

Vice President  
Academic Affairs

MINUTES  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
December 3, 1980

RECEIVED  
JAN 27 1981  
ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT

ATTENDANCE (See attached roster)

CALL TO ORDER

After establishing that a quorum was present, Dr. Jean Kelty called the meeting to order at 4:07.

Dr. Kelty announced that all Senate members should have received, during the preceding week, a four-page handout of questions and answers about the BET proposal. Apparently Central Services did not send it to some Senate members; those who did not have one received one from the Senate secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes for the meeting of November 5, 1980 were accepted as circulated.

REPORT OF CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE: none

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: none

REPORT OF ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE: none

REPORTS OF OTHER SENATE COMMITTEES

University Curriculum Committee

No motion was anticipated in relation to the report of the committee; course proposals were attached. Dr. Kelty asked if there were questions. Dr. Sutton pointed out that course 81-1 (see agenda for Dec. 3, page 3) should read Mechanical Engineering 822. The alteration was made in the official copy of the agenda.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Dr. Kelty referred the Senate to the agenda of the last meeting, where the motion to approve the SBA proposal is indicated. In the minutes of that meeting senators can find a record of the discussion that followed that motion as well as the motion, which passed, to delay discussion until this meeting (see page 6, minutes for Nov. 5). The materials received during the past week were to be added to that discussion. Dr. Kelty opened discussion.

Dr. Virginia Phillips presented some background information, clarifying the progress of her own, and of the BET faculty's, information regarding the implications of the changes sought by SBA. She indicated

that the reason she had not signed the BET memo to the Senate (see minutes for Nov. 5, pp. 8-10) was that she had withdrawn her objections to the SBA proposal. She then made a statement regarding her position in the discussion. (See attached transcript.)

Ms. Peterson spoke on behalf of the faculty members of BET. She thanked the Senate for delaying discussion of this issue, and she indicated that although responses were received to the questions asked by BET, the faculty of BET felt that some concerns must still be expressed and brought to the attention of the university. (See attached transcript.)

Dr. Murphy asked for clarification from the administrative sector about how BET needs would be filled; Dr. Kelty referred the question to Dr. Gillis.

Dr. Gillis did not wish to respond on the floor of the Senate; Dr. Kelty then referred the question to Dr. Alderman. Dr. Alderman noted that the issue seemed to have covered a wide number of situations and that the issue of faculty positions was a matter of ongoing deliberation. He sympathized with Dr. Gillis' hesitance to predict.

Dr. Kelty called for further discussion or questions.

Dr. Baldino pointed out that we have a lesson to learn from this situation: these concerns, he declared, are legitimate and should be the basis for any change in any program. He moved that the SBA proposal be recommitted to committee for reconsideration. There was no second.

A member of SBA noted that at their November meeting SBA voted unanimously to help BET deal with involved courses; he wished to know whether Dr. Phillips had been aware of that. She indicated that she had heard of this only indirectly. He wished to know what the reaction of BET was to SBA's proposal to offer these courses separately in SBA.

Dr. Kelty asked whether the matter had been referred to Academic Affairs; Dr. Khawaja said that it was not an Academic Affairs matter and should go to Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Brothers suggested that this discussion had moved out of the area of what would be helpful in resolving the issue.

Dr. Roberts wished to commend the Senate delay of discussion on this issue; during this time, Dean Paraska had attempted to respond to BET concerns, but Roberts was not satisfied. He stated that the Senate should evaluate the proposal as a curricular matter and referred to Article 15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Dr. Cohen recalled that the only question in matters such as this one used to be whether or not the university had the resources. He suggested that should be the question here. We should rely on those who ought to know.

Dr. Baldino observed that there was a legitimate position on the part of the administration as well as on the part of the department. He suggested that the significant question was whether or not the proposal deserved Senate support academically.

Ed Menaldi inquired about the effect the proposal would have on CAST students. Would curriculum be changed right under their noses?

Dean Dodge said no--there were no curricular changes involved. The proposal was for the School of Business.

Dean Paraska said that those in CAST who had been admitted under the present program would complete their work under that program.

