

LEAD PROFESSOR MODEL FOR A LEGAL ENVIRONMENT OF BUSINESS COURSE: DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING AN ALTERNATIVE TEAM TEACHING APPROACH

LEE USNICK*
RUSSELL USNICK**

I. INTRODUCTION

In spring, 2017, the lead author of this article was asked to serve as the Lead Professor for the Legal Environment of Business course at the Marilyn Davies College of Business (MDCOB) at the University of Houston – Downtown. The course is an introductory, 3000 level course that is one of nine topical required core courses for all Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) majors. This approach has been in operation during Fall 2017, Spring 2018, Fall, 2018, and Spring 2019 semesters. Each of those semesters had more than 500 students enrolled in fifteen or sixteen sections, each no larger than forty students.

This paper is a review of the multi-year experiment to restructure the teaching of this introductory core course into the Lead Professor Model. The secondary author has taught this material in a number of different settings in the past and is listed here in recognition of nearly two years of discussions over every aspect of course design and implementation.

The design and implementation have not been without disagreement within the College of Business. A section near the end of this paper will address opinions about the Lead Professor Model. It is the intention of the authors that the paper limits the opinions about the model itself to that one section. Outside of that section, anything that appears judgmental is not so intended.

II. DEFINING THE LEAD PROFESSOR MODEL

A. Definitions Are Not Clearly Delineated

At the onset of this writing, the authors intended to provide a short introduction of the term and the concept of lead professor providing the

* J.D., Associate Professor of Business Law, University of Houston – Downtown.

** J.D., Dr. Env. Des., Attorney, Houston, Texas.

reader with a precise, agreed-upon-in-the-literature, standard definition. Each step in the search for such clarity incrementally increased the recognition that the terminology surrounding most aspects of any alternative teaching model is neither precise nor agreed upon, at least not to mere attorneys.

Consequently, a lengthy, precise literature review of a lead professor model is beyond the scope of this paper and will be saved for another day. The term and the concept of the Lead Professor Model will be limited to the manner in which that term is used in this particular setting.

B. Help from AACSB

The desire to consider an alternative teaching model parallels the July 2018 approval by AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) of specifications for alternative instructional programs under Standard 5 which became effective January 1, 2019.¹ The MDCOB's Lead Professor Model was operative as a pilot program in academic year 2014-15, mostly implement in academic years 2015-16 and 2016-17, and fully implemented in academic year 2017-18.² Since MDCOB received notice of AACSB accreditation renewal in mid-January 2019, it can be deduced that using the Lead Professor Model did not result in loss of accredited status.

C. The Problems Leading to the MDCOB Lead Professor Model

The College of Business perceived four specific challenges in multi-section core courses. First, there existed knowledge variation among students in upper-division courses. Second, there existed a wide variation in grade distributions across sections. Third, there existed high rates of grades of D, F or Withdraw. And fourth, there was below target student performance on the Educational Testing Service Major Field Test in Business for the BBA degree which was one measure of student learning outcomes.³

¹ ASS'N TO ADVANCE COLLEGIATE SCH. OF BUS. INT'L, 2013 ELIGIBILITY PROCEDURES AND ACCREDITATION STANDARDS FOR BUS. ACCREDITATION, STANDARD 5: FACULTY SUFFICIENCY AND DEVELOPMENT, 29, <https://www.aacsb.edu/-/media/aacsb/docs/accreditation/business/standards-and-tables/2018-business-standards-track-changes> (date last revised: July 1, 2018, effective Jan. 1, 2019).

² MARILYN DAVIES COLL. OF BUS., UNIV. OF HOUSTON – DOWNTOWN, LEAD PROFESSOR MODEL ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETE IMPLEMENTATION (June 1, 2018) (on file with lead author).

³ EDUC. TESTING SERV., MAJOR FIELD TEST IN BUS., https://www.ets.org/s/mft/pdf/mft_testdesc_business.pdf. The ETS MFT for the BBA tests knowledge in 9 business core areas using 120 multiple choice questions. Historically, MDCOB seniors completed the test during their last semester.

