

**MWC COC-SACS Alternative Self-Study
2000-2003**

Faculty Governance Committee Report

Faculty Governance Committee Members:

Chichester, Ana G.	Committee Chair, Associate Professor Modern Foreign Languages (MWC)
Goehring, James E.	Professor, Classics, Philosophy & Religion (MWC)
Gratz, Roy F.	Distinguished Professor, Chemistry (MWC)
Hamilton, Lynn	Director, Information Technology and Instructional Support (JMC)
Morello, John T.	Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs
Price, Wendy L	Associate Professor and Chair, Historic Preservation (MWC)
Staley, Blair	Assistant Professor, Leadership and Management (JMC)
Tyler, Jo	Assistant Professor, TESL and Education (JMC)

Table of Contents
Section 7: Faculty Governance

Executive Summary	3
Overview of Faculty Governance Procedures	5
Recommendations	10
Proposed Statements of Jurisdiction of the Faculty Assembly	14
Proposed Memberships of the Faculty Assembly	14

Referenced Appendices

Appendix 7: University Models of Governance

Appendix 8: Jurisdiction

Appendix 9: Tenure and Contracts

**Report of the
Alternative Self-Study Committee
on Faculty Governance**

Mary Washington College

Executive Summary

The charge to the Alternative Self-Study Committee on Faculty Governance pertained to "all matters arising under the Faculty Handbooks" of Mary Washington College and the James Monroe Center, exclusive of mission. After reviewing the handbooks issued to both faculties, the committee concluded that, although largely identical, there were instances of problematic inconsistency between them with respect to faculty governance, including the descriptions of rights and responsibilities traditionally accorded to faculty at institutions of higher learning. After exploring the current status of faculty governance on both campuses, the committee also reviewed these policies and procedures in order to anticipate potential difficulties in the future as the institution completes its transition to university status. Finally, the committee noted significant concerns about adequate communication and coordination between the faculties on both campuses.

The committee is offering eight recommendations with respect to faculty governance focusing on developing a system to formalize and coordinate communication between faculty, to guarantee appropriate changes in faculty status at JMC, including the awarding of tenure when appropriate, and to create a some kind of faculty assembly to oversee the curriculum at both campuses, while preserving their autonomy.

The committee examined how the faculty handbooks at each institution define the faculty's roles in three areas: first, in terms of the structure of faculty governance; second,

in terms of faculty status, including contracts; and third issues of faculty welfare.¹ The committee first identified issues currently of significant concern to faculty, especially at Mary Washington College. These include such items as: classroom size, faculty-student ratio, teaching, advising responsibilities, course load, faculty development (including start-up funds for newly appointed tenure-track faculty), and the protection of intellectual property. Second, the committee attempted to envision how these issues might be affected by the structural transformation envisioned for the institution, and how these questions, in turn, would affect faculty at JMC as that campus continues to grow. Although there are important questions to resolve in the area of faculty welfare, the committee decided to prioritize issues that focus on immediate concerns, therefore, only recommendations dealing with faculty governance and faculty contracts are included in this report.

The committee viewed its task as threefold: first, to identify the present features that provide institutional integrity and assess their effectiveness; second, to recommend interim changes meant to preserve the system of autonomy in faculty governance for each campus and to provide some guidance to promote communication between faculty and academic programs; and third, to recommend long-term changes in faculty governance and faculty status to accommodate growth at the James Monroe Center. The recommendations that follow envision a future that will reflect a relative stability at Mary Washington College, and significant expansion and change at JMC. In the short term, these recommendations attempt to highlight the immediate need for improved communication between the two campuses. In the longer term, it is important to underscore the need for a strong faculty governance structure that will retain faculty authority over curricular matters, including degree programs, between the two campuses. To achieve this coordination some recommendations encourage the expansion of faculty participation and will require the willing engagement of the faculty and the administration for the enduring benefit of the institution.

The committee gathered most of its information regarding faculty welfare and governance systems on the university level by researching analog institutions, including

¹ These issues are principally addressed in Sections 2 thru 4 of both faculty handbooks, respectively. We define faculty status in traditional contractual terms; e.g., tenured, tenure-track, full-time non tenure-track

interviewing faculty at those institutions in some cases, and by surveying faculty on both our campuses. University governance system models are varied, and after reviewing multiple institutions during the 2000-2001 academic year, the committee focused on those that are in the process of or have recently completed a transition to university status as the most applicable to our situation.

