

**Minutes of the Academic Senate
November 15, 2007**

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on November 15, 2007 by Chairperson Carla Bossard. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Carla Bossard, Vice Chair Brother Charles Hilken, Past Chair Ted Tsukahara, David Alvarez, David Bowen, Zach Flanagan, Barbara Grant, Charles Hamaker, Lidia Luquet, Phil Perry, Martin Rokeach, and Parliamentarian Valerie Burke. Absent were Deane Lamont and Ed Tywoniak.

Also present were: Vice President Michael Beseda, Rebecca Carroll, Dean Tom Carter, Mark Figueroa, Laura Heid, Debra Holtz, Annalee Lamoreaux, Barbara McGraw, Steve Miller, Dean Frank Murray, Jim Sauerberg, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Kathleen Taylor, Dean Russell Tiberii, Associate Registrar Leslie Welty, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the October 25, 2007 meeting were unanimously approved by voice vote.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report – Chair Bossard reported on the following:

- The first meeting of the Communications Task Force is scheduled for November 28, 2007.
- The Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee (AAEC) has completed the evaluation of Academic Vice Provost Frances Sweeney. The results have been compiled and delivered.
- Provost Stampf issued a report in the Campus Bulletin regarding the WASC visit. The WASC committee was pleased with much of what they saw; however they had a few concerns relating to civility and diversity.
- Old Senate action S-03/04-9, Guidelines for Termination of Programs, approved in 2004 has not been approved by the administration. Chair Bossard spoke to the Provost and was told that it was rejected because of the complexity of the process. Chair Bossard said that she has discussed this with Past Chair Tsukahara and Vice Chair Brother Charles Hilken. They have determined that this document, which was approved by the Educational Policies Board and the Academic Senate, is an internal document, which does not require administrative approval. It is a procedural document and very much refers to what is done in the Program Review Committee. Chair Bossard will update the language in the document and return it to the EPB for their approval.
- Met with Provost, President, Vice Provost and Steve Miller. President announced that the new Provost will be hired on a multi-year contract, with retreat rights.
- Tracking of the BOSS documents, reports and surveys, meetings, etc. will be part of the responsibility of Mark Figueroa. Mark Figueroa announced that a BOSS website is currently being constructed. A matrix will be available on line, which will indicate the status of items along any corresponding documentation.

4. Consent Agenda:

- A. *MS In Financial Analysis and Investment Management (MS-FAIM)* - Steve Miller reported that the MS-FAIM received fast track approval in 2004. After the completion of several cohorts, the program has applied for formal approval. The proposal went to the Graduate Policies Committee (GPC) for a formal review. The GPC requested a more detailed proposal, and the proposers responded to all of the concerns raised by the GPC. The EPB then

considered the document at its November 12, 2007 meeting where the proposal was approved by a vote of 15-0-0.

The Senate accepted the proposal on the consent agenda.

5. Vice Chair's Report – Brother Charles announced that the open forum scheduled for November 28, 2007 during community time will be dedicated to the discussion of a freshmen advising model for 2008. The task force has met several times and a draft proposal was discussed at the November 12th EPB meeting. Vice Provost Sweeney is requesting more faculty input in order to form a proposal to be voted on by the EPB at its December meeting.

6. Educational Policies Board (EPB) – Steve Miller reported on the November 12, 2007 meeting of the EPB. The MS-FAIM program was approved. One hour was spent discussing freshmen advising. The task force on advising is comprised of himself, the Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC), the Undergraduate Policies Committee (UPC), Dean Frank Murray, Dean Russell Tiberii, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, and the Senate Past Chair Ted Tsukahara. A draft proposal was discussed which has each department contributing faculty members to a first year advising program that will limit the number of advisees for each faculty member to a maximum of ten. The strengths and weaknesses of a variety of programs were discussed, but he announced that they are not close to finalizing a proposal. Looking at a timeline, a proposal must be in place by late January. The forum scheduled for November 28th is an opportunity to get more faculty input. The task force is looking at a variety of options and considering a variety of concerns that have been raised. Some departments have few faculty and a large number of advisees, while there are other departments with a relatively high number of faculty and a small number of majors. Is it appropriate to place equal numbers of freshmen advisees in all departments? The task force has separated the issue of retention from the issue of first year advising. The forum will be dedicated to the issue of freshmen advising.

