

UEPC

Minutes from Meeting: May 9, 2011.

Recorded by: Asbjorn Moseidjord

Reviewed by: David Gentry-Akin

Present: Norman Bedford, Steve Cortright, Catherine Davalos, Sue Fallis, David Gentry-Akin, Charles Hamaker, Christa Kell, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Kathy Porter, Cynthia Van Gilder, and Linda Wobbe.

Absent: Ken Brown

Chair's Note: The May 9 meeting of the UEPC was the last meeting of this academic year. The minutes have therefore been approved through email circulation.

I. Reports.

David Gentry-Akin accepted being the back-up minutes recorder. Amendments to the minutes of May 2 were proposed and approved. The following should be noted in that regard:

(i) Next year's Chair, David Gentry, informed the Committee that he would conduct a review of UEPC procedures with the aim of rationalizing these and making them explicit in a manual.

(ii) Barbara McGraw had asked for changes to the minutes, and she was invited (with a vote of 10 for, 0 against and 1 abstaining) to submit these proposed changes and have them appended to the minutes.

The chair finally reported that issues regarding the First Year Advising Cohort (FYAC) will carry over to the agenda of next years' UEPC.

II. Open Meeting: The Business Administration Proposal for a Revision to the Major.

Present: Rebecca Carroll, Larisa Genin, Young Jae Lee, Barbara McGraw, and Frances Sweeney.

The following were circulated to the members: (1) A memo dated May 1 from Frances Sweeney to Barbara McGraw on the "Course allocation process", (2) an email dated May 9 from Provost Beth Dobkin to Barbara McGraw and others regarding "BusAd Task Force Questions Re Sections", and (3) a memo to the UEPC from Barbara McGraw dated May 9, 2011 providing estimates of the increase in number of sections offered by the Business Administration Department should the proposal be adopted. The first two of these items had been circulated to the members previously.

Frances Sweeney explained the course allocation process starting from annual budget level planning and down to courses at the departmental level and how these are affected by needs and changing circumstances. This provides considerable freedom in the process, yet is also subject to overall budgetary constraints dictated by enrollments. When enrollments are up, sections can be added. When they are down, sections must be cut. What is protected, above all, are the needs of the departments in delivering the courses necessary for the major so that students can be assured of being able to graduate on time. Frances Sweeney also touched on the difficulty of deciding what should be the maximum number of courses that a department can require for its major and minor programs. She suggested that this should be a topic for the faculty to explore.

Barbara McGraw presented the Department's analysis of section impacts in Business Administration Department. Under the stated assumptions, the impact is expected in the range of 6-8 additional sections per year.

An argument was made by the chair to the effect that course (and section) allocation changes should be assessed in light of academic priorities. If these priorities change, then it would be appropriate to change section allocations. The implication of this view is that the UEPC should focus on the academic priorities of the College, and how this proposal either supports or undermines those priorities.

The discussion then turned to the wider academic impact of the proposal.

Sue Fallis argued that if SMC is to offer a business program, it should be a program of high quality, as this seems to be. If we cannot offer a program of quality, we should offer no program at all.

David Gentry expressed his concern about the degree to which the proposal would result in a major that channels and restricts students to taking so many of their courses at the College within a single department. This has the effect of increasing isolation of business students from the rest of the College. Is this ultimately good for the students?

Rebecca Carroll explained her perspective in transferring from the School of Liberal Arts to the School of Economics and Business Administration. She had earlier shared Dave Gentry's perspective, but has since come to the conclusion that the liberal arts mission of the College is well expressed in courses taught within the business curriculum. This view was also supported by Barbara McGraw.

In support of David Gentry, Steve Cortright presented evidence from three comparison Colleges and argued that: (1) The comparison colleges require far less so-called general education of their business students than Saint Mary's College. Joining them in increasing requirements draws Saint Mary's towards a more discipline-based and therefore more illiberal business degree. (2) Disaggregating the comparison data submitted by the Department and using Carnegie units reveals, *inter alia*, that SMC is at near equality with LMU when it comes to business requirements and is not lagging behind by 2-3 courses as claimed by the Department; and (3) that the ratio of required business courses offered by the Department to non-business courses is much higher than at two of the comparison colleges and slightly higher than the third.

The chair requested that Steve Cortright submits an addendum to the minutes of this meeting containing the data analysis – which was subsequently done and is attached these minutes.

Barbara McGraw responded that the Department had discussed collaboration among departments and would continue to do so. She noted that it was also important that several faculty in the department had a liberal arts background and designed their courses with liberal arts values in mind. Furthermore, she noted that the Department is constrained in its ability to let students take business courses from other departments by AACSB accrediting standards for faculty academic qualifications ("AQ").

Other issues that were addressed in the open session were: Course learning outcomes and research components in the courses.