The committee selected institutions still in the process of transition: e.g. Beaver College and Elon College; others that have recently completed their transition process: e.g. Florida Gulf Coast University, the College of William and Mary, and Christopher Newport University; and others with well established university systems: e.g. Johns Hopkins University, Georgetown University, and Northern Illinois University. Out of this research came an understanding of several governance models that might be adopted, depending on the growth and changes in existing programs at the James Monroe Center in the foreseeable future (See Appendix 7). The data gathered from analog institutions also informed the committee's recommendations regarding faculty contracts.

A faculty survey sent electronically to all members of the faculty in the spring semester of 2002 contributed greatly to the research in preparation for this report. The committee drafted, edited, and revised the major portion of the faculty survey (questions 17-73) with the assistance of the Director of the Self-Study. This report reflects comments from a joint committee meeting in October of 2001 between this committee and members of the Mission and Image committee; it also includes comments from informal meetings with faculty in academic buildings, and between the Self-Study Steering committee and random members of the faculty.

Overview of Faculty Governance Procedures

The outline of faculty governance at Mary Washington College appears in the two faculty handbooks provided to the College's teaching faculty. The Mary Washington College *Faculty Handbook* defines "instructional faculty" as those persons "who hold full-time teaching appointments in various academic departments and who teach courses in the College for credit toward Mary Washington degrees" (13). This *Handbook* pertains only to the faculty teaching on the College's Fredericksburg campus. Faculty at

including renewable term appointments, and adjunct or per-course faculty.

the James Monroe Center, located at the College's Stafford County campus, have their own handbook describing a separate system (*James Monroe Center Faculty Handbook* 11-14).

In a general sense, many of the faculty governance approaches at the two campuses are similar even though the specific governance mechanisms differ. Both handbooks identify the President of the College as the chief executive, administrative, and academic officer who has been designated by the Rector and Board of Visitors to the College with responsibility for "proposing policies and programs for the College, as well as responsibility for their effective implementation upon approval by the Board" (*Mary Washington College Faculty Handbook* 14; *James Monroe Center Faculty Handbook* 11). Both *Handbooks* further indicate that the President has delegated certain authority to the full-time faculty of each campus; the lists of tasks delegated to each faculty are virtually identical (*Mary Washington College Faculty Handbook* 14; *James Monroe Center Faculty Handbook* 11-12). The only difference is that James Monroe Center faculty are specifically charged with the responsibility for contributing to the annual evaluation of administrative faculty and support staff at JMC. Although no similar statement appears in the *Mary Washington College Handbook* in the list of authority and responsibilities of the faculty (*Mary Washington College Faculty Handbook* 14), faculty at MWC are included in administrative faculty evaluation each year as a matter of course.

On both campuses, the final authority of faculty action is defined as either binding or advisory with most being areas as advisory. Additionally, the two faculties share the parallel constraints on their actions. As both *Handbooks* state,

Financial constraints, the time element, and the policies of external groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the College may set limits to the exercise of the above authority. In particular, such limitations may result from the provisions of state and federal law, Executive Orders of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, policies of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, accreditation standards of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and policies of the Board of Visitors. (*Mary Washington College Faculty Handbook* 14; *James Monroe Center Faculty Handbook* 12)

In cases where the President takes final action on a matter that is within an area of delegated faculty responsibility without prior faculty action, or exercises the veto prerogative, both *Handbooks* indicate that the President will communicate to the faculty the reasons for taking such action. If not persuaded by the reasons given, the faculty at either campus may “by majority vote at a subsequent meeting” seek to present the faculty’s position to the Executive Committee of the Board of Visitors.

Despite the similarities in faculty responsibilities at both campuses, there are considerable differences in the mechanisms through which governance functions. Each campus has a different ‘official body’ serving as its voice, and a different committee system. These differences in organization create confusion between the two faculties, and limits formal, systematic interaction between them.

At the Fredericksburg campus, the official voice of the instructional faculty is now the Faculty Senate of Mary Washington College. Inaugurated in the fall of 2000, the Senate’s purpose is “to create an effective legislative and advisory body to ensure representation of faculty interests and to fulfill the authority and responsibilities delegated to the faculty” (*Mary Washington College Faculty Handbook* 13). Establishing the Senate followed a long process marked by several noteworthy moments, but reflected a consensus among faculty that the town-hall format for meetings was inefficient and required a re-examination of the institution’s approach to governance, documented in the *1991-1993 Institutional Self Study of Mary Washington College: Volume I: The Report of the Criteria for Accreditation* (88). The Senate is a representative body composed of 25 full-time faculty members, 22 of whom are elected by the academic departments on the Fredericksburg campus and three who are elected at-large. With the exception of the Faculty President and the President-elect, who serve two-year staggered terms in each position, senators serve one-year. The Senate replaced the former governance system in which all full-time faculty met monthly in plenary session in meetings convened and chaired by the Dean of the Faculty. No JMC faculty attends these meetings.