D. Considering Best Practices for Managing Multi-Section Courses

The College identified three specific best practices that would define the response to the problems identified above. First, there should be consistency across all sections of a core course. Second, there should be quality control over both design and instruction. Third, if team teaching is used, there should be a division of labor with clearly defined roles.⁴

E. The Resulting MDCOB Solution

When fully implemented, the Lead Professor Model was characterized by four solutions. First, there would be consistency and equity which meant that all of the sections of a specific core course would have the same content, assessments, and lesson plans. Second, there would be quality control of design and instruction with all lead professors holding relevant AACSB Scholarly Academic (SA) qualification⁵ developing the course and monitoring all instruction. Third, there would be clear division of labor with clearly defined roles where section instructors acting under the LP follow the course instructional plans developed by the lead professor and provide color commentary as appropriate. And, fourth, lead professor courses would have a focus on continuous improvement which is data-driven and would include “close-the-loop” meetings at the end of every semester.⁶

F. The Definition of Lead Professor Model at MDCOB

Several additional parameters affected the nature of the process. Unlike the previous teaching model, the vast majority of the sections of each core course would be either fully online or hybrid format (half face-to-face and half online). In addition, the teaching would be flipped where lecture type activities would be mostly online, and the face-to-face time focused on activities, discussions, teamwork, problem solving and the like. Finally, all three current modes (face-to-face, hybrid, and fully online) have to provide for identical materials, testing, student work effort, and be equally assessable. As implemented in the Legal Environment of Business course, the Lead Professor Model at MDCOB has some clearly distinguishing characteristics.

⁴ MARILYN DAVIES COLL. OF BUS., *supra* note 2.

⁵ ASS'N TO ADVANCE COLLEGIATE SCH. OF BUS. INT'L, ELIGIBILITY PROCEDURES AND ACCREDITATION STANDARDS FOR BUS. ACCREDITATION, STANDARD 15: FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT, 43, <https://www.aacsb.edu/-/media/aacsb/docs/accreditation/business/standards-and-tables/2018-business-standards> (date last revised: July 1, 2018, effective Jan. 1, 2019).

⁶ MARILYN DAVIES COLL. OF BUS., *supra* note 2.

1. Lead Professor Description

The lead professor will be SA qualified according to AACSB standards. The lead professor designs all aspects of the course. The lead professor develops online lectures and support materials, course syllabus and the like. The lead professor meets with each section occasionally. The lead professor is the professor of record for all students enrolled in all of the sections of the course and assigns each student grade and signs all of the official grade sheets.

2. Section Instructor Description

The section instructor always holds a J.D. degree and has experience practicing law. The section instructors hold degrees completed that qualify them to teach the course on their own; that is, these are not graduate teaching assistants. The section instructor has the first level of interface with the students regardless of the course format. The section instructor grades those portions of student work that the lead professor assigns the section instructor to grade, using grading rubrics designed by the lead professor. All graded work including reports, quizzes, and exams are identical across sections all of the course.

The section instructor is the first level of contact for the student. The student contacts the lead professor only when the section instructor cannot resolve the issue or the section instructor is unavailable. The section instructor handles all day to day section functions such as attendance or missed assignments, and meets with students during office hours.

The section instructor teaches the course in the letter and the spirit of the course designed by the lead professor in the manner prescribed by the lead professor. In the case of the MDCOB Legal Environment of Business course, the section instructors are all licensed attorneys who hold active membership in the State Bar of Texas. Many also have an MBA degree.

III. DESIGNING THE MODEL FOR THIS COURSE

A. Initial Negotiations

The initial request for someone to act as lead professor for the Legal Environment of Business course simply requested that the professor replicate their existing course into the lead professor format. A series of communications followed to clarify what exactly was being agreed upon for the course structure, content, and operation. The agreed upon standards fell

into three general categories: course design criteria, the lead professor role, and the section instructor role.

B. Course Design Criteria

The negotiated course design criteria covered a wide range of topics. Some addressed broad principles. These included items like requiring the creation of a single course, regardless of the delivery format, with identical topics, quizzes, exams, schedules, assignments, grading rubrics, and the like. That is, to the maximum extent possible, there would be a single course that could be delivered as a face-to-face, hybrid, or online course. Additionally, a key focus of the course would be critical thinking. There would be built-in measures of student success. The course would have a clear set of intended end competencies. The course would also build in SACSCOC (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges) and AACSB assessment opportunities. Finally, the course would cover as many pertinent legal environment topics as possible.

