Date: February 26, 2015

To: Curriculum and Programs Committee (CPC)

From: Academic Programs Working Group (APWG)

Group members: Steve Cherry, Doug Downs, Bill Brown, Kirsten Ostergaard, and Randy Babbitt (chair).

Re: Level II proposals for a Bachelor’s Degree Program in Hospitality Management, and an Associate Degree in Culinary Arts, and a School of Interdisciplinary Studies in Food, Agriculture, and Business.

Overview: The proposed Hospitality Management Degree at MSU would include options in Restaurant Management: Farm to Table; Lodge Management & Rural Tourism; Value-Added Food Enterprise; and Sports & Recreation Administration. These BS degrees will be the first 3-year baccalaureate degree programs at MSU, designed to be completed in six academic year semesters and three summer sessions. These are 121-122 credit degrees, with approximately 18 credits of business management coursework and 9 credits of internship incorporated in all options as well as core courses in hospitality (food, lodging, tourism, and recreation).

The Gallatin College’s proposed two-year Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree in Culinary Arts will train students for a variety of culinary and food service positions in the local food services industry. The AAS in Culinary Arts is a 63 credit offering, with 21 of those credits in general education. The AAS includes a summer session of Kitchen Garden Management field work and/or an internship. Of the 20 courses to be offered, 16 are currently offered in the MUS system and 4 will be unique new offerings and 8 will be shared courses with the Bachelor’s Degree in Hospitality Management.

The proposed School of Interdisciplinary Studies in Food, Agriculture, and Business (FAB) will be housed in the College of Education, Health, and Human Development (EHHD) and is a collaboration of the colleges of EHHD, Agriculture, and Business. It would have a director, an administrative assistant, and a program manager. The Director will be responsible for overseeing Sustainable Food & Bioenergy Systems (SFBS), Hospitality Management, Food and Nutrition, the Montana Dietetic Internship, and Towne’s Harvest, in addition to any newly developed programs, and other managing duties. The Program Manager would coordinate all internships and advising for SFBS and Hospitality Management, develop and maintain internet content, and other coordination duties.

History: The Culinary Arts and Hospitality Management programs and the School of FAB are linked as one proposal. They were first presented and discussed in CPC on 10/15/14. The proposal was referred to APWG. After meeting with counterparts at UM and MSU Billings, a revised proposal was submitted on 11/5/14. APWG did a preliminary review and met with Alison...
Harmon and Bob Hietala, Dean of Gallatin College on 1/13/15, resulting in revised documents on 1/27/15. The proposal and supporting documents were posted on Faculty Senate website and comments were solicited from the faculty.

The strengths of the proposal are:

1. Students who are seeking careers in culinary arts, restaurant or foodservice management, catering, or value-added agriculture would be served by a degree in Hospitality Management that integrates more business and management coursework and provides additional hands-on experience with developing and managing a foodservice or value-added enterprise.

2. Coordinating a Bachelor’s degree program in Hospitality Management with a Culinary Arts program offered by the Gallatin College will improve opportunities for students who might have discontinued their education with a two-year degree by creating a clear pathway to a BS.

3. The proposed Hospitality Management Program proposal builds on existing programs, most notably the SFBS degree program, the Montana Dietetic Internship (MDI), and Towne’s Harvest Garden (THG). A Hospitality Management Degree Program would also incorporate coursework currently offered in the College of Business, the Health and Human Development Department, the Agriculture Education Department, and the School of Architecture. The MSU and Gallatin College programs also propose to share several courses.

4. The proposed programs has many letters of support (posted on FS web site) from local high schools (2), Montana hotels/lodges (3), local food producers (2), MSU partners, Department of Commerce, Department of Agriculture, industry organizations (3), and a community development corporation. Many have offered to serve on the programs advisory board and a few said they could support internships.

5. Recent comments have been sent in to support the programs by MSU colleagues including 8 letters from EHHD, 2 from JJCBE, 1 from Gallatin College, and 1 from ASMSU.

