



SIUC Faculty Association

IEA – NEA

500 E. Plaza Drive Suite 5, Carterville, IL 62918
(618) 733 - 4472 www.srucfa.org

FA Report on Proposed School of Management and Marketing

23 May 2018

The proposed school would

- Merge the departments of Management and Marketing
- Move the Hospitality and Tourism Administration (HTA) program from the Department of Animal Science, Food and Nutrition to the new school.
- Move the Sport Administration program from the Department of Kinesiology to the new school.
- Move the Master in Public Administration (MPA) from the Department of Political Science to the new school.

Faculty views on this proposed school are decidedly mixed, with overall votes totaling 18 in favor, 16 opposed, with 6 abstentions, as follows.

- Animal Science, Nutrition and Food (ASNF) 7-3-0 in favor
- Kinesiology 0-9-0 against
- Management 5-0-1 in favor
- Marketing 1-3 against
- Political Science 5-1-5 in favor

Of the two departments to be fully merged one (Management) supports the merger, but the other (Marketing) does not. In the case of the three programs to be moved into the new school from other departments, faculty in one program oppose being transferred into the new school (Sports Administration). The situation regarding the other two programs is less clear. Political Science voted 5-1 in favor of moving the MPA program to the new school, and the chair wrote a letter in support of this move, but five other faculty abstained. ASNF faculty voted by 7-3 to support moving the HTA program to the new school, but program faculty raised concerns about the new organization. While all faculty in the relevant departments (Political Science and ASNF) have the right to vote on program changes, GC and FS committees reviewing this new school may want to confirm that the faculty within those departments whose programs would move support the new school.

Given that many faculty affected by this proposal reject it, the FA recommends rejection by the FS and GC, unless the concerns raised by faculty can be addressed.

In our other reports on proposed new schools, the FA has outlined various common concerns with the restructuring process, including:

- Diminished faculty role in selection of unit leaders;

- Loss of current operating papers, and the need to draft new papers that will be subject to administrative approval;
- Changes to the tenure and promotion process;
- The absence of specific argument or evidence, particularly regarding enrollment or fiscal issues. Faculty in Management, though they voted in support of the new school, noted that cost savings may be minimal.

As most in the intended audience will already have read those reports (and heard a good deal from the FA on these topics in other venues), we will here restrict ourselves to matters specific to the proposed school. Readers interested in a presentation of these arguments can consult any of our earlier article nine reviews. The FA would also be happy to provide a representative to discuss our concerns with the FS or GC.

As we see it, there are two main issues with this particular school proposal.

1. Sport Administration faculty do not wish to join the new school, and their proposed colleagues do not wish to force them to join.

Kinesiology faculty are strongly against the plan because colleagues in the Sport Administration program would be placed, against their will, into the new school. Their arguments can be found in the letter attached to their vote report on the plan. Their three main arguments are:

- Sport Administration faculty view sport as a multi-dimensional construct and not merely as a business. Their research and teaching focuses on the social and psychological aspects of athletes, academic advising for student-athletes, youth/recreational sports, charity sporting events, student-athlete well-being, service, and outreach.
- Sport Administration Faculty have established relationships with colleagues assigned to the proposed School of Human Sciences, but not with those in the School of Marketing and Management.
- Most sport administration programs across North America are housed in units like the proposed School of Human Sciences, rather than in schools or colleges of business.

Faculty in marketing and the HTA program note that they do not wish to see Sport Administration joined to this school without the approval of Sport Administration faculty. Marketing faculty noted that forced move would be “anathema to all.”

This is a problem with an easy solution: allowing Sport Administration to remain with their colleagues in Kinesiology as part of the proposed School of Human Sciences. Unless the administration can provide good reasons for why faculty should be forced to move against their will, we believe that the FS and GC should reject this school proposal on these grounds.

Faculty are concerned about reporting directly to the provost, and desire to remain in the College of Business.

Faculty in Marketing and the HTA program explicitly raised concerns regarding the plan to have the new school report directly to the provost. Faculty in Management made the related point that

they strongly desire to remain within the College of Business (or the renamed version of that college).

This too seems a problem that could be easily resolved. The “Vision 2025” plan does not suggest particularly large changes to the College of Business, save for in its internal structure (via the elimination of departments). Unless faculty in programs slated to join business object, there is no obvious reason for the current CoBA to be eliminated and reconstituted from scratch. The situation here is unlike that in the colleges that would be substantially new.

The programs that do not wish to join proposed schools in business (Economics and Agribusiness Economics, which do not want to join the School of Analytics, Finance, and Economics; and Sports Administration, which does not want to join Management & Marketing) have larger objections than simply being “late arrivals” to CoBA. They instead believe that they belong elsewhere on campus.

Faculty from the two programs that are positive about joining schools in business, those in the MPA program (from Political Science) and IST program (who are assigned to Analytics, Finance, and Economics, but would prefer placement within Accountancy) have not, to our knowledge, expressed concerns about joining the existing College of Business, rather than going through a phase in which CoBA perishes, to be reborn anew. This contrasts with the situation in some other proposed colleges, colleges which would be substantially new, where faculty are concerned about the possibility that they could become second-class citizens if they were added to an existing college, simply because some units would remain within the “renamed” college where others would be transferred in.

Thus in this case the added stage of direct reporting to the provost outside of the college structure, with all the additional complexity that would cause to the restructuring process, may be unnecessary.¹ What we have in this case, at bottom, is the merger of two departments, with the addition of two programs from elsewhere (or three, were Sport Administration forced to join). This can be done without messing with the college structure.

We would suggest that the FS and GC ask the faculty who would be newly assigned to business whether they would object to being added directly to the existing CoBA. If faculty do not object, there seems no reason to eliminate CoBA only to resurrect it in a slightly altered form some time later.

¹ Or, rather, it may be even more unnecessary than it is in other cases. We still fail to see why the restructuring process should be done in two steps, with the current structure demolished and replaced first by liminal phase without colleges, until the new college structure can be put in place. It would seem wiser to make all decisions about restructuring and then implement all changes at once, instead of forcing units to go through a two-phase restructuring process.

Conclusion

Thus, in addition to our general concerns about restructuring, we have highlighted the two issues raised by faculty. One of these, the forced integration of Sport Administration, should be a deal-breaker in our view. At this stage we have faculty votes, and faculty arguments, against the forced merger, with no response from the administration. We would expect the FS and FC to back up faculty on this point, unless the administration can present compelling reasons to do otherwise.

The issue regarding the need to eliminate and reconstitute the College of Business is a larger one, one with repercussions beyond the scope of this particular school. But it is one that the FS and GC can raise with colleagues and the administration, in hopes of streamlining the restructuring process, and allowing colleagues in business to move ahead with building their programs rather than rebuilding their college.