Before closing the meeting, the chair asked the Committee members to make sure that each Committee member had asked all the questions whose answers might influence how they would vote.

III. Closed Meeting: The Business Administration Proposal for a Revision to the Major.

Much delayed, the Committee moved into closed session to reach a conclusion.

The chair raised the issue of the quality of the proposed major. In the discussion that followed, different views emerged regarding the relation of the major to the rest of the academic purpose of the College, i.e., a continuation of the debate in the open session. This debate transitioned into a debate concerning the appropriate number of required courses and how many of these should properly be satisfied within a single Department.

The Committee spent time debating the issue of how many course requirements are appropriate for a major at Saint Mary's. Some pointed to the high number in Chemistry and Biology and asserted the Department should have the right to increase the number on that basis, i.e., if we were going to allow other departments to go as high as 18 courses, on what grounds could we justify saying "No" to the Business Department? Others disagreed, one argument being that a supportive decision with that rationale could cause other departments to now want to increase requirements. Such a trend could potentially have many undesirable overall impacts on the College.

A motion was made and seconded to approve and forward to the Senate the Business Administration proposal for a revision to the major. No amendments were subsequently offered.

Much of the meeting thereafter was spent on identifying the proper course of action for the Committee, with the two main alternatives being approving the motion or rejecting the motion and returning the proposal to the Department with requested changes. In the latter case, the Department would have to resubmit a revised proposal to next year's UEPC.

A vote was taken, and the un-amended motion carried with a vote of 6 "yes", 5 "no", and 0 abstentions.

Addendum:

Steve Cortright's response to the UEPC chair's request for a written copy of the data analysis presented by him in this (May 09) UEPC meeting.

Professor Cortright's analysis followed by his data sheet:

The Proposal tends too much—far too much, for an institution with conspicuous pretensions to the liberal arts—to “sequester” business students in classes offered under the auspices, and from the perspectives, of the business disciplines. In support of David Gentry-Akin's (self-described) “philosophical” reservations, I argued that my data show (1) the comparators require far fewer semester hours of so-called “general education” of their business students than SMC has been accustomed to require of business (and all) students; my inference: these institutions (USF, LMU, U. Portland) are, so far, not sound comparators; the argument of the Proposal that SMC BusAd is “behind” them and must be allowed to catch itself (partly) up, amounts to a demand to join them in a more “illiberal” curriculum (*i.e.*, one weighted more toward disciplinary and away from liberal studies). I argued next that my data show (2) if we abandon the over-elaborate calculations and the aggregated presentation of the Proposal by (a) dis-aggregating the (given) course requirements into requirements (i) from outside the business disciplines, (ii) lower-division business and (iii) upper-division business requirements and by (b) measuring in standard Carnegie semester hours/units, we get a more perspicuous set of comparisons: I infer, *e.g.*, that the Proposal brings the volume of SMC business requirements into near-equality with LMU (not, as the Proposal claims, leaving SMC still lagging by the equivalent of two or three courses), except

that LMU does—and the SMC Proposal does not—send business students into a wide variety of relevant studies from mathematics, economics and rhetoric. I argued last that my data show (3) within the required curricula, course credit from the business disciplines (BusAd courses) stands to course credit overall in a higher ratio—**45.5/59.5cu**—under the Proposal than among the comparators, except USF (which is in slightly higher ratio): LMU 46/67cu; USF 52/70; U. Portland 48/78 – 52/78cu or SMC **.765**; LMU .687; USF .743; U. Portland .615–.667.