6. With the growth in tourism in Montana and particularly in Gallatin Valley, the expected opening of 3 downtown hotels in Bozeman in next year, and growth in agritourism in Montana, training students for jobs in hospitality would support Montana industry and help graduates get good paying jobs.

7. As stated in proposal, the skills sought by employers (job listings) in the local area predominantly include employee training, merchandising, cash register operation, repair, cooking, event catering, food safety and food service experience. These listings suggest that an Associate’s Degree in Culinary Arts should include business management content and skill development. Top job titles for graduates with culinary arts degrees include cook, store manager, and restaurant shift supervisor. “Regarding growth and decline in the demand for Associate’s Degree graduates with a Culinary Arts skills, the report states that the number of positions requiring a Culinary Arts Associate’s Degree declined 17.5% from 2010-2013, but that positions requesting either high school or an associate’s degree grew by 24.8% during the same period.”
8. While the proposed Culinary Arts degree at Gallatin College has significant overlap with Missoula’s Culinary Arts degree, this is not a conflict given the roles of the community colleges to serve the local communities.

9. Considerable thought was put into the coursework for the 4 BS options and the AAS, including common courses and distinctions between the proposed four BS options.

10. The University of Montana offers a BS in Parks, Tourism and Recreation Management which currently enrolls 100-120 students. A similar program here could potentially attract the same enrollment.

The APWG had a number of concerns, including:

1. The proposal is not in line with the Faculty Senate’s prioritization plan. Adding 3 FTE TT and 1 FTE NTT MSU faculty at the cost of adding 3 FTE in MSU administration, as well as other major investments in program start-up and maintenance makes it harder to achieve a 18 to 1 student to faculty ratio within the constraints of MSU’s budget. While donations could be sought to fund the kitchen and hotel, the prioritization plan calls for a priority on fundraising for endowed chairs and student scholarships, not more infrastructure without faculty to support it. This program also does not boost our graduate program or research mission. The addition of more administration will exacerbate the problem of insufficient funding of our current departments.

2. Reviews and approvals by departmental and/or college curriculum committee are required for new program and are also very helpful in assessing the appropriateness of the coursework development and the coursework requirements for each options. There is no report from or approval by any committees before the proposals were submitted to CPC. Such a review, particularly from the College of Business’ curriculum committee, would be very helpful in assessing the proposal.

3. While the curriculum seems to be well structured for the various BS options and AAS, the programs require 20-21 new courses to be developed, 5-6 per year. This is a significant number of courses and reflects the fact that the proposed curriculum is significantly outside our current curriculum.

4. MSU currently does not have faculty with expertise in the major disciplines of this program. While MSU has one existing faculty who teaches culinary management, we have no faculty who list hotel management, tourism management, recreation management, or hospitality management as their expertise. The plan is to hire 3 TT faculty, including one with expertise in hotel, tourism and recreation management and one with expertise in hospitality management. These new faculty members will be relied on to organize and lead the program as it develops, in addition to having to be major players in developing most of the 20 new courses programs required for this degree, as well as teach these new courses.

5. It is proposed that the Hospitality Management Degree program be managed under a new School of Interdisciplinary Studies in Food, Agriculture and Business (FAB)— a collaboration of the colleges of Education, Health, and Human Development; Agriculture, and Business. While the box for creating a new school is checked on the Hospitality Management BOR Level II proposal and the school is mentioned in the proposal, the Level II proposal only really addresses the Hospitality Management Degree. A Level II proposal for the FAB should to be developed and submitted separately for full review of the combined programs, especially since FAB would encompass more than just the Hospitality Management program.
6. FAB requires at least 3 FTE in administration, with 1.5 FTE for management of Hospitality Management degree and 1.5 FTE to manage SFBS, MDI, and THG. However, SFBS, MDI, and THG are currently interdisciplinary programs that are doing well without an added layer of management. Are the new resources of FAB the main resources required by the SFBS, MDI, and THG or would the 1.5 FTE be better spent on hiring faculty in SFBS, MDI, and THG, rather than adding upper administration to these programs?

