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I. Executive Summary

Background

The purpose of the COACHE Task Force is to interpret and contextualize results from the COACHE Faculty Satisfaction Survey, completed by a representative sample of JMU’s tenure-track assistant professors (n=143, 69% response rate); appraise best practices in the development of junior faculty; and develop pragmatic recommendations nested in the University’s mission. Provost Jerry Benson convened the COACHE Task Force, comprised of 10 faculty members, in fall 2012. The task force subdivided into three groups whose purposes reflect survey benchmarks: Career enhancement and development (e.g., tenure and promotion), holistic support for junior faculty (e.g., policies and compensation) and advocacy/representation (e.g., leadership). Between bi-monthly meetings of the entire task force, the groups worked through the recursive process of bringing meaning to COACHE results, conducting more discrete analyses of the data, reviewing additional data sources and relevant texts, and meeting with identified university collaborators.

Key Findings

These findings focus on areas within which JMU rankings are low. Of note, JMU exceeded national satisfaction rankings in several areas: teaching, facilities and work-related resources, interdisciplinary work, and the department.

1. Career enhancement and development encompasses satisfaction data on the nature of faculty work; tenure policies, clarity, reasonableness, and promotion; and interdisciplinary work, collaboration, and mentoring. Regarding tenure, the data reveal:
   - Pre-tenure faculty rated the clarity of the body of evidence that will be considered in making the tenure decision lower than both peers and cohort (mean = 3.45);
   - Overall expectations for performance for earning tenure were less clear to pre-tenure faculty at JMU than the COACHE cohort (mean = 3.19); and
   - 38% of the respondents do not receive consistent messages about tenure requirements from senior colleagues.

   With respect to faculty satisfaction regarding mentoring, COACHE data pointed to the following:
   - JMU faculty rated the importance of having a mentor outside the department lower than its peers and cohort (mean = 3.5); a supplemental survey of academic unit heads found that 88% of our departments do not have a formal mentoring policy, though 94% have an informal protocol.
   - Although 83% of non-tenured faculty consider mentoring within their department to be either “important” or “very important,” only 58% indicate mentoring to be effective. Further, 9% indicate that no departmental mentoring has been received.
   - Outside the department, 52% consider mentoring to be “important” or “very important,” while only 23% find it to have been effective. 38% received no external mentoring.

2. Holistic support for junior faculty includes satisfaction with personal and family policies, benefits, salary, and recognition. The data reveal salary as the single most pervasive issue of dissatisfaction.

---

1 JMU’s chosen peer institutions are Appalachian State University, East Carolina University, SUNY Geneseo, UNC-Charlotte, and UNC-Greensboro.
2 The national cohort includes all institutions whose faculty completed the COACHE survey.
3 All data are measured on a 5-point Likert scale, with 5 being the highest possible satisfaction score.
among tenure-track, early career faculty, noted as follows:

- Faculty satisfaction with salary is significantly lower than that of our peers and cohort (mean = 2.33), these data indicate that JMU faculty rank below the 30th percentile; and
- The following Colleges were significantly lower in satisfaction than their counterparts: CAL (1.95), CISAT (2.46), and CVPA (2.25).

Regarding personal and family policies:

- JMU ranked in the bottom 30% of all institutions surveyed. The particular items that received the lowest ratings included stop-the-clock policies (mean = 2.77), childcare (2.13), eldercare (2.52), and tuition waivers, remission, or exchange (2.15); and
- White male faculty members consistently provided the most negative ratings on these items; results were particularly negative in CAL and CISAT.

3. **Advocacy and representation** constitutes faculty satisfaction with senior leadership, divisional leadership, as well as departmental leadership, collegiality, engagement, and quality. On the whole, junior faculty members are satisfied, if not highly satisfied, with their departments. Both the quantitative results and qualitative comments indicate significant dissatisfaction with senior leaders:

- JMU faculty ranked in the bottom 30% on every single item associated with President/Chancellor pace of decision-making (3.13), stated priorities (3.13), and communication of priorities (2.98); and Chief Academic Officer (i.e., Provost) pace of decision-making (3.17), stated priorities (3.14), and communication of priorities (2.97)\(^4\).
  
  Notably, these data were universally and significantly lower in CAL (ranging from 2.58-2.86).

- Qualitative comments were consistently negative in tone and indicated a high level of rancor. Together, these data pointed to faculty dissatisfaction with four primary concerns or perceptions: poor communication of decisions, senior administration pay increases, hiring practices, and athletic spending.

**Recommendations**

Please refer to the Appendix A for a summary of recommendations drawn from our analyses of various data sources and an internal and external scan of best practices. Please refer to the full COACHE Task Force report, where each of the recommendations is contextualized and described in full.

**Next Steps**

In keeping with findings from the JMU COACHE survey, this task force requests that the senior administration make transparent the “how” and “why” of decisions made in response to our recommendations. It is important that faculty are systematically engaged in this process that extends beyond data interpretation.

---

\(^4\) This task force notes that a different administration was in place during the referent time frame for this survey.
II. Purpose

The purpose of the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) Task Force, convened by Jerry Benson and comprised of 10 faculty, is as follows:

- Interpret and contextualize results from the COACHE 2012 Faculty Satisfaction Survey, completed by tenure-track assistant professors;
- Appraise best practices in the development of junior faculty (within and outside of the JMU campus);
- Develop pragmatic recommendations nested in the University's mission; and
- Submit a report to Dr. Benson in late spring 2013.

III. Composition

The following JMU faculty served as members of the COACHE Task Force:

- Dr. John Almarode, Early, Elementary, and Reading Education
- Dr. Chip Bolyard, Philosophy and Religion
- Dr. Audrey Burnett, Health Sciences
- Dr. Michele Estes, Learning, Technology, and Leadership Education
- Dr. Peter Eubanks, Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Cultures
- Dr. Andy Lankford, Music
- Dr. Steve Leslie, Geology & Environmental Science
- Dr. Laura Parks, Management
- Dr. Rob Prins, Engineering
- Dr. Cara Meixner (Chair), Graduate Psychology and Center for Faculty Innovation

IV. 2012 Satisfaction Survey

During the 2011-2012 academic year, JMU participated in the COACHE Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, developed and deployed by the Harvard Graduate School of Education. A diagnostic and comparative tool, the survey identifies faculty satisfaction within the domains bulleted below, noting overall performance relative to internal subgroups, select peers and a national cohort.

