

1979

A Look Back at the CoB's AACSB Application of 30 Years Ago

USMNEWS.NET has obtained a copy of the USM College of Business Administration's AACSB Accreditation Application of 1979. Many current CoB faculty are comparing the organization today to the one of the Joe Greene era, and this document allows for a serious assessment of where USM's College of Business stands today.

This installment (#3) (re)visits three distinct eras in the history of USM's business college. The first, of course, is the Joe Greene era. The second is the current, 2007-08 Doty-Williams era. Third, and most importantly, we revisit the end of the Ty Black era (late 1990s). These visits examine the profile of the business school's faculty.

Before getting to the analysis, let's start by recalling something former CoB marketing professor Barry Babin stated during a CBA faculty meeting at the beginning of the William Gunther era. At that time Gunther and a number of CBA faculty were clamoring to re-do the CBA's faculty evaluation system. Several faculty wanted a system wherein CBA faculty got to choose individual percentage weights (to teaching, research and service) for appraising their annual performance. Gunther seemed to be supportive of such a change. This suggestion was being discussed at a CBA faculty meeting when Babin pointed out that such a move away from the then-status quo would only serve to hurt faculty who are good performers in all three areas (teaching, research and service).

Babin's comment was on the mark. In thinking about it, one of our sources made the comment that the thing about the Black era that gets lost in all the talk about how much the CoB's research profile improved under Black's leadership is that the collection(s) of faculty who served under Black were the college's best teachers and service performers. In other words, Black assembled the best of faculty across all three areas, which is really what made the CBA so successful under his leadership. Babin's remark was not only correct, it came at a time – at the end (beginning) of Black's (Gunther's) tenure as Dean – when the USM business school was at or near its peak.

Having heard the argument above, in combination with seeing reports about the recent spike in the hiring of ABDs, adjuncts, instructors, assistant professors, visiting instructors, visiting assistant professors, etc., USMNEWS.NET reporters decided examine the CBA faculty profile at the end of the Black era, and then compare it to that of (1) the Greene

1979 CBA, and (2) the current Doty-Williams CoB. Once again, the CBA's 1979 AACSB Accreditation Application comes in handy.

Table 1 below shows the faculty profiles of the 1979 CBA, the CBA at the end of the Black era, and the current CoB.

Table 1
USM Business College Faculty Profiles

Faculty Ranks	Greene Era	Black Era	Doty-Williams Era
Full/Assoc	40	56	37
Assist/Instr	<u>16</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>33</u>
Totals	56	83	70

Sources: The Greene Era data come from the CBA's 1979 Accreditation Application to the AACSB. The Black Era data come from the *1998-99 USM Undergraduate Bulletin*. The Doty-Williams Era data come from the CoB's webpages, Greene Hall marquees, and USMNEWS.NET reports.

As seen in Table 1 above, at the end of the Black era, the CBA faculty was comprised of 67.5 percent fulls/associates and 32.5 percent assistants/instructors.¹ Based on the premise that former CBA Dean Tyrone Black was doing something right in order to have produced the CBA that he did, and that the CBA faculty's profile may have been a product of his methods, the full/associates-to-assistants/instructors breakdown from the Black era is compared (see below) to those from the other two eras.

The first comparison is between what one would expect based upon the Black Era standard of "67.5 to 32.5" to the actual profile of Greene's 1979 CBA. That comparison takes place in Table 2 below.

Table 2
USM Business College Faculty Profiles: Black vs. Greene

Faculty Ranks	Black Era Expectation	Greene Era Actual
Full/Assoc	38	40
Assist/Instr	18	16

The Greene Era (i.e., 1979) CBA faculty profile looked largely like what one would expect to see using the Black Era standard of "67.5 to 32.5." What difference there is between the two was tested, and it was *not* found to be statistically significant (chi-sq test statistic = 0.33). Next, we turn to Table 3 below, which presents a similar comparison, using the Doty-Williams Era in place of the Greene Era shown above in Table 2.

¹ This breakdown includes both permanent and visiting faculty at all four levels.

Table 3
USM Business College Faculty Profiles: Black vs. Greene
Black Era **Doty-Williams Era**

Faculty Ranks	Expectation	Actual
Full/Assoc	47	37
Assist/Instr	23	33

Unlike the previous Greene Era (i.e., 1979), the CoB faculty profile in the Doty-Williams Era does not resemble what one would expect to see using the Black Era standard of “67.5 to 32.5.” The seemingly substantial difference between the two was tested, and it *was* found to be statistically significant (chi-sq test statistic = 6.48). As such, the claim can be made that the Doty-Williams formula(e) is (are) not producing the same type of faculty profile (in terms of rank) seen at (near) the peak of USM’s business school under former Dean Tyrone Black.

To elaborate further on what tables like the ones above might suggest, we have invited USMNEWS.NET’s Duane Cobb to provide some additional commentary.

Duane Cobb Commentary

This new series, “1979,” is an interesting and compelling one, and I am pleased to offer some brief commentary to close installment #3. Let’s start by stating the obvious – the CoB’s new approach to staffing that involves hordes of instructors, adjuncts, visiting faculty, ABDs, etc. is one that has virtually no chance of offering the kinds of research talents and teaching experience and skills that the CoB so desperately needs now, and that the CBA of the 1990s was seemingly overrun with. At a time when the AACSB is breathing down the CoB’s neck, the current (recent) administration seems to be flailing about, waiting for something magical to fall out of the present (dreadful) situation. Black’s formula was not perfect. Few are. However, it was a *recruitment and retention dream* in that productive faculty, not sycophants, were rewarded throughout most of his tenure as Dean.

A second comment I would make relates to service, the often forgotten and/or marginalized component. Look at the two similar profiles – the Greene and Black eras – and the outlying current era once again. What you have is something akin to the impending Social Security System crisis, only in reverse (in terms of age). Using the CoB’s current practice of “protecting new/junior faculty from service,” fewer and fewer senior faculty (over time) are being asked to protect more and more new/junior faculty from service in the CoB. Put differently, many of the more skilled researchers and most experienced teachers in the CoB are being asked to divert more and more of their attention away from those two activities in

order to keep junior/new faculty away from service. Now that more and more of these junior/new faculty are represented by ABDs, so-called “tenure busts,” faculty with online degrees, *unqualified* Center Directors, etc., the return on this diversion seems to be, more often than not, nil to little.

The effects of the demographic changes in the CoB are perverse ones. The CoB is breaking down, unable to perform up the standards of the 1990s for sure, and increasingly unable to match even the results of the earlier Greene era. The frightening part of this story is the proverbial light at the end of the tunnel may be way off in the distance somewhere.