Chair Miller reported on the EPB subcommittees:

- The Undergraduate Policies Committee (UPC) approved two items: a proposal from SEBA to allow a double concentration in finance and marketing, and also a .25 credit cross cultural training course for students planning to study abroad.
- The Program Review Committee (PRC) met with the English Department, next on the agenda is the Modern Languages review.
- The Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) sent a community time survey to department chairs. A survey regarding Turnitin.com will be included with the course evaluation packets.

7. Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) – Jim Sauerberg reported that the Faculty Salary Policy Task Force will meet the last week in November to set up the spring meeting schedule. Open enrollment for benefits will be held the last week in November. Last year the College increased the amount paid toward health benefits. This year an additional option will be offered for employee and children. The health insurance rates will increase.

8. Freshmen Attrition – Vice President for Enrollment Michael Beseda and Mark Figueroa reported on the increase in freshmen attrition. Vice President Beseda said that addressing issues of retention is a responsibility of the community. In trying to identify the cause, the question of who is responsible arises. There is no simple answer, it is a complex issue. Schools should think about not just

recruiting a class to come in the door, but continuing to recruit a class once they are here. Advising is one part of the issue.

Several issues have been suggested as possible problems: local economic situation, electronic application process, and the academic qualifications of the students. The campus deans and directors have formed an ad hoc group of students to discuss the first year experience. Students have said that there is much communication from the admissions officers, faculty and students when they are being recruited, but once they are on campus the connections stop.

Mark Figueroa submitted a written report on retention dated October 11, 2007. SMC experienced a 23% attrition rate from fall 2006 to fall 2007. In comparing the characteristics of those students that left in 2006-07 versus the past years, it indicates a greater proportion of female students and a larger proportion of students from northern California not returning. Also a disproportionate number of Asian American/Pacific Islander and white students did not return. There is not a distinct profile with regard to academic background, ethnicity, or gender. Other academic indicators are high school GPA and SAT scores; proportionally more students in the lower tiers of SAT scores did not return as compared with the overall population. However, there are students who are presidential scholars and students with average scores that have not returned as well. Students were more likely to be on academic probation if they had disciplinary code violations. Information from the standardized student survey is too generic to provide specific detailed information. The five main reasons given by the student for leaving SMC:

1. attend a different college
2. move to a new location
3. did not like the size of the college
4. dissatisfied with the social life of the college
5. wanted to live closer to parents

Mark Figueroa sent an email to the 40 advisors of those freshmen students that left SMC to ask what issues they found with the student. He received feedback from 15 advisors. A few of the comments reported were:

- students wanted a different environment or major,
- homesickness,
- not enough school spirit or social activities,
- want more religious environment,
- personal or health issues.

Several advisors noted a lack of readiness for college (academic readiness, maturity, or motivation) on the part of their advisee.

Mark Figueroa questioned whether the current evaluation form is the best mechanism to get the information needed from advisors about their students and he is looking into implementing an interview protocol for exiting students.

Mark Figueroa reported that he looked carefully at fall 06 and fall 07 groups. He is also looking at students with high GPA's and low SAT's as well as students with low GPA's and high SAT's to see if that gives any indication about the students' success.

Vice President Beseda said the percentage of classes being taught by full time faculty members is a large issue for recruitment, even though it may not be evidence of being related to retention issues. He said it was a surprise to him that such a low number of the core classes are taught by full time faculty, SMC must decide what kind of institution it wants to be.