The Senate meets eight times a year and conducts most of the faculty’s business; however, there are also four annual plenary faculty meetings that all instructional faculty on the Fredericksburg campus are expected (as a professional responsibility) to attend. One of these meetings, held in August, is largely ceremonial in nature and conducts no

business. The second meeting is held in September, if there are challenges to Senate decisions made the previous year. The meeting in March serves to conduct run-off elections for faculty committees and provides an opportunity for any member of the faculty to raise a challenge to any action passed by the Faculty Senate over the course of the academic year. The meeting in April conducts one important piece of business (approving the list of graduates) and also provides an opportunity to bid farewell to faculty who are retiring at the end of the year.

At the Stafford campus, the elements of faculty authority and responsibility listed in the *Faculty Handbook* are delegated to the James Monroe Center Academic Council. The President appoints members to the Council, and all full-time JMC faculty and program directors are Council members. Meetings are convened and chaired by the Vice President for Graduate and Professional Education and Dean of the Faculty at JMC. However, the autonomy of the JMC Academic Council with respect to its own governance is complicated by the fact that some MWC faculty members have also been appointed to JMC's Academic Council as voting members. This kind of inconsistency is a matter of some concern and should be clarified. Better formal communication between the two faculties should assist in resolving these kinds of issues. Recently, the Senate has invited the Dean of Graduate and Professional Studies to address the Senate in the interests of promoting communication between the two campuses.

The faculty governance systems at the two campuses also differ in the constitution of faculty committees. Members of faculty committees on the Fredericksburg campus are either elected by vote of the instructional faculty or are appointed by the Faculty Organization Committee. Procedures for determining membership of these committees are presented in detail in the *Faculty Handbook*. Some committees include non-voting administrative persons, and some have voting student members. Development of the Faculty Senate introduced one new wrinkle in the way that these faculty committees are formed. In the past, persons who conducted business in plenary faculty meetings were also serving on the faculty committees that reported to the faculty. Members of the Faculty Senate, however, may not serve on standing committees. Standing committees, thus, deliberate and bring motions to the Senate, but no member of a standing committee may vote when a matter is finally put before the Senate.

Faculty committees on the Fredericksburg campus themselves underwent significant revision in the 1994-1995 year, for reasons best summarized in the College's restructuring report entitled *Building Upon a Tradition of Educational Excellence*. That report noted that the faculty committee structure was overgrown and unwieldy and overstretched the service capacity of the faculty—there were almost as many college-wide committee slots as there were full-time faculty available to serve. In 1995, the faculty voted to reduce the number of standing committees from 12 to 8. Duties of some committees were consolidated (separate Tenure and Promotion Committees were combined, for example), and the charges of some committees that were eliminated were reassigned to other committees. The faculty's Committee on Admissions, for example, was eliminated and the role of overseeing admission policies (one of the responsibilities listed in the *Handbook* as delegated to the faculty) was added to the duties of the Academic Affairs Committee. Elimination of the Special Programs Committee caused the movement of most of its duties (such as the approving of student proposals for “special majors”) to the Curriculum Committee. Presently, some faculty committees on the Fredericksburg campus have questioned whether they can actually accomplish the duties assigned to them. The Curriculum Committee for example, has begun investigating the question of whether it should continue to review “special major” proposals and reported to the Faculty Senate (at the April 3, 2002 meeting) that it is considering making a proposal that a new committee be formed to take on this task.

Even though action in 1995 reduced the number of Standing Committees, a new group of “Curriculum Advisory Committees” that formally came into existence in 1999 replaced each departed Standing Committee with a new committee serving to oversee a portion of the College's B.A./B.S. General Education Program. In effect, this means there are just as many committees as there used to be; they are just of a different type. To minimize overloading faculty with too much service duty, the *Handbook* sets limits on the “expected” extent of service in a typical year. Two concurrent committee assignments of any type constitute the maximum committee service expected.

