

ED 365 193

HE 026 874

AUTHOR Hanna, Kathryn L.; Swain, Shirley
 TITLE Tenured Faculty Perspectives of Intra-system Transfers: Is There Life after a Campus Closing? ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
 PUB DATE 6 Nov 93
 NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (18th, Pittsburgh, PA, November 4-7, 1993).
 PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Mobility; Followup Studies; Higher Education; Interviews; *School Closing; State Universities; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Transfer; *Tenured Faculty; Transitional Programs; Vocational Adjustment
 IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *University of Minnesota Waseca

ABSTRACT

This study examined the near-term impact of the closing of the University of Minnesota's Waseca (UMW) campus on the tenured faculty who transferred to other University of Minnesota campuses. Eleven faculty members who had transferred to two campuses were interviewed approximately 5 to 8 months following their transfers. Interviewees tended to be in their 40s and 50s and chose new positions which were quite different from their UMW assignments. Several themes emerged from the interviews including the transition process, the type of impact the transfer had on the individual's professional career and personal life, the acceptance of the faculty member into the new unit, the adaptation to a 4-year comprehensive/research institution, and the feelings about the closing itself. Among nine conclusions were the following: (1) when there is systemwide tenure, placement is facilitated when salary lines move with the faculty member; (2) direct system-based help in the form of education/retraining money, office relocation assistance, and moving allowances facilitate a smooth transition; and (3) prospective relocation departments need to be part of a clear well-articulated process. (Contains nine references.)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

**Tenured Faculty Perspectives of Intra-system
Transfers: Is There Life after
a Campus Closing?**

Kathryn L. Hanna*
Assistant Dean, College of Biological Sciences
University of Minnesota

Shirley Swain*
Graduate Student in Higher Education
College of Education
University of Minnesota

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association
for the Study of Higher Education, Pittsburgh, PA.,
November 6, 1993

Correspondence should be sent to: Kathryn Hanna, Assistant Dean,
College of Biological Sciences, University of Minnesota,
123 Snyder Hall, 1475 Gortner Ave., St. Paul, MN 55108,
(612-624-2244)

*K. Hanna was Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs,
University of Minnesota, Waseca; S. Swain was Assistant Vice
Chancellor for External Relations, University of Minnesota,
Duluth, at the time of the study.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathryn L. Hanna

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 026 874



**ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION**

**Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393**

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Pittsburgh Hilton and Towers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, November 4-7, 1993. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Abstract

The University of Minnesota closed one of its five coordinate campuses in 1992. This study examines the near-term impact of involuntary faculty transfers on tenured faculty within this multicampus system. The method employed is an exploratory, descriptive case-study investigating professional and personal experiences of transferred faculty members as they moved from a two-year technical campus to either a Research I or Comprehensive I campus. The paper summarizes the faculty's experiences and makes recommendations for future situations of campus or department closures.

**Tenured Faculty Perspectives of Intra-system
Transfers: Is There Life after
a Campus Closing?**

Introduction

In March 1991 the Regents of the University of Minnesota voted to close its two-year campus at Waseca effective June 1992. Although there have been a number of private college closings across the U.S. in the last 25 years, closure of public institutions has been rare. Educators have had much more experience building campuses and hiring faculty for the tremendous expansion of American higher education than in terminating them. Because of the past rarity of a public campus closing, the situation leaves much ground rich for exploration. A wide range of issues, from the need for special student services to the outplacement of laid-off employees, could have been studied. This research, however, focused on the near-term impact of the closing on the tenured faculty at the Waseca campus (UMW) who were transferred to other campuses of the University of Minnesota system.

Of the 32 tenured faculty at UMW, 13 chose the Voluntary Termination Program (a two-year salary buy-out), 2 took transitional leaves or positions, and 17 transferred to other University of Minnesota campuses--6 to Duluth, 6 to St. Paul, 4 to Minneapolis, and 1 to Crookston at the time of the study (winter, 1993). The closing of the Waseca campus affected these faculty in different ways. Some of the transferring faculty were nearing

retirement and had expected to remain in Waseca, so the closing disrupted long-established plans. The closing prevented others from refining unique curricula which they had developed or from completing specific long-term professional development plans. In addition to the change of employment location, all but one of the transferred faculty were moving from a two-year, technical college to campuses with baccalaureate and graduate programs.

The University's Office of Human Resources, along with coordination from the Waseca administration and the receiving departments within the system, orchestrated the faculty transfer process. Because the University had rarely eliminated a department, let alone closed a campus, there was no blueprint for the transfer process. As a consequence, many issues had to be resolved as they surfaced. This examination and documentation of the transfer process yields useful information for future campus closures.

Literature Review

There is a dearth of information regarding the closure of postsecondary institutions. Wyatt (1986) has suggested that closure is not seriously discussed because the subject is taboo. Although there are articles dealing with program elimination and closure, Wyatt feels that "what is missing is an examination of academic attitudes to closures and the documentation of the experience of all the participants" (p. 21).

