ratings in the “at or above 3.75” category. By continuing ongoing efforts in the areas of curriculum refinement and instructor selection/training, we hope to further increase the number of courses in this category in 2005.

Courses rated the lowest on knowledge/skill acquisition (at or below 3.25) were IS 603: Ethical and Social Issues in HR and OD (3.10), and HROD 671/660/661/688 (2.50): Capstone Courses. Although we would prefer never to see a rating below 3.25 for any course, it is noteworthy that these two course areas have already been addressed with the new MSOD program design. We have removed IS 603 from the MSOD curriculum, replacing it with course-specific ethics content across a number of courses. All current HROD and MSOD transition students are already benefiting from this new content. In addition, MSOD transition students will not take 671/660/661/688, but instead will enroll in the new Leadership and Culminating Project courses.

Table 2: Ratings for Amount of Knowledge/Skill Gained in Each Course

Course(s)	Mean Rating	Number of Responses
HROD 651, 652: HR Management, Strategic HR	<u>4.20</u> (.37)	5
HROD 620: Organizational Behavior and Change	<u>3.98</u> (.12)	55
HROD 633, 634: OD Diagnosis, OD Interventions	<u>3.82</u> (.23)	17
HROD 650: Designing Organizational Change	3.71 (.14)	42
HROD 638: Organizational Concepts, Analysis, and Change	3.60 (.13)	42
HROD 625: Group Dynamics and Team Development	3.57 (.13)	56
HROD 612/614/670: Applied Research Methods and Data Analysis	3.50 (.24)	28
HROD 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices	3.36 (.23)	28
IS 603: Ethical and Social Issues in HR and OD	3.10 (.22)	29
HROD 671, HROD 660/661/688: Capstone Courses	2.50 (.28)	20

Note: Rating scale is as follows: 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4= High, 5=Very High; standard error estimates appear in parentheses; underlined means are ≥ 3.75 .

Anticipated Career Value of HROD Courses

Next, we asked about the **value of HROD courses to your career**, on a scale ranging from 1 (very low) through 3 (moderate) to 5 (very high). **The highly rated courses (at or above 3.75) were HROD 633-34: OD Diagnosis and OD Interventions (4.57), HROD 651-52: HR Management and Strategic HR (4.56), HROD 650: Designing Organizational Change (4.16); HROD 625: Group Dynamics and Team Development (4.09); HROD 620: Organizational Behavior and Change (4.02), HROD 638: Organizational Concepts, Analysis, and Change (4.00), and HROD 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices (3.87).** Thus, seven of 10 course areas were represented in the “above 3.75” category, an improvement over last year, when four course areas were rated at or above 3.75.

Only the Capstone courses (HROD 671/660/661/688) were rated below 3.25 on career value, at 3.17. Again, we believe that this issue will be addressed through the transition from the Capstone Research Project to the Culminating Project course.

Table 3: Ratings for Anticipated Career Value of HROD Courses

Course(s)	Mean Rating	Number of Responses
HROD 633, 634: OD Diagnosis, OD Interventions	<u>4.57</u> (.13)	28
HROD 651, 652: HR Management, Strategic HR	<u>4.56</u> (.20)	16
HROD 650: Designing Organizational Change	<u>4.16</u> (.12)	43
HROD 625: Group Dynamics and Team Development	<u>4.09</u> (.12)	56
HROD 620: Organizational Behavior and Change	<u>4.02</u> (.11)	56
HROD 638: Organizational Concepts, Analysis, and Change	<u>4.00</u> (.12)	45
HROD 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices	<u>3.87</u> (.16)	37
IS 603: Ethical and Social Issues in HR and OD	3.47 (.19)	38
HROD 612/614/670: Applied Research Methods and Data Analysis	3.35 (.19)	37
HROD 671, HROD 660/661/688: Capstone Courses	3.17 (.25)	29

Note: Rating scale is as follows: 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4= High, 5=Very High; standard error estimates appear in parentheses; underlined means are ≥ 3.75 .