If committees dedicated to oversight of the curriculum are burdensome to the MWC faculty, faculty committees at the Stafford campus are even more over-extended. JMC sometimes has committee members appointed, rather than elected, by the Dean of

Graduate and Professional Studies (such as in the case of the James Monroe Center Faculty Development and Awards Committee). One faculty committee (the James Monroe Center Admissions, Advising, and Academic Committee) includes more non-instructional faculty members than it has teaching faculty. The only instructional faculty members who serve on this committee are the three program directors at the JMC. Further, while “recommending policies concerning faculty welfare” is listed as one of the responsibilities of JMC faculty, this task does not appear among the lists of duties of any of the faculty committees nor is it mentioned as a duty of the Academic Council. Terms of office for elected posts are two years, as opposed to the three-year term common to all faculty committees on the Fredericksburg campus, and this campus has no articulated limits to the number of committees upon which faculty may serve. Although the design of the committee system at the James Monroe Center will undoubtedly change as the Center evolves, this situation is troubling.

The campuses share similar language regarding the creation of *Ad Hoc* Committees, language that may be problematic for the Fredericksburg campus system of governance because it does not authorize the Faculty President to establish an *Ad Hoc* Committee unless a motion for creating an *Ad Hoc* Committee has come to the Senate from the Faculty Organization Committee. The Dean at the Fredericksburg campus also may, according to the *Faculty Handbook*, create Ad Hoc Committees and there is some concern, noted by the Faculty Affairs Committee in its report to the Faculty Senate on April 3, 2002, that the creation of *Ad Hoc* Committees may result in bypassing the standing faculty committee charged with dealing with the issue given over to an *Ad Hoc* group. No concerns about the formation of Ad Hoc Committees at the JMC have been raised thus far.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the two entities remain academically independent, each with its own faculty governance system.

There are two separate systems of governance at Mary Washington College and at

the James Monroe Center (as described in the Overview of Faculty Governance Procedures). Faculty governance at the two campuses occurs independently and with only occasional and mostly informal contact between the two campuses. These two systems are designed to facilitate the carrying out of similar authority and responsibilities delegated to each faculty in ways that best serve the governance needs and missions unique to each. It is recommended that the two systems remain academically independent, each with its own ruling body (Senate/Academic Council) to review actions taken by the faculty.

The Faculty Survey documents that faculty from both campuses wish to maintain separate systems of governance (4.37 overall average). Both faculty groups feel that the present separate systems are sufficient to handle faculty governance (3.14 overall average) at the present time.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the institution expand the areas of participation awarded to the faculty at the campus level and university level.

The move to a university structure must be seen as an opportunity for faculty and administration to increase participation in key decisions that impinge on the welfare of faculty, administration, and students. Faculty from all campuses or academic units in coordination with the administration should be given the opportunity to share certain responsibilities. Research from analog institutions shows areas of faculty participation in university systems both in college and on the university level (See Appendix 8). Examples of areas of participation that need expansion in college level include the following:

Coordinating long-range academic planning and fiscal planning - the committee envisions an expansion of the current Planning Committee to include areas of academic concern; for example, reducing the teaching loads from the current standard of four courses per semester. Although moving to a university structure may have no immediate effect on faculty expectations, reducing the teaching load for faculty at MWC has been an institutional goal since the last Self-Study. This goal has become a central issue in recent

years, and the administration and the faculty have made progress toward it through a rotational system of course reduction (commonly referred to on the MWC campus as the "pass-around"). The course reduction goal has become an important issue for two reasons: (1) the expectation of the institution through the criteria included in the FAAR and in the tenure process that faculty engage in scholarship and professional activity; and (2) the prevailing interest of faculty in pursuing scholarship as an essential professional responsibility. The teaching load is of particular concern in small programs on the MWC Campus since the current "pass-around" reductions cannot always be used effectively.

The academic/fiscal planning committee is a place where ideas are explored and decisions made about their value and potential for further development, such as special programs to attract and retain minority student populations, increasing student participation and course offerings in summer school, establishing study-abroad incentives for students, and others.

The committee studied areas of authority/jurisdiction of faculty at analog institutions and found that making recommendations for resource allocation and for fiscal planning, were traditional areas of faculty participation. Fiscal planning/policy was included as an area of jurisdiction in four out of six institutions studied (Christopher Newport University, Georgetown University, the College of William and Mary, and Northern Illinois University; Appendix 8).