Menaldi, who is in Real Estate Technology, wished to know whether that field would be watered down; Paraska felt he had answered that. Dr. Kelty noted that the question referred to future enrollment. Dean Paraska said that there was no plan to change real estate courses. Some Jr.-Sr. courses would be altered. Questions arose: what will substitute for 700 level Business Law? There will be a course from Allied Health. Why have two courses, one for the B.A. and one for technical people? How will two-year students be able to come back?

Dr. Cohen confessed to some confusion over the issue of lower division students taking upper division courses; a student spoke up who is now a sophomore taking junior-level courses simply because all sophomore courses in his field are full.

Dr. Kelty asked whether there was anyone who wished to address these issues.

Dean Paraska responded: the issue before the Senate, he noted, was making changes in SBA to meet accreditation criteria; this involved controlling prerequisites. Students in two-year programs would be given academically sound courses and given recognition for courses already taken.

Menaldi speculated about potential problems should two-year courses ever be converted to four-year degrees.

Dr. Deiderick referred to the proposal of SBA to house courses in SBA, suggesting that this involved other areas, and he pointed out that the chief concern in all discussion should be the protection of the students' concerns.

Dr. Schroeder called the question. The motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS: none

#### ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded: the meeting adjourned at 4:50.

4.

STATEMENT: V. Phillips, Dec. 3, 1981

Dean Paraska responded to the BET faculty questions in writing on Tuesday, November 25, 1980. The Dean's responses raised many additional concerns and questions. There are still two faculty issues of great concern to the BET Department -- Will adequate staffing be provided (quantity and quality)? and Will we be forced to abandon present programs to staff the new courses?

However, if the Academic Vice President Gillis affirms that the administration fully intends to staff BET needs with vacant positions transferred from other departments as inferred in the Dean's responses to Questions 1, 2, and 3, the SBA Proposal should be considered on issues other than those that related to faculty.

The wisdom of my position is subject to question; but as a quasi-member of the administration and because I feel my loyalty is to the total university, I find it necessary, after much consideration, to rely in good faith on statements made by administrators at higher level positions. I am referring to statements such as: all decisions made will be in the best interests of the faculty, the SBA faculty will put no roadblocks in the path of the BET's departments efforts to build two-year curricula; in spite of no written statements, two-year students will not be the brunt of discriminatory acts; even though no written policy statements exist, former two-year and four-year students returning to the university will be treated equally; if two-year students are subjected to validating examinations, four-year students will be subjected to them, too; derogatory statements will no longer be made in SBA to and about two-year students and programs.

There is now one important policy statement in written form. It would appear that the response to No. 7 does spell out the conditions and procedures for voluntary transfer of faculty from one department to another. We may not agree with the policy, but now we have some information on what it is.

I applaud the Senate's decision to postpone deliberation on the SBA Proposal. The month's postponement has, I feel, been instrumental in getting a public statement of intention regarding faculty and has been beneficial to both SBA and BET faculty. Hopefully, future action will be in accord with this written statement and faculty can be assured that they will not be pawns in an administrative chess game. The written policy statement regarding voluntary transfer is of benefit to every university faculty member.

While I don't totally agree with the Deans' (Dodge and Paraska) statement that "there is nothing to worry about" and while I feel that the BET Department is going to face monumental internal problems, I again urge the Senate to consider the SBA proposal on the basis of its potential benefit to the university, its impact on students, its impact on other university programs, etc. rather than on the faculty issues that have been raised.

Thank you for demonstrating that the Senate is sensitive to the concerns of all areas of the university and does recognize the existence of problems in all departments and colleges. It is somewhat reassuring to feel that the Senate truly represents the entire university and can still be a vital force in matters of academic concern.

5  
STATEMENT: C. Peterson, Dec. 3, 1981

I speak today for the faculty members of the Business Education and Technology Department. We wish to thank the University Senate for postponing approval of the School of Business Administration Proposal. This postponement gave us the opportunity to request answers to some questions which we felt were vital matters of consideration to our faculty members. We also felt that the outcome of these concerns could ultimately affect the setting of future precedents for the entire university faculty.

