

# 1979

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

“One day Dean Greene put his arm around my shoulder and said, ‘I think it’s time I promoted you . . .’” – Anonymous

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 (#8) examines the CBA of 1979’s procedures for promoting faculty. We begin with the following text from pages 59-60 of the 1979 AACSB Application:

### III. PERSONNEL

#### A. FACULTY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

##### 3. Describe your procedure and criteria for promoting faculty.

Recommendations for promotions originate at the departmental level with the respective chairman recommending to the Dean the promotion of individual faculty members. The Dean and the individual department chairman evaluate the faculty member(s) recommended for a promotion to determine the relative merit of a given faculty member for promotion. To effect the promotion, the Dean must endorse the recommendation favorably to the Vice President for Academic affairs who gives subsequent approval for consideration to the President of the University.

In the Spring, before budget hearings, the Dean, departmental chairman, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and President meet to go over proposed promotions. If the President supports a promotion after seeing all supporting material and listening to the discussion, the promotion request is submitted to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

Let’s start at the beginning. **III. A. 3.** clearly puts promotion in the hands of the department chairman and the CBA Dean. Given the administrative hierarchy in the 1979 CBA, that effectively vests the promotion decision squarely in the hands of the Dean, as alluded to in the epigraph above about the management style of former CBA Dean Joseph Greene. The degree of “faculty governance” spelled out in the

2006 USM Faculty Handbook is simply not present in the promotion procedures exposition from the CBA's 1979 Application to AACSB.

How closely does the CoB of today follow the 2006 USM Faculty Handbook? Or, to put it differently, how far has the CoB of today drifted backwards to the way things were done in the 1979 CBA? There are at least two recent examples of the reversion to 1979. First, the so-called "letter of agreement" promotion (to professor) of management professor David Duhon played out in a way that was similar to the days of 1979. Duhon had been requesting promotion since the administration of William Gunther, but the Gunther-Niroomand administration of the late 1990s refused to support Duhon's relatively weak research credentials. Then, in 2003, came new Dean Harold Doty. About one year after assuming the reigns of the business school, Doty sat down with Duhon and put together a "letter of agreement" with Duhon which was effectively treated as a list of academic chores for Duhon to complete, at which time Doty would support his (Duhon's) application for promotion.<sup>1</sup>

Duhon had completed those chores in time for the 2005-06 application period. By then, the Mgt & Mkt Department was chaired by marketing professor Barry Babin, who also supported Duhon's "agreement" with Doty.<sup>2</sup> Duhon's promotion application traveled successfully through the pipeline up to the University level, where, sources say, it met with opposition. According to Carter, facing failure "Duhon's friends" went over to the administration building and told Provost Jay Grimes that he (Grimes) better make Duhon a full professor, and Grimes, "who's known for caving, caved."

Our second example involves the tenure and promotion of associate professor of management Kenneth Zantow. After a short stint as visiting assistant professor of management in the late 1990s, Zantow was moved to tenure track and came up for 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Review later, in 2003-04. According to sources, Zantow barely had any research at that time, and his 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Review application was rejected. However, Doty stepped in and offered Zantow the opportunity to strengthen his research record and resubmit his application for a "4<sup>th</sup> Year Review" process the following year, 2004-05. USM's Faculty Handbook did not specify any "4<sup>th</sup> Year Review" process. So, in providing Zantow with this benefit, Doty was acting outside of the lines drawn by USM's faculty for governance of

---

<sup>1</sup> At this time Alvin Williams, a well-known promoter of Greene, was Duhon's chairman (Management & Marketing), and he (Williams) supported Duhon's agreement with Doty.

<sup>2</sup> Sources tell USMNEWS.NET that Babin believed Duhon's research credentials to be inadequate for promotion to professor, yet he (Babin) supported Duhon anyway. EFIB Chair George Carter's belief that Duhon's promotion was unwarranted is now a matter of public record.

personnel matters, such as tenure and promotion.<sup>3</sup> Zantow ultimately passed his 4<sup>th</sup> Year Review in 2004-05, and in June of 2007 he was tenured and promoted to associate professor. Once again Babin was the Mgt & Mkt chair who ultimately signed off on this controversial promotion.

These two stories, both coming from Mgt & Mkt, epitomize the kind of internal promotion practices that would have been allowed without controversy in the 1979 CBA. Yet, these and perhaps others, occurred inside the CoB of today. Thus, somehow the modern day's Dean Doty – the Dean who mocked Greene's "merit raise" policies of the 1970s – governed at least two promotion episodes in a way that would have fit *snug as a bug* within the CBA of 1979.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> In other words, Zantow did not receive a terminal contract after his failed 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Review in 2003-04. This meant that Zantow was in no jeopardy of being terminated by USM until after 2004-05. Since the termination process grants an additional year, Zantow had the added benefit of an additional year to search for other employment if his 4<sup>th</sup> Year Review also failed. This courtesy was not, according to sources, extended to Daniel Michael after his (Michael's) failed 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Review application of 2006-07.

<sup>4</sup> As reported previously, during the CoB's Dec-06 faculty meeting Doty mocked Greene's policy of awarding raises to the faculty "who had the children last."