When single institutions are closed, the termination of tenured faculty is relatively straightforward as long as proper notice is given. However, in multicampus systems the locus of

tenure is an important issue. The issue of faculty tenure within large and multicampus systems when programs or campuses are closed can be a muddy one. Lee and Bowen (1975) cite two influential groups, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, who studied whether tenure should be campus or system-based and came to very different conclusions. The difference in opinion is reflected in the actual practices of multicampus systems. For example, the University of Michigan policy states that it has not terminated tenured faculty due to program elimination, and that if a program were dropped, every attempt would be made for placing the faculty member in an appropriate position, perhaps after retraining (Mortimer et al., 1985), but there are no guarantees. The University of Minnesota, on the other hand, has adopted the position that tenure, in effect, is systemwide. The University of Minnesota tenure code states:

Section 12.2 In the event that programmatic change leads to discontinuation of a program in which a member of the faculty is employed, the University recognizes the obligation to continue the employment of regular faculty in accordance with the terms of their employment, and to continue the employment of non-regular faculty for the term of appointment. In case of fiscal emergency, the provisions of Section 11 apply.

Regular faculty members who are so retained have the responsibility to accept teaching or other assignments for which they are qualified, and to accept training to qualify them for assignment in other fields. The University has the responsibility to assign such faculty members to responsibilities as closely related to their original field of tenure as is practicable, to allow them time in which to continue scholarship in their original field if they wish, and to recognize scholarly contributions in that field as valuable in assessing their contribution to the University for pay, promotion and other purposes.

In addition to the steps mentioned above, the University has the right to offer inducements to faculty

members voluntarily to change fields of study, to seek employment elsewhere, or to accept early retirement (University of Minnesota, 1985).

Many institutions and administrators have avoided the issue of systemwide tenure hoping the issue would not surface. In theory, systemwide tenure fits the academic tradition of a single university, but Lee and Bowen (1975) feel that "systemwide tenure poses so many practical problems as to appear unrealistic" (p. 110).

Mortimer (1981) agrees that an intra-system transfer of faculty would be difficult. He states:

The likelihood of an effective transfer policy is directly related to the complexity of the system involved. For example, it may be possible to negotiate a transfer policy in the Pennsylvania State College and University System because the campuses have somewhat similar teaching missions. It would be quite difficult if not impossible to negotiate such a policy in a multicampus system composed of two-year community colleges, four-year technical institutes and liberal arts colleges, and major university centers. The politics of such transfers as well as their substantive soundness would be seriously called into question (p. 167).

Because of the uniqueness of public institutions closing campuses, there is little in the literature addressing the issues of forced transfers of tenured faculty within systems. The transfer of the Waseca faculty from a two-year technical college to major university centers offered an opportunity to examine the transfer process, its effectiveness, and the near-term consequences.

Rationale

The purpose of this project was primarily to gain a better understanding of the near-term impact on tenured Waseca faculty from the closing of their campus and subsequent transfer to other

campuses within the University of Minnesota system, in the belief that this knowledge can be useful in other like situations, either at the University of Minnesota or other systems. For example, within the state of Minnesota there are four postsecondary educational systems: the University of Minnesota, the State University system, the Community College system, and the Technical College system. All receive some degree of their annual budgets from the state legislature. Over the past few biennia the sluggish economy of the state has forced legislators and the Governor to tighten, and in some instances, decrease its funding to higher education institutions. As a strategy to keep costs under control and avoid duplication, the legislature has mandated that the systems, excluding the University of Minnesota, be merged. Jay Noren, the person hired to lead the merged system, stated recently that he would not rule out campus closings (Chancellor Won't Rule out Campus Closings, 1993). It is possible the merger may also lead to the involuntary transfer of some faculty if programs are consolidated or merged. Also, the University of Minnesota, although already having closed one of its five campuses, has also put its other two-year campus, Crookston, in a tenuous position. If Crookston cannot fulfill a newly implemented baccalaureate goal, the University may consider closing it. Therefore, with the shadow of other closures hanging over the state, the Waseca experience should have lessons which could be beneficial if other closings are mandated.

A second important rationale for the study was that there is little written about the subject. Thoughtful analysis needs to be

documented so that others who face analogous situations may have the benefit of previous experience.

Context of the Study

The University of Minnesota system, prior to the closing of the Waseca campus, had five coordinate campuses spread throughout the state of Minnesota: A Minneapolis-St. Paul campus (Twin Cities or UMTC), Duluth (UMD), Morris (UMM), Crookston (UMC), and Waseca (UMW). The University of Minnesota, a large land grant institution, had 48,943 students enrolled on its various campuses fall 1992. The system has been undergoing financial stresses because the Minnesota Legislature has been decreasing its biennial allocation, yet high student numbers have remained, and programs have proliferated. The system has undergone various planning efforts to refocus its programs and decrease its student body. Increased preparation standards have been introduced; two-year programs are being phased out on most campuses; and efforts such as total quality management and new accounting systems have been implemented to increase efficiency.

Each strategy has met with varying degrees of success. During this period of downsizing and evaluation, the interpretation of what are the real political and financial realities has differed. Considerable conflict has ensued within the University itself, and between the University and many of its external constituents.