Extent to Which the Program Has Matched Expectations, Themes in Open-Ended Responses

The last scaled item was: **“Overall, to what extent has the HROD program met your expectations?”** Answered on a scale ranging from 1 (“Fell Far Short”) through 3 (“Met”) to 5 (“Greatly Exceeded”), **the average score on this item was just short of “Met” at 2.89.** To help interpret this scaled response as well as the responses to the previous items, we examined your responses to the open-ended survey items: “What is the one best thing about the HROD program?”; “What is the one thing that most needs improvement in the HROD program?”; and “Additional comments.” The following seven themes were revealed. Each of these themes was mentioned by at least 10 respondents. For each theme, we have provided two typical comments.

1. Cohort Model (Strength)

According to survey respondents, the cohort model provides support, camaraderie, enhanced learning, and networking opportunities.

“The cohort model [provides]... the feeling of “belonging” to a group that we can gain knowledge from as well as share knowledge with”.

“[A positive aspect of the HROD program is] the cohort atmosphere...gaining from other people’s knowledge/experiences”.

2. Course Scheduling (Strength)

The convenient scheduling of the program was valued by many respondents.

“The one night a week class on Monday made the program easy to schedule”.

“You can do it while working full time”.

3. Course Content (Strength)

The theoretical and practical aspects of the curriculum were cited as program strengths.

“The program combines real life experiences with theory”.

“I really like the course selection and how it relates to my profession. The text books are excellent as well”.

4. Instructors/Teaching Quality (Strength)

The expertise and experience level of certain instructors, as well as the overall quality of instructors were mentioned as program strengths.

“The accessibility and knowledge of our instructors and the personal one-on-one instruction we receive in class [are strengths of the program]”.

“I’ve been pleased with the level of professionalism with all my instructors and look forward to another year at USF”.

5. Instructors/Teaching Quality (Area for Improvement)

The skill level of certain instructors was cited as a program weakness.

“I felt the amount of work was good, but that the bar could have been higher with certain professors...the area that could be stronger is the link between academic knowledge and applying it to the day to day HR or OD experience”.

“[There are] very uneven professor capabilities”.

6. Capstone (Area for Improvement)

Aspects of the capstone research project were mentioned as problematic by several respondents.

“[A negative aspect of the HROD program is] the capstone project and the antiquated way it has to be done”.

“It seems like your philosophy is to get us out as soon as possible and yet the requirements for capstone/thesis don't support that. I like having only one class at a time and being able to concentrate on that”.

7. General Comments (Strength)

Various positive comments were provided.

“[The] HROD program does meet my requirements, it matches with my expectations. It is helping me in my...profession”.

“638, 650, 620 are all great classes which I have directly applied to my work environment”.

Conclusions

- Referrals from friends/colleagues and personal research about graduate programs led the majority of survey respondents to the HROD program at USF.
- The majority of the HROD curriculum was seen as highly career-relevant and most courses earned moderate to high ratings for the amount of knowledge/skill acquired. Course ratings for career relevance and acquired knowledge/skill are at higher levels than those recorded on the 2003 survey.
- The cohort model and convenient course scheduling continue to be assets of the HROD/MSOD program.
- Overall, the results of the survey show that much is going well in the curriculum, instruction, and administration of HROD/MSOD, but the delivery of certain courses in certain regions is in need of improvement.

Thank you again for your time and effort in completing the 2004 HROD Student Survey. We look forward to reading your responses to the 2005 survey, and of course, we welcome your informal feedback at any time.

Appendix Q

*Student Survey Results:
2005*

TO: MSOD Students
FROM: MSOD Leadership Team:
Sharon Wagner, Sylvia Flatt, Mark Lusnar, Frank Gigliotti
DATE: July 22, 2005
RE: 2005 MSOD Student Survey, Executive Summary

Thank you for your responses to the 2005 MSOD Student Survey. Your feedback provides us with insights to help in our ongoing efforts to maximize the value of the program for all MSOD students. Average responses across cohorts and campuses are reported in this summary, but we also carefully examine and address campus-specific and cohort-specific responses.