- Nature of work in research, teaching, and service
- Resources in support of faculty work
- Benefits, compensation, and work/life balance
- Interdisciplinary work and collaboration
- Mentoring
- Tenure and promotion practices
- Leadership and governance
- Departmental collegiality, quality, and engagement
- Appreciation and recognition

During the 2011-2012 academic year, 208 faculty members comprised the JMU population of pre-tenured faculty members; 143 completed the survey, eliciting a robust response rate of 69%. Data were analyzed by Harvard and synthesized in the Provost's Report, a user-friendly account of participant satisfaction relative to internal subgroups (men vs. women, white vs. faculty of color), chosen peers (Appalachian State University, East Carolina University, SUNY-Geneseo, UNC-Charlotte, and UNC-Greensboro), and
a national cohort of COACHE member institutions. The Office of Institutional Research and the task force chair performed additional analyses.

V. Inquiry Process

The task force subdivided into three groups whose purposes map to COACHE domains and benchmark areas: Career enhancement and development (nature of faculty work, collaboration, tenure and promotion), holistic support for junior faculty (policies and compensation, appreciation and recognition), and advocacy/representation (departmental and administrative representation). Between bi-monthly meetings of the entire task force, the interpretation groups worked to bring meaning to COACHE results, conducting more discrete analyses of the data (by College), reviewing additional data sources and relevant texts (e.g., the Faculty Handbook), and meeting with identified stakeholders and collaborators (e.g., the Gender Caucus, the Compensation Task Force). The task force also conducted a survey of academic unit heads and deans; raw data and analyses are available upon request.

VI. Findings and Recommendations

The findings and recommendations of the COACHE Task Force are represented under the auspices of three core areas: A) career enhancement and development, B) holistic support for junior faculty, and C) advocacy and representation. Though presented separately, these areas should be understood as interdependent and mutually enhancing. While some areas of success are highlighted, the foci of our recommendations are on areas within which weaknesses or limitations exist.

A. Career Enhancement and Development

Career enhancement and development encompasses satisfaction data on the nature of faculty work (research, service and teaching); tenure policies, clarity, reasonableness, and promotion; and interdisciplinary work, collaboration, and mentoring.

1. Satisfaction with Tenure and Promotion

The tenure process at James Madison University is designed to “protect academic freedom, provide a reasonable measure of employment security and enable the university to retain a permanent instructional faculty of distinction” (JMU Faculty Handbook, 2012, p. 40). The university posts tenure evaluation criteria by college and academic unit on the Faculty Senate website and via links from the Office of the Provost’s website.

The clarity of the tenure process is important for faculty seeking tenure, as well as those involved in the evaluation processes that lead to tenure such as initial and annual evaluations, and comprehensive evaluations that become a matter of the college’s record (JMU Faculty Handbook, 2012). The Academic Unit Personnel Advisory/Action Committee (PAC) plays a large role in establishing, and adhering to, expectations for faculty evaluation that extend beyond the written policy outlined in the university faculty handbook. Although having well defined policies on paper is a good start, it may not be enough to provide tenure clarity. For example, in instances where units may not wish to have a checklist approach to tenure, non-tenured faculty may rely on tenured colleagues to provide insight into what would be
considered an acceptable body of evidence to amass prior to tenure. Apparent tenure requirements become muddied when tenured colleagues do not convey a consistent message. When asked if they had received consistent messages from tenured faculty about tenure requirements, 38% of COACHE respondents indicated that they had not, while 51% indicated that they had.

One possible scenario discussed amongst task force members was the communication channel between the pre-tenured faculty member and the PAC regarding progress toward tenure and the tenure decision. The nature of communication between these entities is not formative or dynamic, thus leaving the pre-tenured faculty member to obtain more meaningful feedback from fellow colleagues on an informal basis. This could contribute to the perception (and in some cases, the reality) of inconsistent messages from faculty.

In a JMU faculty survey administered by the COACHE Task Force, researchers found that Unit PACs are composed primarily of tenured faculty, although about 69% reported that their PACs include non-tenure track faculty participants. About half the respondents reported the role of their Unit PAC as conducting third-year promotion and tenure reviews. An additional 25% indicated that the Unit PAC was also involved in annual review and/or “other pre-tenure review.” Involving untenured faculty in the review process, even without voting rights in matters of tenure, is one way to facilitate a level of clarity about the tenure process.

Although the university faculty handbook is available online, and despite the inclusion of non-tenured faculty on most Unit PACs, tenure clarity proved to be an area of concern on the JMU COACHE survey. Pre-tenure JMU faculty rated the clarity of the body of evidence (the dossier's contents) that will be considered in making the tenure decision lower than both peers and cohort (mean = 3.45 of 5). Thus, tenure policies require clarification.

Overall, collegial expectations for performance for earning tenure were less clear to pre-tenure faculty at JMU than the COACHE cohort (mean = 3.19). In addition, JMU female faculty rated clarity about the tenure process low in relation to those at peer institutions with regard to expectations as campus citizens and as members of the broader community. JMU male faculty rated tenure clarity low in relation to their cohort with regard to expectations as teachers. Thus, tenure expectations require clarification.

Outcomes revealed areas needing further clarification, as well as models to be shared in a way that respect and do not replace the unique expectations of the tenure process within each Academic Unit.

The following recommendations are derived from these sources of information: The faculty handbook, campus data about the composition and role of Unit PACs, and COACHE survey data in relation to tenure and promotion.