Senator Hamaker added that part-time faculty members are very fine Seminar teachers, but under the cohort program they are also the contact person for freshmen. Part-time faculty members are not as available to students as the full-time faculty.

Senator Luquet suggested look at the third semester students from 06-07. What happens to those students in fall 07, will there be less drop-outs because so many dropped out early? She said she is receiving signals from students; it seems that the number of students going home on the weekends is unusually high. Students taking the course “My SMC” are more articulate and more in touch with their situation, and will talk actively with faculty regarding their status.

What does a good retention model look like? What can and should we do about retention? If students on academic probation are more likely to leave, what should we do about this? Vice President Beseda said that a successful percentage of retention is 90%. There are situations we can’t influence (students moving away or wanting to be with their parents).

Dean Woolpert said that a 25 point difference in the average SAT score between the departing group and the overall group is significant. We should be concerned about the students that we know will find SMC challenging from an academic point of view. How can faculty contribute to a recruitment process that becomes more selective?

Senator Hamaker said the types of questions the students are asked in an exit interview does not address what goes on in the dorms, which is the other major core in the students’ lives. Were there different profiles from prior years in terms of academic preparation indicators that would account for the 20% attrition? Was the class different from others from the outset?

Mark Figueroa said that the academic profile was slightly lower last academic year for those students that did not return in the spring. As far as percentage goes, two contrasting data points were used in comparing our percentage numbers nationally with liberal arts colleges and masters’ colleges. When comparing against liberal arts colleges our rates are lower, but when compared with masters’ colleges, our rates are higher. This year, our numbers are lower than both.

Jim Sauerberg asked what the difference was last year to cause the jump in the number of freshmen leaving SMC? The increase is significant, easily costing the college \$1 million per year. If we can’t attract students and can’t keep students, he suggested that the issue is very serious and the issue doesn’t appear to have the urgency he feels it deserves.

Chair Bossard thanked Michael and Mark for their report.

OLD BUSINESS

9. Resolution on Tenure to Program or Department – Chair Bossard introduced the resolution. A subcommittee consisting of Chair Bossard and Senators Flanagan and Lamont drafted the Academic Senate Locus Report (attached) and the following resolution.

Whereas, the Faculty of Saint Mary's College has overwhelmingly expressed their desire to maintain tenure to the college for many valid reasons we recommend that tenure to the college be the continued policy at Saint Mary's College of California. Further we recommend administrators be advised by the procedures in

the Program Closure Document (see attached) and recommendations in the Report of the Academic Senate on Tenure Locus (see attached) in regard to actions taken in cases of program closure.

A MOTION was made by Senator Flanagin and SECONDED by Senator Luquet to accept the resolution. Senator Rokeach spoke against the resolution; he did not support the logic that a change cannot be made, regardless of the need.

Senator Luquet said that the college is in trouble with the problem of retention and the financial situation of SMC is not brilliant. When a situation is critical, she does not recommend making major changes. She suggested leaving things quiet for now. In keeping things as they are, the college will have the established loyalty of faculty and the willingness to make an effort to get the college out of a critical situation. If changes are made to the measures of security, the needed loyalty will not be there to cope with the crisis.

Senator Alvarez spoke against the motion. He said he does not credit several points in the Academic Senate Tenure Locus Report, e.g., possibility of administration firing faculty by closing their department. He explained that a two-tiered tenure system already exists; those with tenure and those without tenure. Adjunct faculty are marginalized, not included. One can expect SMC to optimistically create new programs in the future. With tenure to the college, it can be expected that administration will decline to place tenure track faculty in the new programs. He believes that the resolution is counter to the concerns of the community rather than a support of the concerns. Chair Bossard added that the Academic Senate Tenure Locus Report is a report of concerns that have been raised by the faculty, it is not a recommendation from the Senate.

A motion was made and approved to postpone discussion of the Senate Tenure Locus Report and the Resolution for 15 minutes in order to first discuss and approve the Faculty Handbook language regarding Program or Department Closures.