At a more tactical level, a complete list of target terms and concepts would be developed. Every learning unit would have identified terms and concepts that were grouped to clear learning objectives. The course would be structured to elicit the highest possible student reading of the text and support materials. Every assignment would have a scoring rubric used to determine the assignment grade, and these rubrics would be made available to students well in advance of the graded event. Efficiency for the course would be measured exclusively on ease and smoothness of the process for the students, and their success in the course.

C. Lead Professor Role

The role of the lead professor would be to create completely the course in every aspect. The lead professor also is the instructor of record and assigns all of the course grades. The lead professor was mandated to challenge the students in positive ways and to avoid all student busy work in the course. The course would be designed so that the opportunity for and value of any cheating was kept to an absolute minimum. This necessitated the lead professor generating new quizzes, exams, and other assignments for each new semester. The lead professor was charged with keeping course expectations and schedules extremely clear and rigid for both students and section instructors.

D. Section Instructor Role

At the negotiation level, the discussions regarding section instructor role focused as much on what would not take place as that which would take place. These included agreements that all sections must stay with the timetable. Section instructors were not allowed to make schedule modifications. This included no cancellation of classes. Additionally, there would be no use of teams for graded work. To the sheer terror of some of the section instructors, there was to be no use of power points of any kind in or out of class. Finally, every section instructor was obligated to reply to any student email contact within 24 hours, and in the event a student did not receive a reply within 24 hours, the student would be directed to email the lead professor directly.

E. The Mid-Summer Surprise

Having completed the above negotiations by mid-Spring 2017, the lead professor-to-be focused on completing pending research and two summer courses which would end in early July. What appeared to be a relatively easy, straightforward transition quickly disappeared. Unknown to the lead professor, others in the College worked feverishly to produce an extensive Lead Professor Model Manual. At first glance, it clarified some things. It created some additional work by specifying formatting requirements for many things. Clearly the students taking multiple core courses using the standardized format would be helped greatly by the consistency of design and delivery of their core courses, but the added formatting effort was not insignificant.

Smoothly having the new course fully operational in the upcoming fall semester received a real jolt with a simple paragraph indicating that all of the core courses would need to address every topic covered by the ETS Major Field Test for the course topic area. Derived from the standard list of AACSB topical learning standards, covering this effectively in a single semester introductory course did not match up with simply moving the existing course to the Lead Professor Model, with a much-expanded definition of the course requirements dictating every aspect of the future course.

IV. COURSE DESIGN CRITERIA

A. *University Course Catalog Course Description*

The first design criterion for course design is meeting the course description in the official university catalog where the university tells the students and the world what the legal environment of business course covers. At the time this course was being designed, the applicable course description was the following:

An introduction to business law, with special emphasis on the legal and ethical environment of business both domestic and international. Topics include a description of the American legal system, crimes, torts, contracts, agency, and legal liability, business organizations, and governmental regulations.⁷

The finished course design would necessarily satisfy all of elements described in that description.

B. *Pre-Lead Professor Model Course Learning Outcomes*

At the time this model was being designed and implemented, there existed an explicit set of course learning outcomes that were the established standards for the course and for the role of the course as a core course for the BBA degree in general. It was expected that upon completion of this course, students should acquire knowledge and skills that include being able to demonstrate knowledge of the legal environment of business: the U.S. Legal System, its origins and hierarchy of authority, its principles and practices. Additionally, the students should demonstrate knowledge of the regulatory environment of business: the U.S. court system, its organization, authority, and practices, and with the local court system and practices.

Further, the student should demonstrate critical thinking skills by applying correctly legal principles and theories to analyze the rights and duties of parties within business relationships and personal relationships. Students need to demonstrate an understanding of the law's impact on business practices, the challenges of regulatory compliance, and the civil and criminal sanctions that may result from non-compliance. There should also be a demonstration of core business knowledge of, and sensitivity to ethical and moral standards and responsibilities in organizations and society, and the

⁷ UNIV. OF HOUSTON – DOWNTOWN, UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG 2016-2017 archived at catalog.uhd.edu.

relationship between law and ethics. Finally, the student should demonstrate effective written communications skills.

C. Ensure Consistency with Topics Currently Taught

Since the charge was to convert an existing course to the Lead Professor Model, there should be an effort to recognize and include, to the extent possible, those topics which were currently being taught. Consequently, the list of current course topics should be incorporated.