Demographic Information

This year 59 students responded to the survey (an approximate return rate of 43%; please see Table 1). This return rate is up from 31% in 2004. We hope to hear from even more of you next year.

Table 1: Respondents by Cohort

Cohort	No. of Responses (Response Rate)
0804	1 (6.7%)
1904	0 (0%)
2604	7 (100%)
3104	3 (50%)
1004	8 (57.1%)
3404	5 (55.6%)
6104	1 (12.5%)
0805	7 (50%)
2605	6 (50%)
8505	5 (62.5%)
1005	5 (62.5%)
3405	2 (22.2%)
6105	9 (47.4%)

More than 1/3 of respondents had been attracted to the MSOD program through information passed on from a friend or colleague, while approximately 25% had learned about the MSOD program through the Internet, and approximately 24% had attended a USF event such as an information meeting or open house. (Please see Table 2.)

Table 2: How Respondents Had Heard about the MSOD Program

Source	Number of Respondents (Percent)
Friend or Colleague	21 (35.6%)
Internet	15 (25.4%)
Information Meeting/Open House	14 (23.7%)
Newspaper Advertisement	6 (10.2%)
Direct Mail	6 (10.2%)
Other	11 (18.6%)

Note: Percents do not sum to 100%; multiple answers were provided by several respondents.

Knowledge/Skill Gained Through MSOD Courses

We asked about the amount of knowledge/skill you believe you have gained during each course in the MSOD program, on a scale ranging from 1 (very low) through 3 (moderate) to 5 (very high). Please see Table 3 for the mean ratings for each item; the full distributions of responses are reported in the Appendix. **The mean rating across all courses is 3.72, up from 3.53 in 2004.** Earning the highest ratings (mean ratings at or above 3.75) were MSOD 625, MSOD 600, MSOD 620, and MSOD 634. IS 603 was the only course rated at or below 3.25; this course is no longer part of the MSOD curriculum.

Table 3: Ratings for Amount of Knowledge/Skill Gained in Each Course

Course(s)	Mean Rating	Number of Responses
MSOD 625: Group Dynamics and Team Development	<u>4.39</u> (.19)	23
MSOD 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change	<u>4.24</u> (.13)	34
MSOD 620: Organizational Behavior and Change	<u>4.22</u> (.22)	23
MSOD 634: OD Interventions	<u>3.75</u> (.33)	12
MSOD 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices	3.71 (.14)	42
MSOD 633: Foundations of OD Practice	3.67 (.36)	12
MSOD 601: Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change	3.50 (.25)	18
MSOD 670: Applied Research Methods and Data Analysis	3.50 (.21)	24
MSOD 650: Designing Organizational Change	3.40 (.22)	20
MSOD 638: Organizational Concepts, Analysis, and Change	3.35 (.20)	23
IS 603: Ethical and Social Issues in HR and OD	<i>3.17</i> (.22)	24

Note: Rating scale is as follows: 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4= High, 5=Very High; standard error estimates appear in parentheses; underlined means are ≥ 3.75 ; italicized means are ≤ 3.25

Anticipated Career Value of MSOD Courses

Next, we asked about the value of MSOD courses to your career, on a scale ranging from 1 (very low) through 3 (moderate) to 5 (very high). Please see Table 4 for the mean ratings for each item; the full distributions of responses are reported in the Appendix. **The mean rating across all courses is 4.06, up from 3.93 in 2004.** Most courses earned high ratings (at or above 3.75), including MSOD 625, MSOD 634, MSOD 620, MSOD 633, MSOD 650, MSOD 638, MSOD 600, and MSOD 645. No course earned a low rating (at or below 3.25).