**Recommendation 1: Identify exemplary models of tenure clarity**, and share these models with academic faculty, Unit PACs, Academic Unit Heads, and Deans in each College. According to a mixed methods study conducted by Cathy Ann Trower (2012) of COACHE, the campuses with the highest tenure clarity scores include Auburn, Ohio State, North Carolina State, the University of Iowa, University of Kansas, and University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Further, faculty satisfaction with tenure clarity was found to be affiliated with the following best practices: (1) institutions are explicit about how institutional mission affects faculty work; (2) institutions set weights or priorities for faculty work (e.g., at NC State, “pre-tenure faculty know what is expected to achieve tenure” (p. 49); (3) when factors beyond excellence in teaching and research matter for tenure, these are defined and explicated; (4) faculty members receive written information about how tenure is achieved and further, how this interfaces with mentoring; (5) junior faculty are oriented systematically to tenure and promotion (e.g., NC State offers an Assistant Professors’ Learning
Community, and Iowa conducts a 2-day program that includes “panels on strategies for success on a clinical or tenure track” (p. 54); (6) institutions offer ongoing forums, seminars and support structures that help faculty succeed in their respective tenure paths; (7) feedback is given both annually and via a third- or fourth-year review process; and (8) departments provide faculty with sample dossiers and feedback letters.

When considering ways to disseminate and learn from best practices (both internal and external), JMU should value the local context within each academic unit. Both senior administrators and faculty at all ranks should support this process. We recommend an annual forum or meeting within which PAC chairs, PAC members, and Unit Heads meet to exchange best practices in a facilitated environment, such as the annual May Symposium coordinated by the Center for Faculty Innovation. (A precedent for such dialogue exists; this year, for instance, Dr. Teresa Gonzalez has invited unit heads and PAC chairs to join a facilitated institute on peer evaluation of teaching.)

Projected Cost: none

**Recommendation 2: Conduct a comparative analysis of the tenure review information across Units.** Faculty review guidelines posted on the Faculty Senate website serve the unique nature of each Unit’s expectations. In addition, they reveal areas of strength and weakness in terms of tenure clarity in policy and expectations. To respond to areas of concern on the COACHE survey, we recommend a faculty-led study of how different Units communicate information regarding the tenure process, including: (a) the body of evidence (i.e., the dossier's contents) considered in making the tenure decision; (b) collegial expectations for performance for earning tenure; and (c) tenure expectations as regards faculty members’ roles as teachers, campus citizens, and as members of the broader community. An analysis of this nature is neither an attempt to rate nor rank departments. Rather, the purpose is to illuminate best practices and provide departments with the opportunity to transfer good ideas to new contexts.

Projected Cost: none

### 2. Satisfaction with Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring

Mentoring is among “the most effective and popular methods of socializing new faculty members [and should be viewed as] a right rather than a privilege” (Trower, 2012, p. 128). Further, multiple studies have found the benefits of mentoring to be correlated with less isolation, anxiety, and uncertainty, and with increased career satisfaction, leadership development, and scholarly productivity (Trower, 2012).

This section relies on data from COACHE, a survey of JMU Academic Unit Heads conducted by the COACHE Task Force, and a convenience sample of best practices in mentoring drawn from a higher education listserv. Overall, James Madison University has met or exceeded benchmarks in areas of interdisciplinary work, collaboration and mentoring on the COACHE survey. However, understanding the importance of mentoring is an area of concern for pre-tenure faculty at JMU. Faculty responses were lower than the cohort when rating the importance of having a mentor outside the institution or outside the department. Furthermore, JMU faculty rated the importance of having a mentor outside the department lower than faculty at our peers and cohort institutions (mean = 3.5).

JMU does not appear to have an official policy or set of guidelines regarding the mentoring of faculty. Likewise, the AUH survey revealed that 88% of responding academic units have no formal mentoring

---

5 While this recommendation may not necessitate a new budget line or involve direct costs, we acknowledge the need for human capital.

6 We refer to mentoring in this context as one-on-one, generally between a junior and senior faculty member.
policy. Even so, 94% of respondents did report having an informal mentoring policy.

The COACHE survey also asks questions related both to mentoring from within and from outside a faculty member’s department. One might assume that these two approaches to mentoring would have different objectives. The COACHE data, however, indicate a gap between the importance of mentoring and its effectiveness, as shown in the table below:

Table 1
COACHE Survey Mentoring Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Importance: % indicating that mentoring is &quot;important&quot; or &quot;very important&quot;</th>
<th>Effectiveness: % indicating &quot;somewhat agree&quot; or &quot;strongly agree&quot; that effective mentoring exists</th>
<th>% Indicating No Mentoring Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Inside Department</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Outside Department</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that although 83% of non-tenured faculty at JMU consider mentoring within their department to be either "important" or "very important", only 58% indicate any level of agreement that effective mentoring exists within their department. In fact, 9% indicate that no mentoring has been received from within their department.

An even larger gap is observed for mentoring outside of the department: 52% of non-tenured faculty at JMU consider mentoring outside their department to be either "important" or "very important", but only 23% indicate any level of agreement that effective mentoring exists outside their department, and 38% indicate that no mentoring has been received from outside their department. Note that although the AUH survey indicates a high level (94% of respondents) of informal mentoring, Table 1 demonstrates that only 58% of faculty report it as being effective. This suggests that although in some cases the informal approach is working well, there are many cases in which it is not perceived to be effective.

A variety of informal practices exist and there is a tendency to involve AUHs and/or PACs in the mentoring relationship in some way. In one academic unit, for example, each new faculty member is matched to a mentor who helps the junior faculty member prepare for milestones (e.g., annual reviews, mid-tenure review, tenure and promotion). An AUH respondent offered this example:

In their first year at JMU, all new department members are assigned a faculty mentor from the existing tenured or tenure-track faculty members. The mentors assist new faculty members in navigating department and university policies and procedures. As well, the mentors generally provide encouragement in pursuing research agendas, attending conferences, and making appropriate contacts in professional communities.