	Present SMC 15-course BusAd Major	Proposed SMC 17-course Core + Concentrations	LMU BBA Bus Core + Major Reqs.	USF BS in BusAd Foundations + Core & Major	U Portland: Common Bus & Major Req's*
Req'd LD Non- BUSAD	ACCT 1 (3.5) ACCT 2 (3.5) ECON 3 (3.5) ECON 4 (3.5) MATH 3 or 27 (3.5) (17.5)	ACCT 1 (3.5) ACCT 2 (3.5) ECON 3 (3.5) ECON 4 (3.5) (14.0) Net course loss from the present major = 1 (1.5)	ECON 110 (3) Int. Micro ECON 120 (3) Int. Macro ECON 230 (3) Int. Stats ACCT 2110 (3) Fin ACCT 2120 (3) Acct. Info CMST 140 (3) Bus Comm. MATH 112 (3) M. Anal. Bus. (21.0)	Foundations: ECON 101 (3) ECON 102 (3) MATH 106 (4) (10) (All "double-dipped" from Univ. Core)	CST 107 Pub. Spking (3) ENG 107 Coll. Writing (3) MTH 121 Calc. Soc. Sc (3) ECN 220 Stats or MTH 161 Stats (3) ECN 120 Micro (3) ECN 121 Macro (3) (18)
Req'd LD BUSAD	BUSAD 40 (3.5)	BUSAD 10 (3.5) BUSAD 40 (3.5) +1 (7.0) Net course gain from	AIMS 2710 (3) Info Syst BLAW 2210 (3) Leg & Reg BADM 1010 (1) Bus Inst. BADM 1020 (1) Int. Eth DMs BADM 1030 (1) Tech Bus BASM 1040 (1) Glob (10.0)	BUS 100 (Fr. Topics) (3) BUS 101 (Prof Dev.) (1) <u>BUS 201 (Acct I)</u> (4) <u>BUS 202 (Acct II)</u> (4) BUS 204 (Quan. An. (4) (16) NB: setting aside accounting [usually not denominated a BUS or BUSAD course] (8)	BUS 100 Intro Ldrship (3) BUS 101 Sftwr Wksp (1) BUS 200 Entr Mkt (3) BUS 202 Prof. Dev (1) <u>BUS 209 Fin. Acct</u> (3) <u>BUS 210 Man. Acct.</u> (3) BUS 250 Leg & Soc. (3) BUS 255 Mgt Info Sys (3) (20) [setting aside accounting] (14)
Req'd UD BUSAD/ Bus Disc.	BUSAD 120 (3.5) BUSAD 123 (3.5) BUSAD 124 (3.5) BUSAD 131 (3.5) BUSAD 132 (3.5) BUSAD 140 (3.5) BUSAD 181 or 182 (3.5)† BUSAD Elective (3.5) BUSAD Elective (3.5) (31.5)	BUSAD 123 (3.5) BUSAD 124 (3.5) BUSAD 127 (3.5) BUSAD 181 (3.5) BUSAD 131 (3.5) BUSAD 132 (3.5) BUSAD 140 (3.5) (24.5) BUSAD Gen/Conc (14.0) +2 (38.5)	FNCE 3410 (3) INBA 3810 (3) MGMT 3610 (3) MRKT 3510 (3) AIMS 3770 (3) BADM 4950 (3) BADM 4970 (3) (21) BusMaj Reqs (15) (36)	BUS 301 Leg. & Reg (4) BUS 302 Mkt. Mang. (4) BUS 304 Mngt & Org (4) BUS 305 Fin Mgmt (4) BUS 308 Syst. In Org (4) BUS 401 Strg Mgmt (4) or 406 Entrepr. (24) Bus Ad Major Courses (20) (44)	BUS 302 Prof Dev Intsp (1) BUS 305 Bus. Fin (3) BUS 355 Dec. Mod'ing (3) BUS 360 Org. Behv. (3) BUS 361 Tech & Ops (3) BUS 400 Mgmt Dec. (3) BUS 402 Prof. Dev. Wk (0) (16) Major Reqs. (24) (40)
	Carnegie units = 21.0 LD 31.5 UD Total: 52.5 (35.0 BusAd)	Carnegie units = 21.0 LD 38.5 UD Total 59.5 (45.5 BusAd) [13]	LMU uses standard Carnegie semester unit/hours = 31.0 LD 36.0 UD Total 67.0 (46.0 Bus Ad) [13+]	USF uses standard Carnegie Semester unit/hours = 26 LD 44 UD Total 70.0 (60 BusAd) [17+]	U Portland uses standard Carnegie Semester unit/hours = 38 LD 40 UD Total 78 (54 – 60 BusAd) [15-17+]

* U Portland Pamplin School's six BBA majors (excluding BBA Accounting) require, in addition to 39 University Core hours, 57 hours of Common Business Requirements (including 15 hours of non-business courses, some open electives), then variable major requirements, in every case totaling 120 hours: e.g., BBA Finance = Univ Core 39 + Common Bus. Reqs. 57 [= Non-bus. Courses 12 + 3 open electives + Bus. Foundation LD 26 + Bus. Foundation UD 16] + major requirements 24 = 120; BBA Marketing = Univ. Core 39 + Common Bus Reqs 57 [= non-Bus. 9 + 6 open electives + Bus. Foundation LD 26 + Bus. Foundation UD 16] + major requirements 24 = 120; *etc.* NB: U Portland's 39/120 semester hour core requirement = 11 – 12 SMC semester course credits or JT + CS + TRELS + 1; USF Core = 46/128 semester units; for College of Business Ad. Students, LMU's core requirements (some prescribed, others structured electives) go to 45/120 semester hours (48 if CMST 140 is counted for the core): at *circa* 1/3 (far less than half) the student's curriculum, these institutions do not offer a liberal arts orientation comparable to SMC's. Figures in parentheses are Carnegie semester units or cu. Figures in brackets are SMC course credits. †Why is BUSAD 182: Business, Economics and Catholic Social Ethics dropped?