7. The argument for housing the Hospitality Management Degree under EHHD is weak. The only argument given in the proposal is “After meeting with faculty and curriculum committees in the Colleges of Education, Health, and Human Development; Agriculture, and Business, it seems like the most logical home for the School of FAB is the College of EHHD” This needs better justification.

8. Other US universities should be used as models on how to guide the design of a hospitality management degree. It is not clear from proposal which type of US degree program would serve as the closest model for the MSU program. A few examples of US hospitality management programs are discussed here.

   - The number one school in US and (and 4th in world) in hospitality management is Cornell University (www.hotelschool.cornell.edu). The Cornell School of Hotel Administration has 60 full-time faculty. Their areas of expertise are: Accounting, Finance, Food & Beverage Management, Human Resources Management, Information Systems, Law, Management Communication, Management & Organizational Behavior, Properties Development and Management, Real Estate, Services Marketing, Services Operations Management, and Strategy.
   - The number 2 school in US is at UNLV: William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration (http://www.unlv.edu/hotel). The number 3 school in US is the Penn State School of Hospitality Management. (http://www.hhd.psu.edu/shm). There faculty of these two schools are not broken down into areas of expertise on their web sites, but a quick review of resumes of their faculty also suggests they are mostly form the areas of business, finance, and management. Even programs in hospitality and tourism that are much farther down the list (copps1.asu.edu/Is/evites/alist_student-piece/images/Journal%20of%20Hospitality%20and%20Tourism%20Research.pdf) have a majority of their faculty with backgrounds in business, finance, and management.

   This strongly suggests that a successful hospitality management program relies very heavily on faculty from the College of Business, Finance, and Management, and not as strongly from Health and Human Development. While the experiences in the courses taught by Health and Human Development are good background training for the different degree options in Hospitality Management, the predominant emphasis in successful hospitality management degree should emphasize the management aspect of the degree.

   Thus, a better argument is needed to why a predominately management oriented degree program like that proposed for Hospitality Management Program is not housed under the College of Business.

9. The industry demand studies are hard to interpret, but one study appears to say that while there is significant growth in the local (multi-county) demand in the hospitality industry for high school graduates, the demand for AAS graduates is not growing. The other study
suggests there is demand for BS graduates in hospitality, but that study surveyed many
states, including Oregon and Washington. It is not clear if the results are applicable to
Montana’s hospitality industry. If the emphasis is on indoor hospitality, it is also not clear
if these studies are applicable.

10. There are two-year culinary programs at Flathead College and Missoula College and both
are not fully enrolled.

11. The MSU budget for Hospitality Management program calls for 3 FTE TT and 1 FTE
NTT faculty and 1.5 FTE of admin (Director, program manager, and administrative
assistant) and projects net revenue of $199K. The budget for the Culinary Arts calls for 1
FTE TT and 0.5 FTE NTT and no admin costs and projects net revenue (loss) of -$42K
the first year, though is probably will break even after that. However, the proposal calls
for 3 FTE of admin (3 at 1.0 FTE each) at MSU’s FAB. The other 1.5 FTE will be
dedicated to managing SFBS, MDI, and THG, which are key resources of the proposed
new program and the proposed FAB, which is incorporated into the degree proposal. It is
not clear why SFBS, MDI, and THG, which are currently operational, need 1.5 FTE of
added upper administration. Regardless, the combined proposal includes FAB and should
include all the new resources required. If the 3 FTE of administration needed for the
Hospitality Management program were included in its budget, after reaching anticipated
student enrollment, the net annual revenue from the program drops from $199K per year
with 1.5 FTE administration to $24K with 3.0 FTE administration. Adding this to the net
annual revenue (loss) of -$42 in the first year or ~-$0K in subsequent years projected by
Culinary Arts, this means that when the programs are up to projected enrollment, they
will have net annual revenue between -$18 and $24K. This revenues does not seem to
justify the $2M in projected start-up costs. If the FAB admin costs are not included in the
Hospitality Management budget, a separate budget for the FAB should be submitted, as it
is part of the combined proposal. The FAB budget should include its admin cost and any
other cost, resources, and facilities required to run the school.