Faculty Handbook Language re: Program or Department Closures - Past Chair Tsukahara said the drafting committee has revised the document based on faculty input. Added was a reference to a retraining program, how ad hoc committees are structured, and references to the existing EPB guidelines for various program approval processes. A MOTION was made by Senator Luquet and SECONDED by Senator Rokeach to discuss the following Program Closure document.

PROGRAM CLOSURE LANGUAGE FOR FACULTY HANDBOOK

2.8.5.2 Discontinuance of an Academic Program or Department not Mandated by General Financial Exigency

- (1) Decisions to discontinue an academic program or a department with administrative responsibility for tenured or tenure-track faculty that are not covered by a state of financial exigency under FH 2.8.5.1, shall be based either on unattained program or departmental financial performance and educational considerations that have been established in either the documents that approve the establishment of the program or department or through the established Program Review procedures for existing programs or departments c.f. EPB Guidelines for Department and Program Reviews and Fast Track Guidelines.*

Proposals to discontinue an academic program or department will originate from the Dean of the School where the program or department resides after consultation with the Provost. The appropriate Educational Policy sub-committee of the Academic Senate (FH 1.7.4 x in development) shall examine the evidence presented by the Dean within sixty working days of receipt of the proposal and shall recommend action to be taken by the Academic Senate. Upon receipt of the proposal to discontinue, the Academic Senate will place this item on the Agenda for their next General Meeting.

The program or department may not be discontinued until such a recommendation is reviewed and voted on affirmatively by the Academic Senate and accepted by the Provost according to established procedures as outlined in FH 1.6.1.2.

- (2) If a tenured or tenure-track, faculty member will be displaced by the discontinuance of a program or department, the President will reassign the individual to another position for which he/she is academically qualified (FH 2.1.1 and 2.8.5) and which is not occupied by another tenured or tenure-track faculty member. Such reassignments shall be made within sixty working days of the decision date for discontinuance of a program or department and after consultation with the faculty member, the Chair of the department for the proposed reassignment, the Dean of the School for the proposed reassignment and the Provost. The reassigned faculty member will continue to provide academic and administrative services to the discontinued program or department as required so that all students impacted by a closure decision will have an opportunity to complete their course of study.*
- (3) If the College fails to reassign the faculty member within sixty working days as stated in Section (2) above, or the faculty member objects to the reassignment, the faculty member may file a grievance as set forth in the Faculty Handbook, and as outlined in FH 2.16.4. The grievance must be filed by the faculty member within twenty working days of the date the College should have made the reassignment, or within twenty working days of the date of assignment to which the faculty member objects.*
- (4) In lieu of assignment to another program or department, the displaced tenured or tenure-track faculty member may make a request to the President for either a reasonable retraining opportunity or reasonable severance from the College. Such a request for retraining or severance may be made by the faculty member at any time after the decision date for discontinuance of a program or department, but in no case may a request for severance be made more than twenty working days after the date at which the College ought to have made, or actually made, an assignment as stated in Section (2).*
- (5) If the faculty member requests severance as stated above in this section (4), the President shall immediately appoint an Ad Hoc Severance Committee comprised of the Provost, Chief Financial Officer, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair of the Academic Senate, and Vice-Chair of the Academic Senate to review the request and to make a recommendation to the President for a severance package. The Ad Hoc Severance Committee shall develop its severance recommendation in consultation with the affected faculty member. The severance package should take into consideration the past record of service to the College of the affected faculty member as well as expected future services that could be expected from the individual. The severance package should consider both salary and benefits. The Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation shall be made to the President within thirty working days of the Committee's appointment. Thereafter, the President has thirty working days to present the College severance proposal to the faculty member. The faculty member has thirty working days to accept or to reject the severance proposal after receiving it from the President. If the faculty member rejects the College severance proposal, then at the time he/she notifies the College of his/her decision, the faculty member must present a counter proposal. The faculty member and the College agree to have the Ad Hoc Severance Committee review the counter proposal and make a final recommendation for a severance package within thirty working days.*
- (6) If the College fails to provide a severance proposal to the faculty member as outlined by the procedures in section (5), then the faculty member can file a grievance within twenty working days of the date the College should have made the severance proposal. This grievance is covered by the process outlined in FH 2.16.4.*
- (7) If the faculty member requests retraining as stated above in this section (4), the President shall immediately appoint an Ad Hoc Retraining Committee comprised of the Provost, Chief Financial Officer, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair of the Academic Senate and Vice-Chair of the Academic Senate to review the request and to make a recommendation to the President for a retraining proposal. The Ad Hoc Retraining Committee shall develop its retraining recommendation in consultation with the affected faculty member. The Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation shall be made to the President within thirty working days of the Committee's appointment. Thereafter, the*