At the time these criteria were established, the topics included in the existing course included an understanding of how the law works, including law and legal reasoning, business ethics, constitutional law, courts and alternative dispute resolution (ADR), and court procedures. Specific areas of the law addressed included torts, negligence, strict liability, product liability, intellectual property, and criminal law. Numerous contracts related topics included an introduction, agreement, consideration, capacity and legality, mistake and fraud, statute of frauds, electronic records, third party rights, performance and discharge, and breach and remedies. Finally, additional topics in the current course included agency, agency liability, employment law, employment discrimination, administrative law, consumer law, and environmental law.

D. Include All ETS Major Field Test Topics

The relevant portion of the ETS Major Field Test that applied to material covered by a legal environment of business course is found in Section VIII⁸ of their topical coverage under the title Legal and Social Environment. This section accounts for ten percent of the test coverage and score. Section VIII is divided into four subtopics.

The first area titled legal environment specifies courts and legal systems, constitution and business, administrative law, tort law and crimes. The second area is titled regulatory environment and lists employment law, labor law, antitrust law, consumer protection, environmental and international law, and security regulation. The third topic area is titled business relationships and lists contract and sales law (UCC), business organizations, law of agency, and intellectual property. The fourth and final topic area titled ethics and social responsibility lists ethics and social responsibility as subtopics.⁹

⁸ EDUC. TESTING SERV., *supra* note 3.

⁹ *Id.*

E. Meet AACSB BBA General Skills Requirements

At the time of the development of this design criteria, the AACSB specified general skills included written and oral communications, ethical understanding and reasoning, analytical thinking, information technology, interpersonal relations and teamwork, diverse and multicultural work environments, reflective thinking, and application of knowledge.¹⁰

F. Meet AACSB Relevant BBA Business Knowledge Areas

The relevant topical requirements refer to two general requirements. First, economic, political, regulatory, legal, technological, and social contexts of organizations in a global society. The second is social responsibility, including sustainability, diversity, and ethical behavior and approaches to management.¹¹

G. Address UHD College of Business BBA Learning Outcomes

The MDCOB had adopted at that time learning outcomes for the BBA degree. Those requirements were effective written communications, effective oral communications, critical thinking-inductive, critical thinking-deductive, critical thinking-analysis, critical thinking-evaluation, core business knowledge, other core business knowledge, and reality based business education.¹²

V. INCORPORATING ALL OF THE DESIGN CRITERIA

A. Building through Deconstruction

To be able to create a matrix that linked each of the design criteria into a single spreadsheet that accounted for overlap and shades of similarity, it proved necessary to change the way many of these criteria were framed. In order to do that, complex statements were deconstructed into single concepts that could be added to a master spreadsheet.

¹⁰ A'SSN TO ADVANCE COLLEGIATE SCH. OF BUS. INT'L, *supra* note 5, 35.

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² MARILYN DAVIES COLL. OF BUS., UNIV. OF HOUSTON – DOWNTOWN, AACSB INT'L CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REVIEW REPORT, 30-31 (Sept. 2018) (on file with lead author).

B. *Deconstruction Example*

As an example of how this occurred, recall the inclusion above of the full course description in the official university catalog:

An introduction to business law, with special emphasis on the legal and ethical environment of business both domestic and international. Topics include a description of the American legal system, crimes, torts, contracts, agency, and legal liability, business organizations, and governmental regulations.¹³

The resulting deconstruction of the course description became the following:

An introduction to business law
The domestic legal environment of business
The domestic ethical environment of business
The international legal environment of business
The international ethical environment of business
A description of the American legal system
Crimes
Torts
Contracts
Agency and legal liability
Business organizations
Governmental regulations

The discrete items were then inserted into the master spreadsheet to assure that all of the necessary design criteria were incorporated into the course plan.

C. *Completing the Criteria Design Spreadsheet*

Each design criteria list was deconstructed into single topic statements that could be used in the spreadsheet. The first step was to create a draft spreadsheet that would provide enough sense of the needs of the course that it would be possible to judge the scope of the class. The process was daunting since requiring coverage of all relevant ETS Major Field Test topics be included made for a considerable list.

¹³ UNIV. OF HOUSTON – DOWNTOWN, *supra* note 7.