Table 4: Ratings for Anticipated Career Value of MSOD Courses

Course(s)	Mean Rating	Number of Responses
MSOD 625: Group Dynamics and Team Development	<u>4.48</u> (.12)	23
MSOD 634: OD Interventions	<u>4.42</u> (.14)	19
MSOD 620: Organizational Behavior and Change	<u>4.30</u> (.15)	23
MSOD 633: Foundations of OD Practice	<u>4.30</u> (.18)	20
MSOD 650: Designing Organizational Change	<u>4.23</u> (.17)	22
MSOD 638: Organizational Concepts, Analysis, and Change	<u>4.14</u> (.18)	22
MSOD 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change	<u>4.09</u> (.15)	34
MSOD 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices	<u>3.95</u> (.13)	44
MSOD 670: Applied Research Methods and Data Analysis	3.71 (.22)	24
MSOD 601: Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change	3.60 (.27)	20
IS 603: Ethical and Social Issues in HR and OD	3.46 (.20)	24

Note: Rating scale is as follows: 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4= High, 5=Very High; standard error estimates appear in parentheses; underlined means are ≥ 3.75 .

Extent to Which the Program Has Matched Expectations

The final scaled item on the survey was: “overall, to what extent has the MSOD program met your expectations?” with response options ranging from 1 (“Fell Far Short”) through 3 (“Met”) to 5 (“Greatly Exceeded”). **The average rating on this item was just over “Met” at 3.09 (s.e.=.12), an improvement over the average rating of 2.89 in 2004.**

Responses to Open-Ended Items

Responses to the open-ended items have been organized by theme. Each theme that was mentioned by at least 10 respondents is reported below, along with typical comments for each theme.

1. “What are the strengths of the MSOD program?”

- **Course Content.** According to survey respondents, the curriculum is a key strength of the MSOD program.
“Good balance between theory and practical application”
“Breadth of courses”
- **Cohort Model.** Many responses referred to the advantages of the cohort model.
“Cohort members from diverse backgrounds provide good discussion perspectives in class”
“Cohort model helps with studying, resources,...group process”
- **Instructors.** The expertise and support of instructors were valued by many respondents.
“Great teachers—most with actual industry experience”
“The support and availability of the professors (and staff)—very high”
- **Course Scheduling.** The convenient scheduling of the program was mentioned in several comments.
“The schedule accommodates working students”
“Convenience and one night per week schedule”

2. “What are the areas for improvement in the MSOD program?”

- **Instructors’ Teaching Skill.** The teaching skill of certain instructors was mentioned by several respondents as an area for improvement.
“Professors with more teaching and training skills”
“Ensuring that the instructors are best suited for the course they are teaching”

3. “What, if anything, would you change about course scheduling (e.g., course sequencing, length of courses, breaks between courses)?”

- **Two Courses at Once.** Many respondents referred to the challenges of taking two courses at a time.
“Because it is a program for professional adults, it is very difficult...when we are required to take two courses at once”
“No more doubling of classes, it is too much work”
- **Breaks between Courses.** Several respondents made suggestions about the breaks between courses.
“More breaks between courses”
“More breaks rather than a few long ones”

4. “Please record any additional comments about the MSOD program...”

A variety of positive responses and suggestions for improvement were provided in response to this item, with no consistent pattern of comments emerging. We are engaging in further analysis of these responses to discover any patterns relevant to regions, cohorts, instructors, or courses.

Conclusions

Thank you again for taking the time to complete the third annual MSOD Student Survey. As always, we have learned much from your responses.

During the past several years, the MSOD leadership team has been focusing on maximizing the academic rigor and practical relevance of the MSOD program, through improvements to curriculum and instruction. We are very pleased to see that these efforts are reflected in ratings and narrative comments about the quality of MSOD courses. Ratings for knowledge and skill gained through MSOD courses as well as the career relevance of the courses improved from 2003 to 2004 and again from 2004 to 2005. The only course to earn a low average rating is one that we have eliminated from the future curriculum. These are the results we would expect to see in a program that emphasizes continuous improvement and strives for excellence. We note, however, that although you positively assess the overall quality of curriculum and instruction in MSOD, we can further improve the consistency of teaching effectiveness across all of the instructors in the program. Be assured that consistent teaching effectiveness is a primary area of focus for the MSOD program in 2005-2006.