The nature of mentoring is generally positive in terms of helping new faculty members adjust to expectations, although some view mentoring as a remediation strategy for struggling faculty. In many cases a mentor is assigned, although sometimes the mentee chooses one or more tenured faculty mentor(s). Mentor and mentee pairing may be made due to a common interest or need, or due to the AUH’s best guess about making a positive match.

To understand how these varied practices compare to those outside our university, the task force gathered
data about best practices in mentoring from seven other institutions. Results showed that 57% of participating universities reported using a model in which mentors were assigned to mentees; 29% reported allowing mentors and mentees to self-select; and 14% reported using a combination of the assign/select models for pairing mentors and mentees. In almost equal numbers, mentors came from outside, within, or a combination of outside and within the department. Mentor-mentee relations were typically maintained for one year, although some were continued for two to three years’ time.

Given JMU faculty responses to COACHE survey items in relation to the importance of mentoring, we recommend the following:

**Recommendation 3:** Develop a strategic process for identifying exemplary models of faculty mentoring – both internal and external to James Madison University. Share these models with all faculty, Unit PACs, Academic Unit Heads, Associate Deans, and Deans. It is well documented in the literature that effective mentoring is correlated with faculty success and is tied to satisfaction with the tenure process (Trower, 2012). Further, studies find that irrespective of how formal or informal the mentoring may be, “the common denominator is that early career faculty are looked after by senior faculty members” (p. 155).

We believe that the Center for Faculty Innovation (CFI) can involve the faculty in the strategic process of identifying internal and external best practices. We also recommend the exploration of what Moody (2004) calls instrumental mentoring, which occurs when senior faculty “take the time to critique the scholarly work of junior faculty, nominate them for career-enhancing awards, include them in valuable networks and circles, collaborate with them on research or teaching projects, and arrange for them to chair conference sessions or submit invited manuscripts” (as cited in Trower, 2012, p. 155).

**Projected Cost:** None

**B. Holistic Support for Junior Faculty**

The area of holistic support for junior faculty includes satisfaction data within the following domains: facilities and work resources, personal and family policies, health and retirement benefits, salary, and appreciation and recognition. Given faculty members’ relative satisfaction with the University’s health and retirement benefits, our recommendations focus on changes - both small and sizable – to salary and personal/family policies.

Across both quantitative and qualitative datasets in COACHE, salary arose as the single most pervasive issue of dissatisfaction among tenure-track, early career faculty. Furthermore, our survey of Deans and Academic Unit Heads found that low salaries at JMU—in many cases, 30%-40% lower than alternative job offers—were the main factor in the loss of non-tenured faculty to competing institutions of higher education in the last five years (*Dean/AUH Survey*). Continuing to address this problem in meaningful and measurable ways should be of paramount importance if we intend to attract and retain quality faculty.

---

7 **Items to consider include:** where partnerships are assigned or self-selected; where mentors from inside or outside the department are used; where mentor-mentee relationships are sustained for the short-term or long-term; where the focus is on orientation, professional development, remediation, tenure and promotion, rejuvenation, etc.; where there is mentor training and support; where there are particular milestones and benchmarks; where the nature of the relationship between mentor and mentee is formal or informal; where there are factors contributing to a successful or unsuccessful mentoring relationship; and where the mentoring relationship involves confidentiality and sensitive matters.
As one AUH expressed in the survey, “We’ve spent the last six years hiring an impressive cohort of young faculty, which might have sustained JMU for 25-30 years. I’m afraid that we have squandered the opportunity to create the sense of institutional loyalty so crucial to the life of the university.”

1. **Satisfaction with Salary**

The COACHE Task Force recommendations on salary are reached independently from the Compensation Task Force, though we have consulted with them on this issue. From what we have learned from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), the following data points offer context for COACHE findings and our subsequent recommendations:

- Within JMU’s faculty salary peer group, consisting of 10 private and 15 public institutions, salaries at the 60th percentile ($82,400) are roughly $14,600 higher than JMU’s 2011 average. Per OIR, the cost to bring the JMU average to the 60th percentile is $13.5 million.
- Corrected for the 5% Virginia Retirement System (VRS) adjustment received by 28.8% of faculty, JMU is currently at a percentage rank of 21.3 for salaries within our peer group.
- JMU faculty members have received neither merit raises nor base increases to their salaries in five academic years.
- According to the AAUP’s *Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession* (Curtis & Thornton, 2013) the pay differential between private and public sectors of higher education is “still growing” – the current range of disparity among assistant professors is seven to 24 percent. In other words, a faculty member hired by JMU at $50,000 could expect to have been offered $53,500-$62,000 from a private-independent institution. Per Curtis and Thornton, “colleges and universities that ignore this point and attempt to underpay their faculty for the work they perform will increasingly confront labor markets where it is difficult to hire and retain the best faculty and where talented graduate students who could have been great faculty members choose nonacademic careers instead” (p. 18).
- Table 2, provided by OIR, indicates average salary by College and academic year for tenure-track faculty members at JMU. These data do not control for term of contract (10- vs. 12-month) or changes in base salary due to altered VRS contribution requirements. Of note, the column denoted AVG (mean) is not the best measure of central tendency for JMU salary data. Superseding all College mean salaries except for the College of Business (COB), these data suggest that the College of Business is an outlier, pulling up and thus inflating the overall mean. According to these data, the Colleges with the lowest mean salaries are the College of Visual and Performing Arts (CVPA) and the College of Arts and Letters (CAL).

COACHE data indicate **faculty dissatisfaction with salary** (x=2.33). Strikingly, these data are significantly lower than that of our COACHE peers and national cohort. Descriptively, our data indicate that JMU faculty rank below the 30th percentile; that is, participants are less satisfied with salary than are 70% of our peer and national cohort institutions, respectively. Internally, the study yielded small effect sizes by sex (men are more dissatisfied than women) and by race (white faculty are more dissatisfied than faculty of color).