The University of Minnesota, Waseca, was a relatively small, two-year, technically-oriented campus with a curriculum directed towards agriculture and rural programs. It was located in a

community of about 8,000 people, whose economy is based on agriculture, printing, and electronics. UMW was the fourth largest employer in the community and the only institution of higher learning within 25 miles. The college offered two-year, Associate of Applied Science degrees in seven programs. It was classified as a two-year college according to the Carnegie classifications.

The Duluth campus is located in the northeast section of the state, approximately 225 miles from Waseca. It is an area of forests and lakes attracting many vacationers. The city is larger than Waseca, yet considerably smaller than the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Approximately 82,000 people reside in Duluth, which has an economy based on natural resource production (primarily iron mining and lumbering), plus shipping, health care, tourism, and education. The immediate area is home to two public universities, a private liberal arts college, two community colleges, and two technical colleges.

The University of Minnesota, Duluth, is considered a Comprehensive I university according to the Carnegie classifications. It has five colleges, a two-year medical school, and a research institute. Students can choose from 11 bachelor degrees in 70 majors, and graduate degrees are offered in 16 different fields.

The flagship Twin Cities campus is located in the metropolitan area of Minneapolis/St. Paul where over 38,000 students attend. In the metropolitan area there are ten private colleges, one public university, six community colleges, six public technical

colleges, and several proprietary institutions. The Twin Cities campus, with its heavy emphasis on research, is considered a Research University I according to the Carnegie Commission's classifications of Institutions of Higher Education.

The following table outlines some of the key statistics of the three campuses important to this study. The statistics for UMW are from 1989-1990, the last "normal" year on the campus. Other figures are the most recent that were available.

Table 1
Campus Statistics

	UMW*	UMD	UMTC
Number of day students (head-count) fall 92	1174	7649	38019
Student high school rank percentile (new high school students only) fall 92	47.2	71.5	72.0
Total faculty 89-90	47.19	353.62	2548.03
Student/faculty ratio 89-90	17.15	18.57	14.95

Source: University of Minnesota Student Profile Reports and Student/Faculty Data for FY90, Management and Planning Information Services. *1989-90 data.

Methods

Because the intent of this study was to develop an understanding of an event, a qualitative research approach appeared most appropriate (Miles and Huberman, 1984; Yin, 1989). This design was chosen to gain insight, discovery, and interpretation, rather than to test hypotheses. This research project looked to discover how transferred faculty were affected and why the transfer process worked or did not work. The case study approach using faculty interviews provides a rich description of their perceptions of the process and an exploration

of the transfer occurrence as a whole from the faculty's perspective.

Although the case study design may be the best research approach because of the nature of the research problem and the questions being asked, there are limitations of which the researchers must be vigilant. Since the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis, both the reader and the authors need to be aware of biases that can affect the final product. In this study, the researchers were both affiliated with the University of Minnesota. One was a tenured faculty member from the Waseca campus who had not yet taken a placement position at the time of the study. She had served as the acting academic vice chancellor for the final three years of the college and had been active in faculty union affairs prior to that appointment. The other researcher, at the time of the study, was an administrator on the UMD campus who had not been directly associated with transfer policies or logistics, and had relatively little information on the details of the transfer during its implementation.

This study explores the perceptions of tenured faculty who transferred concerning their professional and personal successes or failures with the transfer process. Because the transferred faculty who were studied settled on two different campuses it was also possible to draw some cross-campus comparisons of the group.

The scope of the study is very narrow, looking only at the tenured faculty that accepted transfers within the University of Minnesota system instead of the termination program. The authors

did not contact or interview others who were involved in the transfer process such as central administration human resource staff, receiving department chairs or faculty, or families of the affected faculty.

Interview Protocol

At the time of the study sixteen UMW faculty had transferred to UMD and UMTC, all of them men. The sample chosen for this study represents five of the six faculty who transferred to UMD and five of the ten who transferred to the Twin Cities campus. The UMD interviews were conducted by one researcher. The five faculty responding to the request for an interview were chosen. The Twin Cities sample was purposefully selected. First, it was chosen in proportion to where the faculty relocated. Since six went to the St. Paul campus and four went to the Minneapolis campus, the study drew on three from St. Paul and two from Minneapolis. In addition, individuals were chosen to represent the broadest range based on how similar or different their new jobs were compared to the ones they held at UMW, i.e., four had similar jobs and two were chosen to interview; since six had quite different assignments compared to their UMW responsibilities, three were chosen. The five UMTC faculty were all interviewed by the second researcher.

All interviews were conducted during February 1993, and the participants signed a consent form. Each interview was prefaced with a brief explanation of the purpose of the study, emphasizing that it was not a study of the merits of the closing decision, but rather one looking at the impact on the interviewed faculty. The

researchers used a common set of semistructured, open-ended interview questions. Interview questions were designed to be neutral in nature. In each interview faculty were given the opportunity to put forth other information which was not specifically asked, but which they felt was important. The less structured format was chosen because it allowed for the faculty member's perspective to come out without undue influence from the researcher, a method recommended by Merriam (1988).

Analysis

The interview data was coded and rated independently by each researcher. The inter-rater agreement was quite high with the initial examination. The two researchers then discussed disagreements by reexamining the interviews and reached a consensus for the final ratings.