12. There is no evidence provided in the proposal supporting a demand for indoor recreation
in Montana (gyms, fitness centers, and sports clubs), which is the concentration of one of
the four options of the Hospitality degree. Such evidence would be helpful in assessing
the need for that option.

13. While the proposal states that the proposer “has been in communication with faculty at
both UofM and MSU Billings to discuss the distinct niche of each program” there isn’t
any documentation of the content or outcome of those discussions in the proposal. Some
analysis of the overlap between UofM’s and MSU Billings’ programs is given in the
proposal, but it is not clear if UofM and MSU Billings’ concur with this analysis. A
summary of the conversations with UofM and MSU Billings would helpful and letters of
support or non-objection from UofM and Billings would be helpful before embarking on
such a grand vision. Are there areas of collaboration between UM and MSU that could be
explored? While the options in Restaurant Management: Farm to Table and Value-added
Food Enterprise may be unique, the options in Sports and Recreation Administration and
Lodge Management and Rural Tourism seem to have significant overlap with UM’s
programs. The proposal says the proposed MSU option in Lodge Management and Rural
Tourism is only “somewhat” distinguished from UM’s Lodge Management and Rural
Tourism. This is probably not sufficient. UM’s program concentrates on outdoor tourism
and seems to overlap significantly with the proposed description of the Lodge
Management and Rural Tourism. This may stem from not having a clear definition of “rural tourism” and how it is distinct, other than in name, from UM’s programs. If indoor hospitality was consistently the theme of the proposed programs, non-overlap could be argued. This would require a restructuring of the degree plans, especially Lodge Management and Rural Tourism.

14. The only stated distinction of the proposed Sports and Recreation Administration option and UM’s Recreation Management Degree is that MSU’s program will concentrate on indoor facilities. However, throughout the proposal, the proposed Sports and Recreation Administration degree option has outdoor/rural recreation included in its vision, making it ambiguous as to whether it really includes only indoor recreation in Montana (gyms, fitness centers, and sports clubs) or outdoor recreation (“sport-related tourism” in Montana is typically outdoors). This needs to be clarified. If outdoor is included, it would overlap with UofM’s program. If only indoor recreation is the concentration, it would be good to provide some evidence supporting demand for indoor recreation in Montana, in order to assess the demand and need for the Sports and Recreation Administration option.

15. To the question of whether a smaller version of the proposal could be envisioned, a full answer is beyond the scope of this review. The Culinary Arts AA might be able to stand alone, but currently its proposal is intimately tied to the Hospitality Management Program and cannot be assessed as an independent program based on current material. The proposed ramp up of the Hospitality Management program suggests starting with the Sports Recreation Administration option, due to it not requiring a Kitchen. However, in the “minimum resources needed” document (posted on FS web site), the 3 FTE admin are needed and thus it cannot financially stand on its own. Thus, it does not seem like the program or individual options as proposed can ramp up without a commitment to all aspects of the program. Other options for a scaled down program could be explored. One suggestion is to offer the Restaurant Management: Farm to Table and Value-Added Food Enterprise options as interdisciplinary degrees under SFBS in collaboration with business, utilizing existing business, management, and marketing courses. This would eliminate the need for the new school and most of the new hires.

16. Two organizations that support of tourism in Montana are the Office of Tourism and the Governor’s Tourism Advisory Council. Their assessment of the program and letters of support from them would be helpful in moving the proposal forward.

The APWG has carefully considered the submission and has provided an analysis of the pros and cons of the proposal. We recommend that the CPC weigh the merits and concerns and discuss options with the proposers.