Further analyses conducted by the OIR sensitized the task force to differences by College. At the time of the study, six Colleges existed in the University structure: College of Arts and Letters (CAL), College of Education (COE), College of Integrated Sciences and Technologies (CISAT), College of Science and Mathematics (CSM) and College of Visual and Performing Arts (CVPA). Effect sizes and significant differences were found with CAL (x=1.95), CISAT (x=2.46), and CVPA (x=2.25).
Table 2

Average JMU Salary by College for Tenure-Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACAD YEAR</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>CISAT</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>COB</th>
<th>COE</th>
<th>CSM</th>
<th>CVPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$50,785.42</td>
<td>$46,110.17</td>
<td>$41,741.53</td>
<td>$71,751.20</td>
<td>$50,032.70</td>
<td>$48,423.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$61,100.00</td>
<td>$49,451.29</td>
<td>$41,385.83</td>
<td>$72,895.17</td>
<td>$50,621.87</td>
<td>$45,513.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$62,089.86</td>
<td>$55,371.40</td>
<td>$42,048.69</td>
<td>$75,437.60</td>
<td>$50,349.45</td>
<td>$46,003.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$62,229.94</td>
<td>$55,443.60</td>
<td>$43,710.53</td>
<td>$79,985.15</td>
<td>$49,871.11</td>
<td>$48,495.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$66,335.63</td>
<td>$59,019.11</td>
<td>$45,882.84</td>
<td>$84,090.48</td>
<td>$51,811.29</td>
<td>$50,907.11</td>
<td>$44,870.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$70,774.50</td>
<td>$61,233.17</td>
<td>$47,170.22</td>
<td>$89,230.59</td>
<td>$51,936.24</td>
<td>$52,764.03</td>
<td>$46,050.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$75,527.81</td>
<td>$62,247.11</td>
<td>$48,729.82</td>
<td>$92,130.17</td>
<td>$55,200.67</td>
<td>$54,222.35</td>
<td>$47,973.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$73,278.38</td>
<td>$61,818.40</td>
<td>$50,405.70</td>
<td>$95,380.90</td>
<td>$59,249.68</td>
<td>$55,776.53</td>
<td>$49,509.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$70,456.36</td>
<td>$62,443.65</td>
<td>$50,378.63</td>
<td>$96,415.54</td>
<td>$57,458.89</td>
<td>$56,050.39</td>
<td>$48,987.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$73,043.00</td>
<td>$63,536.56</td>
<td>$50,994.09</td>
<td>$90,334.79</td>
<td>$57,548.35</td>
<td>$56,990.50</td>
<td>$47,833.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$73,591.57</td>
<td>$61,942.49</td>
<td>$52,938.08</td>
<td>$92,549.45</td>
<td>$57,916.00</td>
<td>$59,777.38</td>
<td>$49,173.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single most common problem identified by pre-tenured faculty in their narrative comments on the COACHE survey involves salary stagnation, inversion, and compression. Roughly one-third of the open-ended comments drove at salary issues, often triangulated with sub-themes related to lack of morale and distrust toward the administration. As one COACHE respondent wrote, “the faculty are in fact getting poorer due to inflation. This is an intolerable situation and is the number one reason why many younger faculty keep their eye on the job market.” Another respondent noted that “it is demoralizing to see colleagues who have been working here for many years without a raise. Further, it’s also demoralizing to perform at a high level and not be rewarded in any way other than a ‘pat on the back.’”

The following comment is particularly illustrative of the change desired by some respondents:

“Work actively to restore annual merit-based salary promotions. Work actively to provide adequate pay for tenured and tenure-track faculty [,] especially in addressing pay inversion and compression issues. As an assistant professor, I do not believe it will be feasible to stay at the University long-term if these issues are not addressed.”

In order to better understand where inequities exist across and within the University, the following data were requested: Average base and non-base salaries and raises by rank, department, and college (5 years); average base and non-base salaries and raises granted at the AUH level and above (5 years); and retention data. Much of these data were undeliverable by OIR due to internal policies precluding the release of information that might identify an individual or department. Finding a way to make this information available, even if not through OIR, is strongly recommended (refer to Section 3 for more detailed recommendations on information sharing).

Our additional recommendations are as follows:

✓ **Recommendation 4: Bring salaries to the 60th percentile** over the course of the next five academic years. While this will entail reprioritization of funds and new approaches to fundraising, we perceive the opportunity cost of not doing it (i.e., costs affiliated with attrition of excellent faculty, hiring and
search costs, etc.) to be significant. Please refer to the report and recommendations of the Compensation Task Force.
Projected cost: Reprioritization of $13.5 million per year, per OIR. Enacting such salary reforms, especially when made transparent, will help restore faculty members’ faith in the administrative agenda (refer to Section 3 of this report).

✓ Recommendation 5: Reinstate annual increases to faculty salaries; apportion merit increases that reflect faculty members’ contributions to the academic mission. This task force is encouraged by the recent memorandum dated 2/26/13 from President Alger announcing plans for a 3% base increase, which has since been approved by Governor McDonnell. Support for faculty members’ contribution to teaching, research, and service efforts that support students’ learning should be the University’s foremost priority. Mission-driven budgeting wherein both faculty and students are rewarded for extraordinary work is crucial. Ideally, pay increases should be separated into two allocations: a cost-of-living increase that is distributed to allow employees to keep up with inflation, and a separate merit increase that is distributed to high-performing employees.
Projected cost: Unknown.

✓ Recommendation 6: Triage inversion/compression salary remedies by focusing first on those units with lower salaries overall and with larger inversion/compression problems. While compression and inversion may privilege newly hired faculty, it damages the morale of those from whom such junior faculty require mentoring, peer review and collegial support. This, in turn, creates tension within the broader system. The task force supports continued and systematic action from the Administration that addresses the salary inversion and compression study done several years ago. Further, we recommend triaging remedies by focusing on the Colleges or units within which inversion and compression issues are most substantial. To varying degrees, best practices in remedying problems affiliated with inversion and compression are available from higher education consortia such as AAUP.
Projected cost: Unknown; Refer to Inversion Study.