Regarding the format of MSOD courses, it is clear that the cohort model and once per week course scheduling continue to be valued aspects of the MSOD program. Two suggested areas for improvement to format are revealed in your responses. First, many individuals in the HROD-MSOD transition groups mentioned the difficulty of “doubling up” on courses. As many of you know, we have been able to effect a change in this area, and the MSOD program will no longer require students to take two courses simultaneously. Second, you have suggested that we examine the length and frequency of breaks between courses. Although decisions about the length and timing of breaks between courses are made at the College level and thus are not under the direct control of the program, we will commit to exploring this idea with College administration in 2005-2006.

Our student survey is a yearly endeavor, but we welcome your informal feedback at any time. Please don't hesitate to contact Program Director Sharon Wagner (wagners@usfca.edu) with your thoughts about the strengths and areas for improvement of the MSOD program.

Appendix: Summary of Individual Course Assessment Responses

Item	Sample Size	Response				
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis and Change is...	34	0 (0%)	1 (2.9%)	3 (8.8%)	17 (50%)	13 (38.2%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 620: Organizational Behavior and Change is...	23	1 (4.3%)	0 (0%)	4 (17.4%)	6 (26.1%)	12 (52.2%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 625: Group Dynamics and Team Development is...	23	0 (0%)	1 (4.3%)	3 (13.0%)	5 (21.7%)	14 (60.9%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 601: Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis and Change is...	18	1 (5.6%)	2 (11.1%)	4 (22.2%)	9 (50%)	2 (11.1%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 638: Organizational Concepts, Analysis, and Change is...	23	0 (0%)	5 (21.7%)	7 (30.4%)	9 (39.1%)	2 (8.7%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 650: Designing Organizational Change is...	20	0 (0%)	4 (20%)	7 (35%)	6 (30%)	3 (15%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 603: Ethical and Social Issues in HR and OD is...	24	2 (8.3%)	3 (12.5%)	11 (45.8%)	5 (20.8%)	3 (12.5%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices is...	42	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.4%)	15 (35.7%)	17 (40.5%)	8 (19%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 670: Applied Research Methods and Data Analysis is...	24	1 (4.2%)	3 (12.5%)	6 (25%)	11 (45.8%)	3 (12.5%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 633: Foundations of OD Practice is...	12	1 (8.3%)	0 (0%)	5 (41.7%)	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 634: OD Interventions is...	12	1 (8.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	5 (41.75)	3 (25%)
Totals for Knowledge/Skill	255	8 (3.1%)	20 (7.8%)	68 (26.7%)	92 (36.1%)	67 (26.3%)
The anticipated value of course 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change to my career is:	34	0 (0%)	1 (2.9%)	9 (26.5%)	10 (29.4%)	14 (41.2%)
The anticipated value of course 620: Organizational Behavior and Change to my career is:	23	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (13%)	10 (43.5%)	10 (43.5%)
The anticipated value of course 625: Group Dynamics and Team Development to my career is:	23	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.3%)	10 (43.5%)	12 (52.2%)
The anticipated value of course 601: Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change to my career is:	20	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	9 (45%)	4 (20%)
The anticipated value of course 638: Organizational Concepts, Analysis, and Change to my career is:	22	0 (0%)	1 (4.5%)	3 (13.6%)	10 (45.5%)	8 (36.4%)
The anticipated value of course 650: Designing Organizational Change to my career is:	22	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (22.7%)	7 (31.8%)	10 (45.5%)
The anticipated value of course 603: Ethical and Social Issues in HR and OD to my career is:	24	1 (4.2%)	1 (4.2%)	12 (50%)	6 (25%)	4 (16.7%)
The anticipated value of course 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices to my career is:	44	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	13 (29.5%)	17 (38.6%)	13 (29.5%)
The anticipated value of course 670: Applied Research Methods and Data Analysis to my career is:	24	0 (0%)	3 (12.5%)	8 (33.3%)	6 (25%)	7 (29.2%)
The anticipated value of course 633: Foundations of OD Practice to my career is:	20	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	9 (45%)	9 (45%)
The anticipated value of course 634: OD Interventions to my career is:	19	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.3%)	9 (47.4%)	9 (47.4%)
Total for Anticipated Career Value	275	3 (1.1%)	9 (3.3%)	60 (21.8%)	103 (37.5%)	100 (36.4%)
Grand Totals	530	11 (2.1%)	29 (5.5%)	128 (24.2%)	195 (36.8%)	167% (31.5%)