President has thirty working days to present the College retraining proposal to the faculty member. The faculty member has thirty working days to accept or to reject the retraining proposal after receiving it from the President. If the faculty member rejects the College retraining proposal, then at the time he/she notifies the College of his/her decision, the faculty member must present a counter proposal. The faculty member and the College agree to have the Ad Hoc Retraining Committee review the counter proposal and make a final recommendation for a retraining package within thirty working days.

- (8) *If the College fails to provide a mutually agreeable retraining proposal to the faculty member as outlined by the procedures in section (7), then the faculty member can file a grievance within twenty working days of the date the College should have made the severance proposal. This grievance is covered by the process outlined in FH 2.16.4*
- (9) *If during a three-year period, the department, program, or substantially equivalent organization is reopened, the reassigned tenured or tenure-track faculty members, in order of their College employment seniority, will have the option of assuming their former positions during the first year of revived operation of the former department, program or substantially equivalent organization.*

*Authored by: Sara Stampp, Provost, Mindy Thomas, Professor of Politics, Ted Tsukahara, Tutor, Integral Program, Andrew Williams, Professor, Graduate Business Programs, and James Hawley, Professor, Graduate Business Programs.
November 7, 2007*

Senator Grant questioned the process for determining the criteria for program closures in (1). Would new programs have different criteria than established departments? Will there be a similar system for figuring out what the criteria are for program closures across the college? Past Chair Tsukahara responded that paragraph (1) is meant to identify the ways programs are started, documentation that the department and school must present in order to receive approval. A well-developed program review process is uniform across the college. The existing document that needs revising is the document the Senate and EPB approved in 2004, but has not received administrative approval for, the procedures on what is done if a department/program is being recommended for closure.

Senator Grant asked if established financial criteria is placed alongside educational criteria? Does this open the way for financial criteria to be established for departments that already exist and are long-standing? Past Chair Tsukahara responded that by adding the education language to the paragraph, it says the decisions cannot be solely on financial criteria, it expands the protection, it does not narrow it.

Senator Grant said departments may be asked to be separately accountable to bring revenue to the college in a way they are not at this point. The SOE functions as a school, but she expressed concern that the unit will be defined very narrowly and it could lead to unanticipated consequences. Does anyone think this could pave the way to make it the criteria for all programs and departments?

Dean Murray said that any financial performance and educational considerations as specified in the document are the ones that have been established through the program review procedures (five year cycle) or the documents established through the fast track process. For an already established program, no new financial performance targets can be set except through the program review process. The previously approved EPB and Senate document, which outlines the procedures for closing a program, directs the timeline for this type of issue (who can propose the closure of a program, who should weigh in on the timeline, etc.). The program review process will protect current programs.

Dean Woolpert asked for clarification regarding the “financial and educational underperformance” language in the first paragraph. He asked if no program could be considered for closure solely on financial grounds. Past Chair Tsukahara said that should a program be started purely on financial grounds, it would be a mistake. There is an educational rationale for starting and maintaining programs. There should be consideration of the educational benefits, even if a program is struggling financially. A cost benefit calculation would have to be made.