The study concentrated on a single aspect of the closing, the near-term impact on tenured faculty from a holistic viewpoint. The study provided a "thick" description of the phenomenon under study, taking into account the cultural basis of the academic setting and the significance of being tenured. The study dealt with a very complex event with many factors contributing to the impact that it had on faculty. The timing of the study was very critical. The closing was fairly recent, but most faculty had completed their transfers, and were approximately five to eight months into their new positions. This time frame allowed them to still have vivid memories of their feelings, but also to have had time to begin to settle into a new professional and personal life.

The authors sought insight into the successful parts of the transition and those that failed to work as well. From this knowledge the authors evaluated the transition, summarized what happened, and drew some inferences, thus increasing its potential applicability. The literature is very thin on the subject of campus closings and its impact on faculty. Predetermined hypotheses do not appear to exist. The study's results rely on inductive reasoning based on an examination of the data.

The regularity and similarity of issues which were raised by both groups of faculty and observed by both researchers gave a comfortable level of reliability, which could not have been realized if only a single interview had been conducted. Reliability was also enhanced through adherence to a prescribed interview protocol, using double-coding techniques (Miles and Huberman, 1984), and making clear explanations of how conclusions were drawn from the collected data.

Since this study looks at a unique event, it does not lend itself to universal generalizability. Because of the exploratory nature of the study, the results must be considered indicative rather than conclusive. However, closure situations are not necessarily unique, and these results could provide insight to those confronted with like circumstances.

Results

A summary of characteristics and related issues of the ten faculty interviewed are shown on Table 2. In many respects the faculty were quite similar. They were mostly in their 40s and 50s. Regardless of where they chose to transfer, there were

faculty at both UMD and UMTC who had school age children, commuted daily or weekly, and chose new positions which were quite different from their UMW assignments.

Table 2
Characteristics Related to
Transferred Faculty Interviewed

	UMD*	UMTC*
Number of faculty with 5 months at new position at time of interview	3	3
Number of faculty with 8 months at new position at time of interview	2	2
Number of faculty with children under 19 years old	3	2
Number of faculty with very different positions than UMW	2	3
Number of faculty with name signage in their office area at time of interview	5	2
Number of faculty with PhD or terminal degree	3	3

* N=5

The composition of the two groups of faculty choosing to go to different campuses was remarkably similar. For example the average age of transferred faculty was 49 at UMD and 46 at UMTC. The similarity may be due to the homogeneity of the faculty who chose to stay with the University rather than taking the Voluntary Termination Program (VTP).

Table 3 illustrates the summary of faculty responses to the key questions asked in the interview or issues which were volunteered. For purposes of this study, professional issues were defined to include how the faculty viewed their careers, including advancement, relationship with colleagues, and other related factors such as affiliations in national organizations. Personal issues were separated into two subcategories, direct and indirect.

Direct personal issues were those that directly impacted the faculty member, such as financial issues, housing or living arrangements, and psychological issues. Indirect personal issues were those which affected their families.

As shown in Table 3 there appears to be more consistency of responses from those faculty who relocated to UMD rather than to UMTC. There is more variation in the attitudes of faculty in Twin

Table 3
Summary of Faculty Responses

Interview number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Campus	UMD	UMD	UMD	UMD	UMD	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC
General view of transfer process	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	-
Attitude about decision to transfer rather than take VTP	-	NV	NV	+	NV	NV	NV	-	NV	-
Attitude about choice of new position rather than other U options	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0
Used ed/retraining funds	yes	no	yes	yes						
Orientation/welcome to new campus	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	no	no	no	yes	no
Acceptance by new department	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	-	+	-
Professional outcomes	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	-
Direct personal outcomes	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	0	-
Indirect personal outcomes	-	-	-	+	-	+	0	-	0	0
Attitude toward UMW closing decision	-	NV	-	NV	-	NV	NV	-	NV	-

Note: + indicates faculty expressed a generally positive attitude; 0 indicates a neutral attitude; - indicates a generally negative attitude; NV indicates faculty did not volunteer information which could be rated. +,0,- are net ratings determined by the researchers, for example if one very positive personal experience was offset by a very negative one, the net was 0.

Cities situations than at Duluth. UMD faculty appear to be more satisfied with their professional situation than UMTC faculty, but somewhat less satisfied with their personal situations.

Faculty who dwelled on the "wrongness" of the UMW closing decision, even though they were never directly asked about their opinion of the decision, reflected more negative personal adjustment attitudes. The negative personal adjustments are not as closely related to whether the faculty member is commuting or has children under 19 years of age.

The key transfer issues affecting their professional lives as described by faculty are summarized in Table 4. All faculty could express something about the transition that was positive for their professional life. The greatest range of examples though, was given when asked about what things did not work for them professionally.

Table 5 outlines issues brought up by faculty which relate to the personal side of transferring. It is interesting to note that faculty who transferred to UMD had more difficulty with the housing transition than faculty who chose to work in the Twin Cities. The distance from Waseca, 225 miles to Duluth versus 75 to the Twin Cities, was a factor for at least one faculty member deciding to transfer to the Twin Cities rather than elsewhere. His family continued to live in the Waseca area while he commuted regularly.