Appendix R

*Student Survey Results:
2006*

TO: MSOD Students
FROM: MSOD Leadership Team:
Sharon Wagner, Sylvia Flatt, Mark Lusnar, Frank Gigliotti
DATE: August 31, 2006
RE: Summary of 2006 MSOD Student Survey

Thank you for your responses to the 2006 MSOD Student Survey! We've reported results for all respondents (across cohorts and campuses) in the summary below. We also carefully examine and address campus-specific and cohort-specific responses.

Demographic Information

This year 75 students responded to the survey (a return rate of approximately 69%; please see Table 1). This return rate is up considerably from 43% in 2005.

Table 1: Respondents by Cohort

Cohort	No. of Responses (Response Rate)
0805	13 (92.8%)
2605	10 (90.9%)
8505	6 (75%)
1005	8 (100%)
3405	2 (22.2%)
6105	10 (58.8%)
0806	8 (66.7%)
2606	2 (28.6%)
1006	5 (62.5%)
3406	5 (62.5%)
6106	6 (100%)

Forty percent of respondents had been attracted to the MSOD program through information passed on from a friend or colleague, while over 25% had learned about the MSOD program through the Internet. (Please see Table 2.)

Table 2: How Respondents Had Heard about the MSOD Program

Source	Number of Respondents (Percent)
Friend or Colleague	30 (40%)
Internet	21 (28%)
Information Meeting/Open House	10 (13.3%)
Newspaper Advertisement	7 (9.3%)
Direct Mail	3 (4%)
Other	12 (16%)

Note: Percents do not sum to 100%; multiple answers were provided by several respondents.

Knowledge/Skill Gained Through MSOD Courses

We asked about the amount of knowledge/skill you believe you have gained during each course in the MSOD program, on a scale ranging from 1 (very low) through 3 (moderate) to 5 (very high). Please see Table 3 for the mean ratings for each item; the full distributions of responses are reported in the Appendix. The mean rating across all courses is 4.02, up from 3.72 in 2005. Each year we note the course ratings that at or above 3.75 and those that are at or below 3.25. This year, every course was rated at or above 3.75.

Table 3: Ratings for Amount of Knowledge/Skill Gained in Each Course

Course	Mean Rating	Number of Responses
MSOD 611: Applied OD Research and Statistics	<u>4.19</u> (.16)	27
MSOD 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis and Change	<u>4.12</u> (.11)	69
MSOD 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices	<u>4.11</u> (.10)	55
MSOD 601: Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change	<u>4.04</u> (.11)	55
MSOD 646: Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation	4.02 (.14)	45
MSOD 633: Foundations of OD Practice	<u>3.84</u> (.12)	45
MSOD 634: OD Interventions	<u>3.82</u> (.14)	44

Note: Rating scale is as follows: 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4= High, 5=Very High; standard error estimates appear in parentheses; underlined means are ≥ 3.75 .