The resulting spreadsheet contained nearly one hundred discrete criteria that needed to be satisfied. Some were repetitions coming from several design criteria sources. Some apparent repetitions were actually significantly subtly unique. In the end, the use of the design criteria matrix made it possible to identify where in the course particular design requirements were addressed. The matrix also allowed quick identification of all of the places where a specific set (say ETS Major Field Test topics) were addressed. As a result, one matrix identified where every criteria was addressed within the course. See Appendix A for a consolidated summary of the design criteria matrix.

D. Legal Environment of Business, Not Business Law

It was decided that the best fit was to cover as many topics as possible at the cost of covering some very broad topics very quickly. The course had been called Legal Environment of Business for decades, but was often taught as more of a business law course. This Lead Professor Model course that covered all of the ETS Major Field Test topics would indeed be a quick, broad look at the legal environment aspects of numerous law topics, leaving it very much less of a business law course.

E. The Final Barrier – The Textbook

Given the number of topics, getting students to read long, detailed material was not going to be a successful approach. Fortunately, a text by Melvin and Guerra-Pujol¹⁴ provided the topical coverage called for by our design criteria in a format that was not overly voluminous.

F. Putting It All Together

With the textbook in hand, the design phase of the course itself came to a close. The final spreadsheet included all of the criteria from the various sources, cross indexed into an ordered course progression that matched up with the chosen text by chapter.

¹⁴ SEAN P. MELVIN & F.E. GUERRA-PUJOL, THE LEGAL ENVIRONMENT OF BUSINESS: A MANAGERIAL APPROACH: THEORY TO PRACTICE (3d ed. 2018).

VI. IMPLEMENTING THE COURSE

A. *Creating Discrete Course Topics, Learning Objectives, and Terms*

Given the academic calendar and the need for exams and other assessments, the course focused on 23 discrete units. In the interest of making things as clear as possible for the students, 195 learning objectives closely tied to the textbook were identified to cover the 23 topics.

To effectively address these learning objectives, 463 terms of art across the 23 topics were identified as those that the students would be introduced to and expected to comprehend. The learning outcomes, terms, and schedule were crafted into a single document for each of the 23 topics. The format was designed so that students would use the document for study and notetaking. These notes were the only materials allowed for use during the final exam as an incentive to them to make on-going notes and stay current in the class.

B. *The First Look at Class Delivery Modes*

To this point, there has been no distinction at all in the course development to account for the fact that the model was required to be consistent for face-to-face, hybrid (one-half face-to-face and one-half online), and fully online. To go forward, the starting point was to establish one goal for student-time per week spent on the course, regardless of the delivery mode. The goal of nine total hours of student effort every week for the three-credit hour course was established.

Next, a nine-hour effort of activities and exercises was created for each of the three modes. Some of the activities would apply only to one mode, while some activities, such as reading the text, would apply to all modes. See Appendix B.

Every student, whatever their mode, would have access to all of the material provided for all three modes. Each mode would then have required weekly activities specific to that mode, but all of the activities and materials of the other modes would be available to everyone as optional engagement beyond that which was required in their enrollment mode.

C. *Breadth Has Its Cost*

While the system seemed to work in theory at this point, a simple calculation had a chilling effect. In the hybrid mode, for example, there are somewhere around 900 minutes of actual effective face-to-face time. At 23 topics, each of which had a chapter of text material, each topic would have, at best, one-half of a 75 minute class meeting, or 37 minutes per topic.

Each of the 195 learning objectives is given about 4.5 minutes. The 463 terms of art get roughly 1.94 minutes each. The outstanding section instructors rose to the occasion with great energy and thought leading to solutions that have worked very well. Currently, section instructors take the first fifteen minutes to review the two topics for the previous week. They take one of the two topics for that week, and spend thirty minutes as if having an initial client meeting on a problem related to the topic.

VII. OPINIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The student reaction to this course has been much more positive than anticipated. The consensus feedback is that students feel that they are fortunate to have two professors, one academic and one a current practitioner.