✓ Recommendation 7: Establish a committee to investigate differential tuition models. This task force understands the market factors that drive differences in faculty salaries (e.g., starting salary for a humanities versus business professor). Several public institutions have developed differential tuition models within business (e.g., Iowa State) and engineering programs (e.g., Texas A&M) in order to pay faculty, scale courses and cover equipment costs. Of note, this task force is aware of a differential tuition plan proposed to the JMU Board of Visitors (BOV) –to be decided upon in June – that would entail a $50 per-credit-hour surcharge on COB majors. We share the Senate’s concern that implementation details be made concrete and transparent to JMU faculty.
Projected cost: Considerable cost savings.

✓ Recommendation 8: Focus on academic giving, and involve faculty in the campaign to do so. As JMU develops plans for its next capital campaign, we suggest a core focus on the cultivation of academic giving from donors and alumni. The Office of Development espouses a focus on support for “student-centered excellence” that aids “the university in its mission” (http://www.jmu.edu/development). However, there exists a sentiment among faculty that the University’s fundraising efforts have instead centered on support for athletics and auxiliary services.
Projected cost: Unknown
2. **Satisfaction with Personal and Family Policies**

According to the COACHE survey data, there are only two benchmarks (out of 20) in which JMU ranked in the bottom 30% of all institutions surveyed: “Personal and Family Policies” and “Leadership: Senior” (*Provost’s Report*, p. 15). Developing policies that are more equitable, more explicit, and uniformly applied across divisions and departments should be JMU’s foremost priority in this area. An overview of these issues may be found in the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2001) report entitled *Statement of Principles on Family Responsibilities and Academic Work*.

The particular items within the Personal and Family Policies area of the COACHE survey that received the lowest ratings included:

- Stop-the-clock policies (mean = 2.77)
- Childcare (2.13)
- Eldercare (2.52)
- Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange (2.15)

All of these items were classified as being in the bottom 30% of ratings as compared both to the cohort as a whole and our selected peer institutions (refer to *Provost’s Report*, p. 21). Perhaps surprisingly, white male faculty members at JMU consistently provided the most negative ratings on these items. The above areas are not merely “women’s issues,” as their critics often portray them; they are issues that have deep resonance for the faculty as a whole. Perhaps predictably, when COACHE responses were broken out by college, results were particularly strong in the two colleges with the most negative assessment of salary problems: CAL and CISAT.

We will offer recommendations in the following main topic areas. New items are added here that were not addressed directly in the original COACHE survey, but that nevertheless are seen as related and important.

- a. Gender and LGBT Equality Policies
- b. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) Policies
- c. Stop-the-Tenure-Clock Policies
- d. Spousal Hiring Policies
- e. Childcare and Eldercare Policies
- f. Tuition Waiver and Exchange Policies

**a) Gender and LGBT Equality Policies**

Though JMU has made many important advances regarding gender equality in recent years, the institution as a whole still has deficiencies. Campus groups such as the Madison Caucus for Gender Equality and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Ally Education Program Advisory Board have been working to improve the campus climate in these areas. Family-related employment policies affect all of those who have families. Such policies are especially important for pre-tenured women, insofar as they are more likely to be engaged in child-rearing activities during their first years following graduate school than their tenured colleagues. Some LGBT faculty have these concerns, as well as general concerns, about health coverage for their domestic partners or spouses.

Current JMU policies and practices that address these issues include the *Faculty Handbook* (2012) section III.J.1.b. (2) (Family and Medical Leave), and the *Manual of Policies and Procedures*, Policy 1308 on Family and Medical Leave (University Policy Committee, 2011). Beyond the information presented
there, it has been the practice of JMU to grant paid FMLA leave to eligible full-time faculty. In general, faculty do not seem to be aware of this generous practice.

According to the COACHE survey data, JMU ranked in the bottom 30% with respect to its cohort and peer institutions concerning pre-tenured faculty satisfaction with family policies. In regard to LGBT faculty, this is exacerbated by the following facts:

- JMU and the State of Virginia benefit policies are inequitable for LGBT married couples and their families when compared to heterosexual colleagues.
  - Per the laws of the Commonwealth (Department of Human Resources Management, 2010) regarding family leave, a spouse is a husband or wife as recognized under the laws of the Commonwealth for the purpose of marriage, which currently does not include non-heterosexual marriages.
  - Per the laws of the Commonwealth (Department of Human Resources Management, 2010) regarding spousal eligibility for health insurance benefits, the marriage must be recognized as legal in the Commonwealth of Virginia.
- Fundamental language in JMU non-discrimination policies does not cover transgender members of the community.

Furthermore, Euben’s (2005) AAUP study found that:

Nearly 300 colleges and universities now offer some kind of domestic partnership benefit, which may include insurance policies (health, disability, life); tuition remission; child care; family and bereavement leaves; and retirement plans. Currently, all Big Ten universities except for the University of Wisconsin-Madison provide and pay for domestic partner benefits. Seventy-four percent of the top 50 national four-year institutions as ranked by US News & World Report provide domestic partnership benefits… Public universities in 20 states provide benefits to employees’ domestic partners. Of those 20 states, 12 have laws or constitutional amendments banning recognition of same-sex marriage. The ACLU calculates that 18 of the 74 statewide university systems in the country provide domestic partner benefits, and 150 of the nation’s 530 individual state-funded universities provide benefits to employees’ same-sex partners.