Anticipated Career Value of MSOD Courses

Next, we asked about the value of MSOD courses to your career, on a scale ranging from 1 (very low) through 3 (moderate) to 5 (very high). Please see Table 4 for the mean ratings for each item; the full distributions of responses are reported in the Appendix. The mean rating across all courses is 3.99, compared to 4.06 last year. Each course earned a rating at or above 3.75.

Table 4: Ratings for Anticipated Career Value of MSOD Courses

Course	Mean Rating	Number of Responses
MSOD 646: Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation	4.16 (.15)	45
MSOD 634: OD Interventions	<u>4.11</u> (.12)	45
MSOD 601: Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change	<u>4.05</u> (.10)	55
MSOD 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices	<u>3.98</u> (.11)	54
MSOD 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis and Change	<u>3.96</u> (.11)	70
MSOD 633: Foundations of OD Practice	<u>3.89</u> (.14)	45
MSOD 611: Applied OD Research and Statistics	<u>3.78</u> (.18)	27

Note: Rating scale is as follows: 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4= High, 5=Very High; standard error estimates appear in parentheses; underlined means are ≥ 3.75 .

Extent to Which the Program Has Matched Expectations

The final scaled item on the survey was: “overall, to what extent has the MSOD program met your expectations?” with response options ranging from 1 (“Fell Far Short”) through 3 (“Met”) to 5 (“Greatly Exceeded”). The average rating on this item was between “Met” and “Exceeded” at 3.38 (s.e. = .09, n = 69), a large improvement over the average rating of 3.09 in 2005.

Responses to Open-Ended Items

Responses to the open-ended items have been organized by theme. Each theme that was mentioned by at least 10 respondents is reported below, along with typical comments for each theme.

1. “What are the strengths of the MSOD program?”

- **Instructors.** Nearly 40% of you mentioned instructors as a strength of the MSOD program.
“The experience of the instructors allows them to bring the learning to life”
“Good mix of teaching styles”
- **Cohort Model.** Many responses referred to the cohort model.
“*Cohort model*”
“*The cohort*”
- **Curriculum.** Many of you mentioned the value of the curriculum in response to this question.
“*The program addresses OD in a comprehensive manner, is detailed, provides tools for analysis, teaches us to think*”
“*It attempts to balance theory and practice, a holistic approach*”
- **Applicability.** The practical applicability of the program was mentioned in several comments.
“*Applicable knowledge*”
“*Subject matter that is very relatable to our jobs*”

2. “What are the areas for improvement in the MSOD program?”

- **Instructors.** Several respondents mentioned instructors in response to this question. A variety of concerns were mentioned, including consistency in teaching ability, the need for variety in instructors, and the work experience of instructors. We are closely examining the pattern of responses by cohort to this item to determine how we may address these concerns; for example, 40% of these responses came from one cohort.
“*Instructor teaching ability varies from one instructor to another*”
“*Provide wide range of instructors*”
- **Changes to Courses.** A variety of suggestions were made for improving specific courses. There was no clear consensus in these comments, which ranged from suggestions about evaluation methods, to guest speakers, to classroom activities.
“*Recommend not having final test*”
“*More guest speakers*”

3. “What, if anything, would you change about course scheduling (e.g., course sequencing, length of courses, breaks between courses)?”

- **No Changes Required.** Most frequently, respondents indicated there were no problems with course scheduling.
“So far so good.”
“Seems OK so far”
- **Breaks between Courses.** Several respondents made suggestions about the breaks between courses, although there was no clear consensus in these comments
“Would like mini breaks throughout the program instead of long breaks far apart”
“I recommend fewer breaks to allow more time to process the information”

4. “Please record any additional comments about the MSOD program...”

A variety of responses were provided in response to this item, most frequently taking the form of positive assessments of the MSOD program.

“I have found this to be a very valuable experience and it has no doubt improved my skills in my work”
I’m really enjoying it!”