Table 4
Professional Issues

Issue	Representative Faculty Comments
<p>What worked well professionally? UMD faculty</p> <p>UMTC faculty</p>	<p>Good match with professional skills "I look at it as an advancement for me." Broadens his base of experience, likes diversity of people with whom he works A good match of skills, able to continue in his discipline Refreshing--can put together his skills in a new way, has made new professional contacts</p> <p>"I have positive feelings...partly because I knew the department well." Worked well because of a guaranteed position Knew immediately where he was going "I'm filling a void in this department. ...I felt I belonged and know people are willing to help me." Gaining new experience not available at UMW</p>
<p>What didn't work well professionally? UMD faculty</p> <p>UMTC faculty</p>	<p>Must do more research, takes time away from student contact Not enough time to prepare for new work, big teaching adjustment, concerned about research Lateral move "Nothing." Difficult to be motivated when closing of UMW devalues previous work</p> <p>No orientation/welcome Drastic change in function, even though position was explained to other faculty, they weren't using his expertise "Expected to hit ground running." Lack of departmental cooperation, isolation Has to be careful what he says in departmental meetings, department has narrow perspective "No sense of community." Misses colleagues, not a good fit</p>

Table 5
Personal Issues

Issue	Representative Faculty Comments
<p>What worked well personally? UMD faculty</p> <p>UMTC faculty</p>	<p>"Nothing." More leisure time with family Was able to sell house in Waseca Chance for reflection, reevaluation, build house Likes new house, worked well for spouse</p> <p>Easy housing transition, worked well for family Able to commute, family doesn't have to move Housing is convenient Housing situation is working out Family has adjusted well to situation</p>
<p>What did not work well personally? UMD faculty</p> <p>UMTC faculty</p>	<p>Economic hardship, used up savings "Housing is a negative." Commuting weekly is difficult Financial hardship, set back years, stressful Problem selling Waseca house Hard on marriage, health stress</p> <p>Could have used more house-hunting resources Commuting is expensive Difficult to balance housing and job transition at same time Too much personal change all at one time, trauma Financial hardship, used up savings, slow to integrate into community</p>

Table 6 summarizes how the faculty feel about the adjustment from a two-year, technical-type campus to a four-year comprehensive or research one. Except for the factors related to the large size of the Twin Cities campus, there were few negative comments about this particular part of the transition,

Faculty were queried about their expectations of their new positions and if those expectations were met. There was a wide

Table 6
Observations on 2 Vs 4 year campus

UMD faculty	Different mind set, feels accepted but not as sociable Classes more intense, big change, but working out Easy transition Enjoys working with new students and clients, no difficulty
UMTC faculty	Size can be overwhelming, no one place to get information, frustrating Different because of different assignment, but still have wide range of students Average level of student is higher, but range is about the same, more commuting students, less out of class contact Mostly urban students, more emphasis on research, but that's OK Vast campus, staff less likely to work late

range of responses which are summarized in Table 7. Those faculty who had the least "sticker shock" were those who were most familiar with the receiving department and knew some of their new colleagues.

Table 7
Expectations Vs reality

UMD faculty	OK, except for housing About the same, except it's a faster pace About the same, except it's more stressful Expectations are exceeded Significant change of career direction from initial expectations
UMTC faculty	About the same Much as expected Culture shock About the same, except had to figure out where he fit in Less community of interest than expected

Several other issues were frequently brought up by faculty. Those faculty who did not have a significant break between their UMW responsibilities and their new position said that they needed one. All of the faculty except one are on 12-month appointments;

therefore none of them had the traditional three-month break. The faculty who had single-quarter leaves, or significant vacation breaks, rarely mentioned the need for more transition time.

Virtually all of the faculty had availed themselves of the educational/retraining benefits offered by the University. In several instances, faculty mentioned this access to training as being very helpful to preparing them for responsibilities in their new positions.

Faculty who accepted Professional/Academic positions within the University in place of their regular faculty appointment brought up their concern about accepting this type of position. It remained an unknown for them whether it was the right decision.

Finally, several faculty mentioned the connection between the attitude about the campus closing and the loyalty, commitment, or professional motivation toward the University. This was often discussed in general terms, rather than their own specific situations, but there was the perception that a faculty's attitude toward the closing decision influenced professional outcomes.

Discussion

General Emerging Themes

Several themes emerge from the analysis of the interview data. Among the themes were the transition process, the type of impact the transfer had on the transferred faculty's professional career and personal life, the acceptance of the faculty member into the new unit, the adaptation to a 4-year comprehensive/research institution, and the harbored feelings about the closing itself. Examination of the data shows many

similarities, but also patterns which might be linked with distinctive faculty characteristics or issues.

Each of the six themes will be discussed, first for general patterns across all faculty interviewed, and second for patterns observed between those who went to the UMD campus and those who went to the Twin Cities campus.

The Transition Process

Most of the faculty felt that the actual process used by the University for implementing the move worked quite well, once it got past the initial floundering. Five key points were brought up by the faculty: No lay-offs of tenured faculty, the transfer of salary lines along with the faculty member, the availability of educational/retraining dollars, the transfer of office and other equipment, and the moving allowance.