Reviewing/recommending policies for admissions - there is no faculty governance structure that deals principally with admissions. While the faculty on the campus of MWC did participate in an admissions committee, this is no longer the case (see Overview of Faculty Governance Procedures, section on committees on the Fredericksburg campus). Research of analog institutions showed that one area of jurisdiction for many faculty members at these institutions included participation in reviewing standards for admissions and in recommending admissions policy (John Hopkins University, The College of William and Mary, University of Texas at San Antonio; Appendix 8).

Establishing a policy on issues of intellectual property - there are no governance

structures on either campus to address issues regarding intellectual property rights, a concern to all faculty teaching and especially those teaching distance learning and web-based courses. This is an example of a campus-specific issue that might need to be addressed at the university level because the issue concerns all faculty members, even if the origin of concern is more specific to one campus. There is a need to revise the dated language in the *Faculty Handbook* regarding intellectual property so as to include concerns of the faculty teaching distance learning and web-based courses. The present policy on intellectual property stated in the *MWC Faculty Handbook* was created in 1987 (section 4.4.2).

Establishing a more comprehensive committee structure at the James Monroe Center -

One of the responsibilities of JMC faculty is to recommend policies concerning faculty welfare. However, there are no faculty governance structures yet in place to take up the task of reviewing and recommending policies affecting the faculty. There will soon be a need at the JMC for faculty committees that examine issues of faculty affairs (including compensation and benefits), faculty organization, and faculty contracts. Another example of an issue of concern primarily to one campus but which might need to be addressed at the university level is the hiring of multi-year contract faculty. Attempts by the existing governance structures at MWC to deal with the issue of non-tenure track appointments failed to formulate a definite policy.

Recommendation: The committee recommends the creation of a Faculty Assembly. The Faculty Assembly will function as an advisory body that reports to the Deans (and Provost) and the President (five to ten years).

The institution will need at some point in the future a structure that will function as a university level system of governance to address faculty concerns and serve in an advisory capacity. The present governance system at MWC does not include members of the faculty from JMC. On the other hand, the JMC Academic Council has included faculty from MWC in its membership. The recommendation above addresses the future need for there to be greater collaboration and communication at the level of faculty

governance between the two campuses. The committee anticipates that the expansion of the JMC and its programs will necessitate areas of coordination and communication between the two faculty constituencies. Research from analog institutions shows that at some point in the development of the university structure, institutions have needed an overarching structure to consider issues of concern to the entire faculty. Even institutions where most faculty governance takes place at the home level through faculty committees (on faculty affairs, student affairs, tenure and promotion, curriculum, etc.) include a Faculty Senate, Faculty Council or Faculty Assembly that reviews and recommends university-wide policies such as faculty welfare issues, longer and shorter term institutional academic and fiscal planning, and other matters pertaining to faculty rights and responsibilities (Florida Gulf Coast University, Christopher Newport University).

Proposed Statements of Jurisdiction of the Faculty Assembly:

1. The Assembly will create and maintain a flexible, collegial, and integrated institutional structure.
2. The Assembly will review issues of concern to the entire faculty including: faculty compensation and faculty benefits, and faculty development, etc.
3. The Assembly will assess the impact of proposed programs and proposed changes in existing programs that may affect more than one faculty or school.
4. The Assembly will assess the impact of proposed programs and proposed changes in existing programs that significantly affect the university's resource allocation.
5. The Assembly will also evaluate the impact of university plans on personnel policy such as joint appointments.

Proposed Membership of the Faculty Assembly:

1. Each college shall have representation on the Faculty Assembly.
2. The *Ad Hoc* committee on Faculty Organization for the University will recommend membership distribution of the Faculty Assembly.
3. The *Ad Hoc* committee will recommend the procedure for the election of officers

to the Faculty Assembly.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the formation of an *Ad Hoc* Committee on Faculty Organization for the University begin as soon as university status is attained.

The committee recommends that a faculty committee of faculty from the two campuses be appointed. The *Ad Hoc* committee will recommend the areas of jurisdiction of the Faculty Assembly and will decide its membership distribution. The committee will also determine the need for new governance structures such as university-wide standing or ad hoc committees. The Senate (MWC) and Academic Council (JMC) will forward nominations for members. The Deans from the two faculty groups will choose members of the committee. Upon the fulfillment of its charge, the committee will report its findings to the Senate, Academic Council, and the Deans.

Recommendation: It is recommended that MWC retain its strong commitment to the tenure system.

Appointments at MWC for full-time faculty are tenure-track. The *Faculty Handbook* defines the standard ranks and/or titles for continuing teaching faculty in the category of tenured or tenure-track as Instructors, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors, and Distinguished Professors (section 3.1).