Although we did receive responses to the questions posed on our questionnaire to the Dean (all of you should have received copies of the questionnaire and the responses) we do want to take this opportunity to voice some concerns which we still have. We feel that although our department is the one being affected by these concerns at this particular time, these are still collegial matters which should, at least, be brought to the attention of the university community.

1. We feel that the wording of the answers to our questions is vague enough so as to permit tampering with the faculty should the administration choose to "change its present plans." In our opinion, phrases such as "is not planned" or "is not contemplated", give the impression that procedures for the formulation of a successful transition program are somewhat indefinite.
2. The answer which we received to clarify Question #5 seems to lead to the possible discrimination of faculty. It was stated that certain credentials and criteria would be required of some new faculty members entering the BET Department, but there would be no standardization of these demands. To be more specific, two instructors recently entering the BET Department were required to obtain a terminal degree within five years before tenure or promotion would be granted. However, we have recently been told that Business

Technology Instructors applying for open positions may not have this expectation placed upon them.

It has been indicated to us that the age of incoming employees to the department may play a definite role in contractual requirements. Yet, this does not seem to be in accord with past precedents.

3. According to the OEA Agreement, Article 9, Section 9.2, Curriculum development is collegial. Preliminary discussions with the Dean indicate that his priority ranking of programs does not necessarily correlate with the majority opinions of the BET Faculty members. In effect, we may have to de-emphasize or even eliminate programs which we have worked very hard to develop and which we feel contribute to the overall good of the department both now and in the future.

While our chairman has indicated that the SBA Proposal should be considered on grounds other than the impact on faculty, we do feel that there are still faculty issues that are important.

Once again, thank you for your time and consideration.

*Cynthia Peterson*



Vice President  
Academic Affairs

*Senate*  
**RECEIVED**

DEC 1 1980

Questions Regarding the SBA Proposal

ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT

1. How does the Administration plan to transfer faculty?
  - A. A retrenchment process
  - B. A voluntary process
2. If retrenchment or voluntary transfer of faculty occurs in the School of Business because of the proposed changes, what plan will be used to determine which faculty will remain in the School of Business?
  - A. SBA Department needs
  - B. Length of University service
3. If retrenchment necessitates the transfer of some School of Business faculty members to the Business Education and Technology Department, who will decide which faculty members will be transferred?
  - A. Administrative officers
  - B. Departments in the School of Business
  - C. Business Education and Technology Department
4. If retrenchment or voluntary transfer of faculty members occurs, which promotion and tenure criteria will be used for their future evaluation?
  - A. School of Business
  - B. College of Applied Science and Technology
5. Will transferred faculty have to meet the same requirement for tenure as Business Education and Technology faculty members hired in the last eight years, i.e., possession of a terminal degree?
  - A. Yes
  - B. No
6. If a voluntary transfer process is used, will those transferring be held to the same criteria mandated to individuals who requested inter school transfers in the past; that is, will the transferring faculty member lose tenure and be given new faculty status in the Business Education and Technology Department?
  - A. Yes
  - B. No

TO: MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
RE: RESPONSES TO BET QUESTIONS ABOUT  
SBA PROPOSAL

7. Will salary equity be established between present Business Education and Technology transferred faculty?
  - A. Yes
  - B. No
  
8. Will the Administration guarantee that present Business Education and Technology faculty members without tenure will not be displaced to facilitate implementation of the SBA proposal?
  - A. Yes
  - B. No
  
9. If School of Business faculty members join the Business Education and Technology Department faculty, who will have priority for the available faculty positions, should enrollment decline in the future?
  - A. Faculty with the most years of University service, regardless of their professional backgrounds
  - B. Faculty members most qualified to fill the positions
  - C. Faculty with the most years of Business Education and Technology Department service
  
10. Will the two budgeted positions in the Business Education and Technology Department being filled this year on a temporary basis be advertised with the same job description this year?
  - A. Yes
  - B. No
  
11. If the job description in Question 10 is changed, who will authorize the change?
  - A. Business Education and Technology Faculty
  - B. The Administration
  
12. Which program(s) (referred to in President Coffelt's letter) will be eliminated?
  - A. Business Technology programs
  - B. Business Education and Technology programs
  - C. Other University programs