A vote was taken on the motion to accept the Program Closure Language for the Faculty Handbook. The motion passed by voice vote, with two opposing votes.

Resolution on Tenure to the Program or Department - Chair Bossard reopened the discussion. Barbara McGraw suggested revising the language as follows:

Whereas the Faculty of Saint Mary's College has overwhelmingly expressed their desire to maintain tenure to the college for many valid reasons, we recommend that tenure to the college be the continued policy at Saint Mary's College of California. Further we ~~submit recommend administrators be advised by~~ the procedures in the Program Closure Document (see attached) **for adoption in the Faculty Handbook**, and ~~recommendations in~~ **we provide** the Report of the Academic Senate on Tenure Locus (see attached) **as information and advice.** ~~in regard to actions taken in cases of program closure.~~

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Tsukahara and SECONDED by Senator Flanagan to accept the amended resolution. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Senator Rokeach added that by voting for the resolution, no department has the right to say no to a faculty reassignment; every student at SMC has the right to a professor with expertise in the subject matter and expertise in the pedagogy of that subject matter.

Laura Heid responded that in the SOE, it would be more difficult to get faculty to be as actively involved with the entire college as a whole if faculty are hired with tenure to a program.

A vote was taken on the amended resolution. The motion to approve the resolution passed by voice vote, with two opposing votes.

10. Faculty Handbook language Section 1.6.1, Shared Governance – Not discussed.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator

11-15-08

Academic Senate Tenure Locus Report

In the 2007 BOS report, the Academic Senate was charged with exploring with the faculty the issue of changing tenure at Saint Mary's College from "tenure to the college" to "tenure to programs, schools, or departments."

In response to this charge, the Academic Senate: 1) hosted two faculty forums (September 27 and October 24, 2007) to discuss the locus of tenure and 2) surveyed the ranked faculty (online) during October of 2007. Explicitly, the topic for discussion was the possibility of changing Faculty Handbook Section 2.1.1, which reads that tenured faculty members are "tenured to the College and not to a program, department, or School."

In the forums and the survey, the faculty identified major concerns associated with maintaining tenure to the college. Principle among them were:

1. Financial cost to the college when academic units close;
2. The difficulty caused by entrepreneurial, graduate programs;
3. The problem of finding a home for "orphaned" faculty;
4. The negative financial and/or academic impact on departments receiving "orphaned" faculty.

However, the faculty felt that these (and other concerns) were outweighed by those associated with changing the locus of tenure to the program, department or school. In this area, the following concerns were specifically identified:

1. Tenure to departments would seriously undermine the sense of community at Saint Mary's and further hurt the commitment of faculty to non-departmental responsibilities, such as Collegiate Seminar, January Term, and other non-academic programs. This would cause irreparable damage to much of what makes Saint Mary's unique.
2. A two-tiered tenure system (longer-serving faculty tenured to the college, newer faculty tenured to the program/department) would create a serious division between faculty colleagues.
3. Tenure to the department or program threatens the academic freedom associated with tenure. The administration could effectively "fire" faculty by closing their department. (A frequently raised point was the "not-too-long-ago" attempt to discontinue the social sciences at our institution.)
4. If the college wishes to become more successful and thus more financially stable it should protect the faculty, who are the greatest asset of the college and at the center of its educational mission.

The October survey's results garnered 143 responses from full-time faculty (tenured or tenure-track). Of that number, 106 (i.e., 74%) opposed ending the current policy of tenure to the college. Thus, the faculty response is clear to the question of locus of tenure.