Accordingly, we recommend the following:

- **Recommendation 9: Add gender identity and expression to JMU non-discrimination policies.**
  President Steger of Virginia Tech has announced public support for health and other benefits for partners of the Commonwealth’s employees. On April 16, 2013, the SAFEZONE listserv published Dr. Steger’s talking points for the spring 2013 Council of Presidents of Virginia Colleges and Universities meeting. The following resolution was noted and is endorsed fully by this task force: All state employees – including university faculty, administrators and staff – deserve protection from discrimination… Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender employees remain vulnerable in the workplace, not owing to performance but merely due to their sexual orientation or gender identity… Non-discrimination makes good business sense. Many of Virginia’s major corporations already incorporate benefits as well as nondiscrimination language, recognizing that it enhances efforts to attract and retain top employees. Without these measures, the Commonwealth’s colleges and state agencies are at a disadvantage as we compete with other major public and private universities across the nation to attract the most dynamic faculty and staff.

**Projected cost:** None.
✓ **Recommendation 10: Provide health insurance and FMLA-style coverage for domestic partners**
   (and their children) or, if not feasible given the State Constitution, provide a stipend fund to address the inequality of health care costs faced by domestic partnerships or marriages not recognized by the Commonwealth of Virginia as compared to those marriages legally recognized by the Commonwealth of Virginia. As noted above, Virginia Tech president Steger, on behalf of all Virginia public institutions, advocates offering insurance and family benefits to domestic partners and their families. **Projected cost:** Unknown.

### b) Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) Policies

The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), which provides job protection for specified family and medical conditions, was signed into law in 1993. In addition to the basic provisions of job protection and continuation of health insurance coverage, JMU has adopted the practice of providing paid leave for qualified full-time faculty members who are utilizing FMLA benefits. While there does not seem to be documentation for when this practice first went into effect, faculty utilizing FMLA benefits have been receiving paid leave for a number of years.

JMU currently addresses FMLA policies in the *Faculty Handbook* section III.J.1.b: Leave Without Pay (JMU Faculty Handbook, 2012). JMU’s official policy (Policy 1308) for FMLA is Policy 1308 (University Policy Committee, 2011).

The practice of providing paid leave for faculty who are utilizing FMLA benefits does not appear in writing in any “official” JMU documentation, online or otherwise. Until recently, many faculty and department heads were unaware of JMU’s paid leave practice. According to research (Yoest & Rhodes, 2004; as cited in Trower, 2012), the relationship between the use of family policies and the perceptions of departmental supportiveness is both positive and significant. That is, 84% of women whose departments are thought to be “very supportive” of FMLA actually took a leave. The number drops strikingly when one perceives one’s unit to be unsupportive.

According to the Office of Human Resources, the approximate number of faculty who utilized FMLA benefits during the past five years is as follows: 2008 (16), 2009 (35), 2010 (34), 2011 (30), 2012 (32). These numbers suggest that more faculty members first became aware of FMLA practices in 2009. Also, the current process of administering FMLA benefits seems to vary across campus. This involves a process of negotiation and communication between the faculty member, department head, and the Absence Programs Coordinator from Human Resources. Numerous peer coverage strategies have been implemented. Since FMLA benefits are administered on an individual “case by case” basis, there has been an inevitable lack of clarity, uniformity, and equity. In many peer coverage models, additional funding is required in order to compensate part-time or adjunct faculty. Currently, these additional funds are often the direct responsibility of the unit in which the individual faculty member serves. This tends to create a financial strain on these departments, especially those with tight budgets. In such departments, there might be a tendency for department heads to be less cooperative in working with a faculty member to devise an appropriate peer coverage strategy. In addition, junior faculty might be less inclined to take full advantage of FMLA benefits if they know it will cause a strain on their department’s budget or potentially count against them in some way in the tenure process.

The FMLA/Peer Coverage Subcommittee in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology generated an informal report on February 15, 2012; this report is available upon request from the head of Sociology and Anthropology. The committee gathered FMLA data and policies, where available, from peer institutions. This report serves as a basic model for how future study in this area could be implemented and has informed several of our recommendations.
We recommend the following:

✓ **Recommendation 11:** Clearly state the University’s practice of FMLA paid leave benefits in writing. This written policy should prominently appear in the *JMU Faculty Handbook* and on the Human Resources website. Another option is to create a parental care guidebook similar to that of the Ohio State University (2012), which centralizes all issues (both policies and practices) related to families. Every new faculty member should be provided with this information during his or her initial orientation session. In addition, every academic unit head should receive the updated FMLA information at the beginning of each academic year.

Projected cost: None.

✓ **Recommendation 12:** Develop a uniform peer coverage plan. A study of best practices among our peer institutions and cohort will likely need to take place. Such a plan would help provide clarity, uniformity, and equity in the administration of FMLA benefits across campus. We recommend, also, that this task force investigate the practice of extending FMLA benefits via uniform peer coverage to first-year full-time faculty.

Projected cost: None.

✓ **Recommendation 13:** Establish a pool of money in the university budget to help defray the departmental costs of peer coverage implementation. Relieve departments of the responsibility for providing additional funding (e.g., to support adjunct hiring). We concur with a recommendation from the Madison Gender Caucus (personal communication, January 2013) for the university to support a centralized system in Academic Affairs for funding and staffing FMLA leaves. If this were implemented, junior faculty would not need to find their own peer coverage, experience pressure in knowing that senior faculty would have to cover for them, or rely on department heads who may have conflicting interests.

Projected cost: Unknown. Per a memorandum generated by the co-chairs of the Madison Caucus on 4/18/13, Mr. Alger has asked HR Director Diane Yerian to investigate options.

c) **Stop the Tenure Clock Policies**

Stop-the-tenure-clock policies exist in order to allow tenure-track faculty additional time before going up for tenure in the case of extenuating circumstances that make a more traditional schedule difficult. Again, the significance of automatic stop-the-clock provisions is well documented in the literature (Jaschik, 2009; Williams & Norton, 2008; and Draco & Williams, 2008 as cited in Trower, 2012). The most common case in which this is applicable involves pregnancy and childbirth; many academic women put off starting families during graduate school, and thus they are often faced with a choice between having children or progressing speedily towards tenure. Other major medical events (in one’s own case, or in the case of one’s family members) also can make timely progression to tenure more difficult. JMU currently addresses stop-the-clock policies in the *Faculty Handbook* (2012) section III.E.7.c: Suspensions.