Once it was clear to the UMW faculty that the University would not lay-off tenured faculty, some of the uncertainty of the campus closing was removed. One faculty member commented that once "we were guaranteed positions, it took away the anxiety." But even though positions were secure, for at least six months it was unclear where the salary dollars would come from in the new positions. Faculty were worried, as stated by one member, about "who would buy me." This initially slowed the process because budget cuts were prevalent throughout much of the University, and little progress was being made to find transfer positions. In the summer of 1991, central administration agreed to transfer salary lines along with the faculty member, and this decision eased the process. In fact once it was clear that faculty were almost

"free" to receiving departments, some units aggressively recruited faculty. Interviewees from both campuses remarked on how well UMD (and a few other units) understood the process and took an aggressive stance to recruit Waseca faculty. As stated by one person, "Some units could do a better job...they can be creative--to break out of their mold--that the faculty don't have to go to just open positions--but that the units need to look at the skills of the faculty member and imagine how those skills can be put to good use in their unit."

A number of faculty members expressed the benefits of the additional education/retraining dollars that were allocated to the staff at the closing campus. One mentioned taking classes in preparation for reentering the classroom. One pointed out that the transfer process must be started early enough "so that faculty can take advantage of appropriate conference opportunities for their new position." Another used a single quarter leave to gear up for his new position.

Allowing the faculty to move their computers and other equipment with them was helpful. "It is comfortable to have my old desk with me," one faculty said. However, moving office equipment to the faculty's new unit was not without glitches. Several faculty members complained that it was several months before their equipment arrived or that it came damaged. The whole process of inventory dispersion from UMW was one issue that central administration had not pre-planned, and therefore coordination between the campuses often had rough spots.

Several faculty discussed the helpfulness of the moving expense allowance. However, a third of the faculty felt that the housing expenses were creating significant financial hardships. Also, because the moving allowance was based on the faculty's salary, it varied greatly, and there was no consideration for the higher costs of living between Waseca and their new community.

Professional Impact

A majority of faculty felt that the transfer was a positive step in their professional career overall. Some felt that it was a distinct advancement. Those faculty who had generally positive feelings toward their new position commented that, "I look at it as an advancement for me." Others felt that the move worked well into their own personal plans for their career. "I probably would not have been given any opportunity to do this kind of work at this time, had it not been for the transfer. It is a lateral move, but it broadens my base of experience." Another felt that he was "filling a void in the department...that the senior people had been helpful and they were trying to do some informal mentoring." Another said that taking on a staff role appealed to him. He was ready to give up climbing the ladder. A common theme among these middle-aged males was that they looked at the transfer as an opportunity for personal and professional reflection. Many said that they examined their professional worth and found that going through the transfer process had reconfirmed their professional competitiveness. As they interviewed, they realized that there were ample opportunities for them to contribute.

The attitude toward their professional situation was quite different, depending on the campus to which faculty relocated. The UMD transferees, without exception, felt they had landed in a good professional situation, but faculty on the Twin Cities campus had very mixed outcomes. Those faculty who had less positive professional outcomes were often "plunked" into the department without much help or guidance from the department chair or senior department members. One commented that at first it was quite dull, that people didn't know what his role in the department was to be. Another lamented that there is much isolation in his department. "I don't want to sound too negative, but the transition was harder than I thought. I've had little help with my new job responsibilities." He also commented that it takes him a while to "fall in love with my work. Right now it's a struggle...not like UMW." Another UMTC faculty mentioned the lack of community on the campus. Even a faculty member who thought the transfer was working well for him commented that integrating into the large campus was difficult. "It's almost like you're expected to learn by osmosis. It's probably a reflection of size; however, it can be overwhelming." Several of the UMTC faculty were having second thoughts as to their choice of positions. One wondered whether he should have chosen another campus. Another thought maybe he should have looked at more options. A third thought maybe he should have looked closer at the Voluntary Termination Program. The questioning of whether the right professional decision was made was a Twin Cities faculty phenomenon. It may be that the size (see Table 1) and culture of the Twin Cities campus

was so different from that of UMW or UMD that professional adjustment was much more difficult to achieve. A second explanation may be that those opting for UMD, a more distant campus requiring a major move, were more flexible and greater risk takers. Another possible explanation is the influence the acceptance by the new unit had as discussed below.

Unit Acceptance

There appears to be a close link between the professional satisfaction faculty feel to their new positions and to how accepted within the unit the faculty felt. Also, faculty who questioned whether they made the right choice had more difficulty integrating into the new department. With this study though, it is not possible to tell the exact link. It may be a case of the chicken and the egg, i.e., unsureness of the decision leads to less attempt at integration, which is sensed by receiving faculty, which leads to negative feelings by the faculty member, which leads to more doubts about his choice, etc.

There is a striking difference between the two campuses in the faculty's perceived acceptance and welcome. All UMD transferred faculty felt very welcomed when they came. One commented that his new office was better than his Waseca one. "That is important to me. There are very nice people here. They are helpful. I feel warmly received. I feel that I am part of the team." Another felt that the dean and department head were very supportive, allowing him to continue his previous national association commitments.