Most new faculty appointments are made at the rank of Assistant Professor for teaching faculty holding a terminal degree. Members of the faculty who are tenured or tenure-track are assured continued reelection. They are reelected or reappointed, year after year, by the Board of Visitors upon recommendation by the President.

Mary Washington College, through its commitment to the tenure system has adopted this First Amendment Statement:

Mary Washington College vigorously supports freedom of inquiry and expression within the academic community. All members of that community have a fundamental right to follow their interests and to express their views privately and

publicly without censorship, constrained only by the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the laws of the United States, and respect for the property and persons of others. While the College may institute regulations to ensure the orderly expression of ideas and to protect the resources needed for productive inquiry, there [*sic*] regulations shall not be interpreted in a way which restricts freedom of inquiry and expression by any member of the College community. (*Faculty Handbook*, D.1)

MWC has adopted the Statement on Academic Freedom of the Association of American Colleges (1941), and the American Association of University Professors' statement on Freedom and Responsibility (1970), as part of the parameters of academic freedom for the college community. The recommendation recognizes the commitment of MWC to the tenure system and to the freedom of inquiry and expression as an important part of the history of the college and of its mission.

Recommendation: It is recommended that JMC begin offering some tenure-track appointments to members of the faculty in the graduate programs in Education and Business (five to ten years).

The JMC *Faculty Handbook* has adopted the Statement on Academic Freedom of the Association of American Colleges (1941), and the American Association of University Professors' statement on Freedom and Responsibility (1970), as part of the parameters of academic freedom for the college community. Therefore, the above recommendation seeks to address issues unrelated to the freedom of inquiry and expression important to the institution. Instead, it seeks to address concerns regarding the establishment of graduate programs where the faculty is very new and the image of expertise and prestige that accompanies a long-established institution that has yet to develop.

In the case of an institution where professors teaching in its schools of professional studies are hired under multi-year contracts, tenure may be viewed as unnecessary to attract and retain faculty (Johns Hopkins, for instance). In an institution of

long-standing recognition, offering tenure to attract and retain faculty may not be viewed as essential to the preservation of its image or prestige. On the other hand, in an institution that lacks a distinct definition, and indeed a name that will identify its two campuses, and that is in the early stages of development, retaining faculty to build stability and permanence is essential. It is also important in an institution with close connections to its regional population and to the community it serves to attract and retain faculty that will make a commitment to the institution and to Fredericksburg (region).

The committee understands the need for flexibility at the James Monroe Center in order for the campus to address regional needs and the changing needs of the adult population it serves. Therefore, the intent of the recommendation is that JMC will retain a percentage of its non-tenure track appointments in the areas where rapid changes in program offerings might occur.

Recommendation: It is recommended that both colleges offer faculty teaching under multi-year contracts a form of job security.

A faculty affairs committee at JMC or its Academic Council would need to review hiring policy and recommend multi-year contract faculty be awarded job security in the form of a rolling contract or some other system. One option might be for the institution to offer to assist faculty in searching for alternative employment in case of non-reappointment due to the deletion of a program. In another option, a distinction could be made between short-term and long-term contracts in order to make them more comparable to the tenure system (a recommendation of a Faculty Senate committee at Gulf Coast University). The length of the contract might be awarded based on the rank attained such as a five-year contract for an assistant professor, a ten-year contract for a professor. Or, the administration might choose to either implement a system of rolling contracts or the automatic extension of a contract upon the completion of a satisfactory performance evaluation. For example, some Hamline University professors teaching on 12-month non-tenure contracts are on rolling contracts. The faculty members on rolling contracts "are always in the first year of the stated contract length. If the rolling contract is not renewed then the faculty member is entitled to the remainder of the term" (see

Appendix 9).

Recommendation: It is recommended that the James Monroe Center re-structure itself programmatically (five to ten years) to accommodate the growth of the Business and Education programs.

The two main graduate degree programs at the JMC should become schools or colleges: The School or College of Education / The School or College of Business.

The recommendation is for each college or school to retain complete autonomy over its own curriculum. Changes in curriculum and changes in programs are to be handled at the college level.

The Faculty Assembly, if adopted, would review and assess potential conflicts between programs in the same discipline at different campuses and will advise the Deans (Provost) of those conflicts.

The programmatic structure for these two disciplines provides collaboration and communication where it may be needed in the future without interfering with the program offerings of each college.