Conclusions

Thank you again for taking the time to complete the fourth annual MSOD Student Survey. Your responses to this survey along with your course evaluations provide us with rich feedback on your classroom experience and help us to maximize the value of the MSOD program for all students. As you know, the academic rigor and practical relevance of the education you receive in the MSOD program is of paramount importance to us. Your feedback during each of the past few years indicates that our efforts in these areas are paying off for you!

We are particularly pleased to see your high ratings of the knowledge/skill and career relevance of all courses, as well as your positive comments about instructors, the curriculum and the practical applicability of the program. There are certain aspects of the curriculum and instruction that can benefit from further refinement; we appreciate your helping us to pinpoint these areas with specific comments about your experiences.

After receiving your feedback from last year’s survey, we promised to explore the idea of standardizing the length and frequency of breaks between courses. As you may know, changes of this nature can be difficult to accomplish. We are happy to report, however, that we have been able to bring about a major change in the calendars for all students who will begin the program in Fall 2006 or later. These students will have a standardized course schedule with consistent summer, winter, and holiday breaks.

We conduct our student survey each summer, but we welcome your informal feedback at any time. Please don’t hesitate to contact Program Director Sharon Wagner (wagners@usfca.edu) with your thoughts about the strengths and areas for improvement of the MSOD program.

Appendix: Summary of Individual Course Assessment Responses

Item	Sample Size	Response				
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis and Change is...	69	2 (2.9%)	1 (1.4%)	12 (17.4%)	26 (37.7%)	28 (40.6%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 601: Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change is...	55	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.8%)	14 (25.5%)	22 (40.0%)	18 (32.7%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices is...	55	0 (0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (20.0%)	27 (49.1%)	17 (30.9%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 646: Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation is...	45	0 (0.0%)	4 (8.9%)	8 (17.8%)	16 (35.6%)	17 (37.8%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 633: Foundations of OD Practice is...	45	0 (0%)	2 (4.4%)	12 (26.7%)	22 (48.9%)	9 (20.0%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 634: OD Interventions is...	44	1 (2.3%)	2 (4.5%)	10 (22.7%)	22 (50%)	9 (20.5%)
The amount of knowledge/skill I gained in course 611: Applied OD Research and Statistics is...	27	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.7%)	4 (14.8%)	11 (40.7%)	11 (40.7%)
Totals for Knowledge/Skill	340	3 (0.9%)	11 (3.2%)	71 (20.9%)	146 (42.9%)	109 (32.0%)
The anticipated value of course 600: Organizational Behavior, Diagnosis, and Change to my career is:	70	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.4%)	20 (28.6%)	26 (37.1%)	22 (31.4%)
The anticipated value of course 601: Organizational Analysis, Diagnosis, and Change to my career is:	55	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.8%)	10 (18.2%)	29 (52.7%)	15 (27.3%)
The anticipated value of course 645: Fundamentals of Business Practices to my career is:	54	0 (0%)	2 (3.7%)	13 (24.1%)	23 (42.6%)	16 (29.6%)
The anticipated value of course 646: Group Process, Communication, and Facilitation is:	45	2 (4.4%)	1 (2.2%)	5 (11.1%)	17 (37.8%)	20 (44.4%)
The anticipated value of course 633: Foundations of OD Practice to my career is:	45	2 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (20.0%)	24 (53.3%)	10 (22.2%)
The anticipated value of course 634: OD Interventions to my career is:	45	1 (2.2%)	0 (0%)	7 (15.6%)	22 (48.9%)	15 (33.3%)
The anticipated value of course 611: Applied OD Research and Statistics to my career is:	27	1 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (33.3%)	11 (40.7%)	6 (22.2%)
Total for Anticipated Career Value	341	7 (1.1%)	5 (3.3%)	73 (21.8%)	152 (37.5%)	104 (36.4%)
Grand Totals	681	10 (1.5%)	16 (2.3%)	144 (21.1%)	298 (43.8%)	213 (31.3%)

Appendix S

*Alumni Survey Results:
2006*