There were some similar experiences on the Twin Cities campus. One stated that "I felt I belonged, and I know people are willing to help me." He was given a welcome reception, and his name was on his office door the day he arrived. However, a majority of those UMTC faculty interviewed felt the welcome into the unit was less than desired. One had to ask his department chair about the general logistics of the department and the campus. "It has been on my own initiative." Another said that "With new people it's every man for himself." Another said, "I've been on my own. Others seem unaware or don't care."

There are a number of possible explanations for the different acceptance of the transferred faculty. The different sizes of the campuses may create different cultures as to unit cooperation, socialization, and "initiation rituals." Another explanation may be that faculty who chose to go to UMW in the first place have strong preferences for a small campus atmosphere, which UMD more closely emulates. Thirdly, faculty at UMW and UMD were in the same faculty collective bargaining unit since 1981. Belonging to the same faculty union may have created a sense of camaraderie which carried over in the transfer process.

Personal Impact

Generally speaking, the dissatisfaction with the transfer was much more personal than professional. The transfer seemed to present personal hardship for a majority of those interviewed. The biggest obstacle to a smooth transition seemed to be the financial hardship associated with their housing or living situation and the separation from their families. One half of the

faculty interviewed commuted daily or weekly to their new work locations. UMD faculty traveled 450 miles back and forth, while UMTC faculty traveled 150 miles round-trip. Commuting resulted from the slow sale of a house, the reluctance of the working spouse to move immediately, or the desire to keep children in Waseca area schools. For the most part, UMD faculty were looking at the commute as a short term action, while UMTC commuters were intending to continue longer term--often until children had completed high school. The UMTC faculty were in effect still keeping one foot in both doors. In fact the decision to choose UMTC over other campuses, in at least one case, was motivated by his desire to keep his Waseca area house and not uproot his children. But one person felt so distraught over the temporary separation from his family that he questioned his decision to move, thinking that he should have taken the buy-out. Most with children under the age of nineteen were very concerned about the effect of moving on their children.

Several faculty brought up the high cost of living at their new locations compared to the Waseca area. One had exhausted his savings because of the housing differential. Another said that the transfer had set him back five to ten years financially, and that his earlier personal plans for travel are unlikely now.

The personal stress of the transfer process was emphasized by several people. Examples include those who sought personal counseling during the process to help deal with the trauma, had eating problems, or had difficulty in making new friends. Several faculty mentioned the effect the closing decision had on their

self-worth. They felt that they were doing a good job at UMW, but closing the campus had made them feel worthless, that what they did had no value. It is not unusual for a person's sense of worth to be tied to his job, and this appears to be true of the transferees.

On the positive side, some faculty really liked their new city. A couple of faculty were excited about their new homes. One Duluth member liked the idea of being close to a cabin on a lake. In three cases, spouses had found good employment and were making a good adjustment. The personal issues, though, were clearly some of the biggest obstacles in the adjustment process to the new position.

Adaptation

Adjusting to the student body of a four-year and graduate institution did not appear to be as much of a problem as some of the faculty had expected prior to transferring. Faculty on both campuses commented on how the average level of students was better than at UMW, but there was still a wide range of abilities. Both groups of interviewees mentioned they experienced reduced direct contact with students and a greater emphasis on the research component of their positions.

Adjustments to other factors of the campus culture were more difficult for UMTC faculty. The Duluth faculty's comments included items such as "People's depth and scope, and the diversity of the campus is great....It was too much alike at Waseca....It was an easy transition" and "I worried if I could handle it....It was a big concern, but it turned out OK"; whereas

UMTC faculty cited the vastness of the campuses, lack of community, and expectations of figuring it out for themselves. The difference of going from a campus of 1000 students and a community of 8000 to a campus of 46,000 students in a large metropolitan area is notable and reflected in the results of this study.

Agreement with Closing Decision

The interview protocol was consciously designed not to discuss the pros and cons of the decision to close the Waseca campus; however, half of the faculty voluntarily expressed definite disagreement about the closure decision. The interviewer explained that the merit of the closure decision was not the topic of this research, but the faculty who wanted to talk persisted. For the most part, it was the belief of these faculty that the University was not being honest with them. They felt that if they could agree with the closing decision, their willingness to accept the difficulties with the transfer and/or separation from their families would be easier to bear. They also expressed a decreased loyalty or motivation to the University. The faculty who expressed great displeasure with the decision were also the ones who felt the most negative personal impact of the transfer. All of them have been slow in establishing a new residency or integrating into the new community. In addition one person felt that some of those who disagreed with the closing decision made unreasonable demands to get all of the resources possible, making the transfer process take more time, dollars, and human resources than necessary. In other words a forced position transfer was going to cost the University more than a voluntary one.

Due to the research protocol, not all of those interviewed gave information about how their attitude concerning the closing decision affected their acceptance of the transfer process, so no specific conclusions can be drawn from this study. However, the potential correlation between a faculty person's belief in the merits of the campus closure and his acceptance of the personal difficulties associated with the transfer process is intriguing. This could be the subject for future research.