13. What criteria will be used to determine program elimination?
- A. Student Enrollment
  - B. Faculty Availability
  - C. Cost justification
  - D. Other
14. Will the Business Education and Technology Department be given permission to advertise the needed positions during the Winter quarter 1981?
- A. Yes
  - B. No

## INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

4

TO FACULTY --- BUS. EDUC. & TECH. DEPT.DATE Nov. 24, 1980FROM N. ParaskaSUBJECT Questions Arising From School of Business Administration Proposal

On November 4, 1980, I received from Mrs. Phillips a list of fourteen (14) questions prepared by the faculty. The information that follows is arranged in numerical order responding to the questions.

1. The administration does not plan to transfer faculty. The additional resources needed will be provided by the transfer of vacant positions.
2. All School of Business Administration faculty will remain in their present departments.
3. No transfer by the retrenchment article of the agreement is planned.
4. No transfer of faculty is contemplated but all faculty in C.A.S.T. will be judged by criteria appropriate to C.A.S.T.
5. No transfer of faculty is contemplated. The statement that all faculty hired in the last eight (8) years were required to have or obtain a doctorate is not accurate. All additional faculty in the B.E. & T. department will be employed with credentials needed or will be expected to acquire same. My detailed discussion on this matter is presented at the end of this material.
6. The statement of this question indicates a misunderstanding of what has happened heretofore. There have been very few transfers between departments. In two or more cases, a faculty member applied to fill a vacancy in another department. The individual moved at same salary and retained his years of service. In the Summer of 1979, a faculty member applied for a higher salaried position in another department. On an ad hoc basis, the individual was permitted to resign his tenured position and was hired in the new position at the higher salary as a new hire (giving up all prior service). During the summer of 1980, another faculty member applied for a higher salaried position in another department. The President directed the acting academic vice-president to establish a policy to govern in such cases. After consultation with the academic deans, the decision was made that

Page 2  
Faculty - BE&T  
Questions - SBA Proposal  
Nov. 24, 1980

a resignation and a new hire must be separated by a lapse of time. The faculty member was not permitted to resign and instantly accept a higher salaried position. In essence the policy in effect now is that lateral transfers can be made on a mutually voluntary basis at the current salary with the retention of accrued service.

7. Any faculty who may wish to apply for a vacancy in B.E. & T. will be considered along with all other applicants. Salary equity would be a factor considered in the selection of the individual to be recommended for appointment.
8. B.E. & T. faculty on regular appointment will not be displaced to facilitate the implementation of the School of Business Administration proposal. I anticipate the need for additional faculty. The two faculty members now on one-year temporary appointments will complete their contracts with the University on June 15, 1981.
9. It is not planned to have any S.B.A. faculty join the B.E. & T. department. Should an individual faculty member in S.B.A. apply for a position in B.E. & T. and be accepted into the department, the individual would retain accrued service and would be judged on that basis.
10. No. All positions now vacant or to become vacant will be reviewed based on need. If the department can demonstrate a justification for filling a particular position, due consideration will be given to the recommendation. Based on my information, the Real Estate Technology program would seem to have a lower priority than would a position needed in Accounting or Business Management Technology.
11. A change in the job description should originate in the B.E. & T. department. I am attaching a table (Inclosure No. 1) showing the experience of majors and graduates in all B.E. & T. programs to assist the consideration of need. Also attached (Inclosure No. 2) is the Board of Regents' criteria for two-year program review which is scheduled for 1982. As in the past, the Academic Vice President will approve position descriptions.
12. The President has not directed that any program be eliminated. However, as the new courses and new curricula are developed the information referred to in Answer No. 11 should be given

serious consideration and if a B.E. & T. program does not meet Board of Regents' criteria, we should consider options that are open to avoid being asked by the Board of Regents to discontinue a program.

13. All factors would be considered if a program is to be eliminated. In the case of two-year programs, the Board of Regents' criteria for review of programs will carry significant weight since all two-year programs are scheduled for review in 1982.
14. Permission to advertise new positions will be granted as soon as the actual staffing is developed, resources allocated, and position announcements approved. Some positions could be advertised as early as winter quarter.

