



May 2006

Notes from OD&C Conference Sessions, Saturday, April 8, 2006

Mary Alice Annecharico

University of Pennsylvania, mannecha@mail.med.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.upenn.edu/od_conf_2006

Annecharico, Mary Alice, "Notes from OD&C Conference Sessions, Saturday, April 8, 2006" (2006). *Building ODC as an Academic Discipline (2006)*. 5.

http://repository.upenn.edu/od_conf_2006/5

Academy of Management, Organization Development and Change Division, "Building ODC as an Academic Discipline," 7-8 April 2006.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/od_conf_2006/5

For more information, please contact libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Notes from OD&C Conference Sessions, Saturday, April 8, 2006

Abstract

Notes on presentations by Jane Wheeler, Steve Schepman, and Eric Goodman.

Comments

Academy of Management, Organization Development and Change Division, "Building ODC as an Academic Discipline," 7-8 April 2006.

Notes from OD&C conference sessions, Saturday, April 8, 2006
Mary Alice Annecharico

Jane Wheeler
Faculty and Teaching Challenges (reframed as “Opportunities and Possibilities”)

What is the balance of integration among Faculty, Practitioners, adjunct faculty?
What is the perception of ‘value’ of adjunct faculty?

Must change the orientation of the program and encourage that OD&C is a ‘nice place’.

There is conflict of ‘power and status’ of the tenured faculty, whereas there should be a concentration of what will bring value to the students.

Some believe that OD&C programs are the **cash cows** for university settings. But there is tension among the faculty who lead the programs. The opportunity here is to create a scientific practitioner model that garners the mutual respect of faculty and practitioners alike across the organization.

It would be interesting to know the actual number of programs aligned with business school accreditation. (this is a question asked on the Penn data base instrument).

How many programs offer the doctorate as a preparation to teach?
How many programs encourage non-scholarly publications as a means of establishing industry credentials for the OD&C practitioner to bring to the market-quality joint academic ‘practical and best practice/ good stuff’ evidence? (the concept here was that some faculty who are also in consulting and business practices find that without publications, their expert statuses are taken less seriously.)

Programs should stop the “social identity” chasm. That is: pitting the academic researcher who is driving toward tenure vs. the practitioners who represent industry best practice. There should be room for both on the faculty without all the current tension.

Next session: MSOD (Central Wash U) – Conflict of identity of the program

The discussion team entitled this session: “Keeping the S in MSOD”

Some programs do not have an S in the program

“S” =

- science (study of, systematic knowledge, **academic rigor)
- new knowledge is questionably missing from the thesis of Outside of the Box thinking in the 1st year of programs
- laborious research to publish new findings is done at a scale that is often slower

- than what the industry itself is already doing. i.e., Form whom are we publishing? Academics? Industry?
- At the student level, the S represents rigor and new knowledge through discovery and application in work

The requirements for turning around new and break through knowledge are too slow. Do we offer false promises of the values of change?

The student mix reinforces the concept of a scientific perspective since it brings together adults from many business avenues who are in the midst of change and best practice realities.

- Critical thinking in the classroom must be stimulated in order to guide a disciplined approach in the workplace
- Theories are studied as a basis of the critical thinking skills to be acquired.

Programs must seek out new discoveries in order to grow beyond the current traditional scientific methods with new theory. E.g.- the bench to bedside integration of science and medicine and change.

Session 3 – Eric Goodman - Should we rebuild or restart programs?

The group asked: “are we reaching the right audiences within the US? Are programs an influence? Do they make a difference?

- How many new university programs are starting?
- Are programs reaching the under represented students (i.e., Afro American colleges and universities?)
- Who is looking at the global programs?

The focus of programs should be a “Learning Age” instead of referring to it as a Technology Age.

Who are/were the students?

- Few are technology based students
- More are mid-level managers, some Human Resources managers, and other industries

Learners should be BOTH the teachers and the students

- Leaders as learners spark new learning
- Take time to explore and examine processes that the industries can illustrate through student experiences

The assimilation of new learning is done through its implementation

The content and sequence of programs should emphasis an enthusiasm for learning
Frame the learning environment through reading (which is practical and balanced!!)

Teach by experiential methods by encouraging the development of relationships among the students

Experiential integration in the classroom with cases and content provides the conduit for applying learning theory outside the classroom.

A survey should be conducted to determine effective teaching tactics

- Is there value in online learning?
- Ask the students how they wish to be taught.
- Ask the clients of consulting services how they best use the information provided to them
- Mix it up

Sequencing an OD&C program:

1. Early – Philosophy of science, theory
2. Mid – Metrics
3. End – Application

Or, as some programs have done the sequencing:

1. Leave it to the students
2. Make it rigorous
3. Make it more sequenced