In the spirit of shared governance and responsibility, the survey instrument also asked the faculty, "If you do not support this change, what solutions do you favor that would solve or mitigate the problems raised by closure of a program or department?" Of the 143 faculty responders, 90 provided suggestions. In general, these suggestions can be grouped into the following categories:

1. Planning and Caution in Creating New Departments/Programs

- a. Carefully prepare and plan before opening new programs.
 - i. Create a financial back-up plan/buffer for new programs.
 - ii. Staff new programs with non-tenured faculty, at least until they have proven their viability. Suggestions include:
 1. A differential pay scale, in lieu of tenure
 2. Using TUG faculty to teach in these programs
 3. Hiring adjuncts, with the possibility of converting to the tenure-track if the program proves viable
 - b. Grow slowly and carefully.
 - c. Much more institutional support needs to be available to help new programs succeed, or they should not be opened.
 - d. Hold deans and administrators responsible for the educational and fiscal health of programs that they open and oversee.
 - e. Only open programs that are appropriate in light of our mission and ones that are financial reasonable.
2. Support and Good Administration of Current Programs
 - a. Better outreach and advertising to bring in a healthy number of students to the programs at the college.
 - b. A more rigorous and focused evaluation of current programs, with the purpose of identifying issues when they are just beginning, and thus (one assumes) easier to treat.
 3. Hiring/Tenure of Faculty
 - a. Do not hire faculty who are limited to one area of expertise, especially in a high-risk area.
 - b. Include secondary competencies in the job descriptions for new hires.
 - c. Hire faculty to joint appointments to a new and existing program or department, with the explicit consultation and approval of both units.
 - d. Be more restrictive with the requirements for granting tenure.
 4. Closing a Program
 - a. Work hard not to close programs unless absolutely necessary.
 - b. A strong severance package policy is necessary.
 - c. Encourage senior faculty to retire or go on reduced service.
 - d. Release lecturers and adjuncts first, with full-time faculty teaching the necessary courses.
 5. Accommodating “orphaned” faculty who choose to stay
 - a. It is absolutely necessary to have a clear and orderly procedure for how this transition takes place.
 - b. Expect that departments will welcome “orphaned” faculty.
 - c. Conversely, do not expect that departments will be happy to take on a displaced faculty member by themselves. Suggestions include:
 - i. Rely on Seminar and January Term -- this would probably necessitate the changing of the rules for teaching in these programs, as well as possibly replacing a number of lecturers and part-timers that teach in these units. However, a massive change to the staffing of these programs would only occur in the unlikely event that another program as large as SEED were to be closed. (This last point was noted many, many times.)
 - ii. Assign faculty to Seminar as their primary department.
 - iii. Replace some of the faculty’s courses with administrative or advising duties
 - iv. Support from the college to departments that take on “orphaned” faculty, i.e., a clear incentive to take on displaced colleagues

- v. Require the consent of the department that is taking on the “orphaned” faculty member
 - vi. Have multiple departments “share” displaced faculty
 - vii. Require “orphaned” faculty to piece together a course load
 - viii. Have displaced faculty teach interdisciplinary courses that are not housed in a department but still fulfill area requirements
 - ix. Not allow a situation where the placement of an “orphaned” faculty member in a new department lowers the number of departmental courses that can be taught by other members of that department
 - d. It is necessary that there be a commitment by all to job re-training in the case of a faculty member shifting to a department outside their expertise area.
6. Fund-raising/endowment
- a. Comments in this area tended to focus on the feeling by many faculty that they are being asked to relinquish one of their fundamental rights as faculty (i.e., full tenure) to make up for failures by the administration and governing boards to: 1) build the endowment to an adequate level, and 2) plan and lead appropriately. As such, the faculty calls for a new emphasis on excellence in this area.
 - b. Other comments included a call to re-examine the way in which individual departments and programs are expected to support programs like Collegiate Seminar and Integral. These programs rely on faculty being released from department and school responsibilities for their existence. This system puts financial and staffing pressure on departments and it is suggested that Collegiate Seminar and Integral look to more external fundraising.