I feel the faculty are entitled to know my views about qualifications for faculty. Basically, we should employ faculty with as high qualifications as possible. Not all programs have the same need for academic credentials. In the case of the offering in B.E. & T. up to the present time, a significant portion of the instruction included individuals preparing to be Business Education teachers. I discussed this aspect with Mrs. Phillips and indicated that based on academic qualification of present faculty, the department needed to have some faculty with doctorates. We agreed that a goal would be 4 or 5 doctorates in the department. On this basis, we advertised for doctorates. Since we were unable to recruit doctorates, we employed two faculty members with masters with an obligation to obtain a doctorate. We may need an additional doctorate to provide good balance in the Business Education offerings (both graduate and undergraduate).

The faculty needed to teach the new courses for business technology programs should certainly meet the Board of Regents' criteria as provided in the "Operating Manual for Two-Year Campuses". If we can employ faculty with qualifications that exceed the Board of Regents' criteria, I would favor it. However, if we cannot locate a faculty member with the minimum criteria, we may employ a lesser qualified individual with the requirement that the individual undertake additional study to qualify. We have done this in Allied Health where we could not hire faculty with a masters degree so the faculty have an obligation to earn a masters.

  
N. Paraska

NP:gy  
CC: Dr. Gillis  
Dr. Alderman  
Dean Dodge

May 12, 1980

NUMBER OF BUSINESS EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY MAJORS AND GRADUATES

MAJOR	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
	Majors Grads											
Accounting Tech.	11 - 1	44 - 2	76 - 3	108 - 4	147 - 20	123 - 6	145 - 20	194 - 21	208 - 28	175 - 21	184 - 19	196 - 16
Advertising Tech.	12 - 0	33 - 0	43 - 2	55 - 5	57 - 8	62 - 6	48 - 10	47 - 16	47 - 8	47 - 5	44 - 8	44 - 3
Bus. Mgmt. Tech.	- 1	11 - 0	49 - 0	84 - 3	122 - 6	135 - 9	124 - 13	153 - 5	168 - 15	178 - 19	201 - 20	221 - 16
Court/Conf. Rep.											23 - 0	31 - 2
Gen. Adm. Tech.	85 - 1	138 - 4	122 - 9	128 - 10	114 - 10	135 - 28	126 - 30	116 - 18	91 - 14	79 - 15	53 - 9	20 - 9
Graphics Tech.		6 - 0	24 - 0	43 - 1	54 - 5	62 - 6	73 - 17	92 - 19	70 - 15	48 - 10	44 - 5	52 - 12
Marketing Tech.	5 - 2	35 - 0	54 - 2	84 - 13	91 - 12	96 - 24	104 - 16	88 - 21	82 - 16	78 - 17	82 - 16	98 - 18
Public Adm. Tech.		1 - 0	2 - 0	10 - 1	3 - 1	12 - 0	8 - 2	10 - 7	9 - 1	9 - 0	15 - 1	6 - 1
Real Estate Tech.						14 - 1	20 - 0	29 - 6	58 - 1	62 - 3	52 - 2	48 - 4
Secretarial Stu.	235 - 30	220 - 20	301 - 23	314 - 41	299 - 36	280 - 47	305 - 50	411 - 36	435 - 29	431 - 38	413 - 40	387 - 55
Transp. Mgmt. T.	- 1	3 - 0	6 - 0	15 - 0	25 - 2	27 - 3	42 - 9	35 - 5	37 - 12	41 - 5	35 - 9	31 - 5

Enclosure 1

8/1/79

Page 700.4

- (6) Criteria which will be used in recommending continuation of associate degree programs will include:
- (a) Employment of at least one full-time faculty member to give leadership to the program;
  - (b) A minimum enrollment of fifteen first-year students annually;
  - (c) A minimum enrollment of twelve second-year students annually;
  - (d) A minimum of eight graduates in the fourth year of the program's operation, or an average of eight graduates per year over the five-year period; and
  - (e) A minimum average placement of seventy-five percent of its graduates who are available for employment in jobs which are related to the technology over the five-year period.