Faculty Recommendations

Most of the faculty gave several suggestions for improving the transfer and transition process. Table 8 summarizes those actions. Most of these suggestions relate to the logistics of the process, which might be carried out to smooth some of the bumps in the transfer process.

Conclusions

From the analysis of the data, a number of patterns emerged which were judged representative of the total picture. With the help of the faculty's insightful descriptions of their transfer experiences, the following inferences may be made:

1. When there is systemwide tenure, placement is facilitated when salary lines move with the faculty member.
2. Direct system-based help to transferees in the form of education/retraining money, office relocation assistance, and moving allowances are necessary to a smooth transition.
3. It is necessary to have a clear, well-articulated process not only for the affected faculty, but for the prospective relocation department as well. This assists the departments to actively pursue potential candidates.

Table 8
Suggested Actions During Transfer Process

Actions		
Prior to transfer	Transfer	Post-transfer
<p>Role of central administration in conjunction with administration of closing unit</p> <p>Set guidelines, start process as early as possible Establish credibility Establish funding guidelines Encourage potential receiving departments to look at faculty skills Offer personal or professional counseling to help facilitate the best possible match Provide education/retraining opportunities Establish assistance for spouses/family</p>	<p>Coordinate timely delivery of office equipment/etc. Allow for break between job responsibilities</p>	<p>Provide moving/other expenses Make listing of new addresses available</p>
<p>Role of receiving department</p> <p>Recruit--view creatively Define new position Prepare as for any new faculty member Arrange for telephone, office signage, etc.</p>	<p>Take active role in welcome and orientation Aid in timely delivery of office equipment</p>	<p>Continue to assist with integration of member into unit Set-up informal mentoring Encourage community building</p>
<p>Role of faculty member</p> <p>Examine all options Seek career and/or professional counseling if needed Seek appropriate educational/retraining opportunities</p>	<p>Take a break between assignments</p>	<p>Keep a positive attitude Accept fact that adjustment may take significant time</p>

4. Receiving units need to offer orientation assistance and not assume that intra-system transferred faculty are campus knowledgeable.
5. Good professional matches can be made if the skills of the faculty member, their preferred working environment, and the mechanisms for family adjustments are carefully incorporated into the process. Adjustments to the percentage of time spent teaching, amount and type of interaction with students, pace of work, and diversity of the campus appeared to be relatively easy, while unreceptive departments and lack of integrating processes deter effective transfers.
6. Faculty transferring to the Duluth campus had more satisfactory professional outcomes on average than those transferring to the Twin Cities campus.
7. Faculty at the smaller Duluth campus felt more accepted by their new unit and recognized for their contributions than faculty transferred to the larger Twin Cities campus.
8. Faculty who found moves professionally beneficial could still experience extreme personal hardships. Satisfaction with the professional aspects of the transfer is separable from personal satisfaction.
9. The faculty attitude regarding the merit of the campus closure decision may affect how transferees accept the difficulties of the transition.

Further Research

The scope of this inquiry could be broadened to include interviews with all parties to the transfer process. A more inclusive investigation could lead to a more complete evaluation of the process. In addition, a study could be completed to compare the experiences of the tenured faculty who transferred with those who accepted the Voluntary Termination Plan. A more comprehensive examination of the impact on all employees, i.e., civil service, untenured faculty, and professional academic employees, could be the subject of further research also. A longitudinal study after one, three, and five years would allow

for a more complete comparison of the faculty's experience between their new and old position, i.e., a long-term study.

It would also be interesting to pursue research to investigate any relationship to the transferring member's attitude about the closing decision itself and his ability to adjust to the transfer and the satisfaction with his new position. Another possible investigation might be to examine if there was any connection between the fact that UMD and UMW faculty were in a common bargaining unit working together for common goals and the higher job satisfaction that UMD transferees felt. In addition, a study of cultural differences and perspectives between the old and new campuses would provide a useful analytical framework.

More investigations into the successful and unsuccessful aspects of involuntary faculty transfers will most likely be needed in the future, as the public becomes less willing to fund sparsely populated campuses, leaving them vulnerable to closure. This study was a preliminary step in this direction.

References

- Chancellor Won't Rule out Campus Closings. 1993. The Duluth News-Tribune. February 3, 1993. 124:4A.
- Lee, Eugene C., and Frank M. Bowen. 1975. Managing Multicampus Systems: Effective Administration in an Unsteady State. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Merriam, Sharan B. 1988. Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Miles, M. and A. M. Huberman. 1984. Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Mortimer, Kenneth P. 1981. Procedures and Criteria for Faculty Retrenchment. In James R. Mingle and Associates (Ed.) Challenges of Retrenchment: Strategies for Consolidating Programs, Cutting Costs, and Reallocating Resources. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Mortimer, Kenneth P., Marque Bagshaw, and Andrew T. Masland. 1985. Flexibility in Academic Staffing: Effective Policies and Practices. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- University of Minnesota. 1985. Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure. July 1, 1985. Minneapolis, MN.
- Wyatt, J. F. 1986. Institutional Identity and Its Extinction. Higher Education Review. 18: 21-32. Spring 1986.
- Yin, Robert K. 1989. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.