The College of Business has announced that it intends to cease administering the ETS Major Field Test for BBA students. A replacement is under development. Spring 2019 was the last semester for the Lead Professor Model across the core courses. At this writing, alternative delivery models are under discussion.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF LEAD PROFESSOR COURSE DESIGN CRITERIA MATRIX

Design Criteria

An Introduction to Business Law
Ethics and Social Responsibility: Social Responsibility
Intro to Law
Social Contexts of Organizations in a Global Society
Ethics and Social Responsibility: Ethics
The Domestic Legal Environment of Business
Ethics and Social Responsibility: Social Responsibility
Social Contexts of Organizations in a Global Society
The Domestic Ethical Environment of Business
Understand Legal Env of Business and Sustainability
Regulatory Contexts of Organizations in Global Society
Understand the Law's Impact on Business Practices
Legal Contexts of Organizations in a Global Society
Ethics and Social Responsibility: Ethics
The International Legal Environment of Business
Ethics and Social Responsibility: Social Responsibility
Regulatory Env: Environmental and International Law
The International Ethical Environment of Business
Business Ethics
Ethics and Social Responsibility: Ethics
Ethical Understanding and Reasoning
Regulatory Contexts of Organizations in Global Society
Legal Contexts of Organizations in a Global Society
Understand Standards in Organizations and Society
Understand Ethical and Moral Responsibilities
Understand the Relationship Between Law and Ethics.
A Description of the American Legal System
Legal Environment: Courts and Legal Systems
U.S. Legal System's Origins
Constitutional law
Legal Environment: Constitution and Business
U.S. Legal System's Hierarchy of Authority
Courts, Alternative Dispute Resolution
U.S. Legal System's Principles
U.S. Legal System's Practices
U.S. Court system's Organization
U.S. Court System's Authority
U.S. Court System's Practices
Court Procedures
Crimes

Criteria Source

University Catalog
ETS-Major Field Test Topic
Existing Course Content
AACSB Knowledge
ETS-Major Field Test Topic
University Catalog
ETS-Major Field Test Topic
AACSB Knowledge
University Catalog
Learning Outcomes
AACSB Knowledge
Learning Outcomes
AACSB Knowledge
ETS-Major Field Test Topic
University Catalog
ETS-Major Field Test Topic
ETS-Major Field Test Topic
University Catalog
Existing Course Content
ETS-Major Field Test Topic
AACSB Skill
AACSB Knowledge
AACSB Knowledge
Learning Outcomes
Learning Outcomes
Learning Outcomes
University Catalog
ETS-Major Field Test Topic
Learning Outcomes
Existing Course Content
ETS-Major Field Test Topic
Learning Outcomes
Existing Course Content
Learning Outcomes
Learning Outcomes
Learning Outcomes
Learning Outcomes
Learning Outcomes
Existing Course Content
University Catalog

Design Criteria

Business Relationships: Intellectual Property
Intellectual Property
Internet Law
Critical Thinking: Correctly Apply Legal Principles
Critical Thinking: Correctly Apply Theories
Critical Thinking: Correctly Analyze the Rights of Parties
Critical Thinking: Correctly Apply the Duties of Parties
Written and Oral Communication
Analytical Thinking
Information Technology
Interpersonal Relations and Teamwork
Diverse and Multicultural Work Environments
Reflective Thinking
Application of Knowledge

Criteria Source

ETS-Major Field Test Topic
Existing Course Content
Existing Course Content
Learning Outcomes
Learning Outcomes
Learning Outcomes
Learning Outcomes
AACSB Skill
AACSB Skill
AACSB Skill
AACSB Skill
AACSB Skill
AACSB Skill
AACSB Skill

APPENDIX B

TEACHING MODE EQUITY AND CONSISTENCY WORKSHEET

<i>Expected Weekly Student Effort (In Hours)</i>	<i>Face-to-Face</i>	<i>Hybrid</i>	<i>Full Online</i>
Read Text	3	3	3
Live Session Attendance	2.5	1.25	0
View Topic Introduction Video (1 per topic)	Optional	0.5	0.5
View Topic Summary Video (1 per topic)	Optional	Optional	0.5
Read Topic Written Lecture (1 per topic)	Optional	0.5	0.5
Take Topic Quiz (1 per topic)	0.5	0.5	0.5
Work on paper (weekly average time spent)	1.5	1.5	1.5
On-Going Exam Preparation	1.5	1.5	1.5
Posting to Discussion Board (1 per topic)	Optional	Optional	1
Total	9.0 Hours	8.75 Hours	9.0 Hours