In our survey of Deans and Academic Unit Heads, it was found that there is some variation from department to department regarding how such requests are handled. Most departments rely upon the faculty member to request such a stop-the-clock accommodation. However, there is significant concern that untenured faculty members, rightly or wrongly, often perceive asking for such accommodations as a negative mark against them. Other universities have attempted to alleviate this concern by making stop-the-clock policies automatic, rather than having them request-based. This is referred to as having an automatic “opt-out” policy, rather than JMU’s current policy, which is an “opt-in” policy.
We recommend the following:

**Recommendation 14:** Develop an opt-out (automatic stop-the-clock) rather than an opt-in policy. Pre-tenure faculty members are doubly vulnerable, so this policy – a stop-the-clock provision – would take effect whenever an FMLA request is granted. As with FMLA requests, this too should be handled centrally, rather than at the departmental level. Again, such a policy should centrally appear in a “one-stop-shop” guidebook or manual.

Projected cost: None. We calculate that this will likely save the university some money, as some promotion-related pay raises would be delayed. Furthermore, this may enhance faculty satisfaction and deter attrition.

**d) Spousal Hiring Policies**

While some departments at JMU may at times put into effect various spousal hiring procedures on an *ad hoc* basis (e.g., to fill certain part-time positions within the department), JMU currently lacks a formal university-wide policy regarding spousal hires. Furthermore, individual departments’ *ad hoc* hiring practices at JMU usually focus on academic appointments for a “trailing” spouse, and not on helping the faculty spouse to find non-academic employment within the wider community.

An influential Stanford University report entitled “Dual-Career Academic Couples” found that 36% of academics in the United States have an academic spouse, and called spousal hiring “the next great challenge facing universities” (Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research, 2008). As noted in the Duke Chronicle, George McLendon, Dean of Arts and Sciences at Duke University, has found that spousal hiring leads to greater diversity among faculty, increases the prestige of departments in which spousal hiring occurs, and leads to more successful recruitment and retention of high-quality faculty (Mahuta, 2006).

Finally, Trower (2012) indicates that when providing dual-career assistance, “long-term domestic partners (regardless of gender) must be assisted accordingly...[and] should a [partner] require employment, a central financing office should be created in order to fund both short-and long-term academic and administrative positions” (p. 75). Such practices help mitigate what is commonly referred to as the “trailing spouse” gap.

We recommend the following:

**Recommendation 15:** Create a well-defined spousal hiring policy or protocol at the university-wide level.

Projected cost: None other than staff resources in creating the policy. Frankly, investing in spouses may save the University money by scaling partners into one benefit plan. This may also prevent the attrition of faculty who leave the university when their partners cannot find work.

**Recommendation 16:** Allow spouses and partners to access the resources of the Office of Career and Academic Planning (CAP) in order to seek local employment. Other universities and colleges allow this practice, formally or informally.

Projected cost: None beyond the current budgetary allocations of CAP.
✓ **Recommendation 17:** Create a mechanism whereby unit heads consult with Human Resources regarding available positions for ‘trailing’ spouses or partners.
Projected cost: None.

✓ **Recommendation 18:** Consider the creation of 1.5x appointments, in which an academic couple shares an appointment equivalent to 1.5 FTE (vs. two faculty lines). Such appointments are becoming more commonplace (e.g., UT-Austin, University of Nebraska, Whitman College, etc.). In some cases when a new or .5x position is created within the same unit as one’s partner, a central funding office funds the new hire’s salary for the first year, alleviating potential departmental tensions (Trower, 2012).
Projected cost: None; such appointments may actually save or defray costs, allowing for the creation of more flexible faculty lines.

e) **Childcare and Eldercare Policies**

This task force is aware of efforts, both historic and current, to establish a childcare center at JMU. Thus, our report serves to underscore and emphasize the importance of this need. Currently, JMU has no childcare or eldercare benefits for existing faculty. Though there are multiple childcare options in Harrisonburg and the surrounding area, having an on-campus facility would be especially beneficial to nursing mothers and families of young children. With JMU’s recent land and office space purchases, there is an increased likelihood that a suitable on-campus location for a childcare center can be found – yet this will entail reprioritization of both space and funding.

During a recent town hall meeting with the Madison Commission, a faculty member in Education discussed the difficulty many education students have in finding local placements for the practicum experiences they need to have with young children. And as the AAUP (2001) report cited above states, faculty members derive peace of mind from knowing that their children are receiving quality care and that the facility has long-term stability. If the institution has an early childhood education program, the opportunity to use the facility for training students provides an additional benefit and contributes to high standards of childcare.

We recommend the following:

✓ **Recommendation 19:** Form a childcare committee or task force to investigate the creation of an on-campus, full-time daycare center. According to the Madison Caucus on Gender Equality, an on-site facility fosters employee work-life balance, constitutes a recruiting tool, provides placement opportunities for students, cultivates research options for faculty, and more. The possible location, costs, and benefits to pre-professional students and faculty should be among the items considered and investigated. The committee or task force should include broad representation (from both faculty and staff) and include at least one university official with expertise in space and budget allocations. Since our initial formulation of this recommendation, we are encouraged to have learned from the Madison Caucus on Gender Equality that Mr. Alger has asked Human Resources to investigate options for this project.
Projected cost: Unknown. (The use of practicum students would defray costs; the University may also find an on-site center to be profitable in spite of its affordability to faculty and staff. Of note, child development centers provide fertile ground for best practices in teaching, research and outreach, often leading to significant opportunities for grant-related funding.)
**Recommendation 20:** Form an eldercare committee or task force to investigate the plausibility of an eldercare center, perhaps in conjunction with Nursing, Gerontology or Graduate Psychology. As is common in intergenerational care programs such as Harrisonburg’s *Generations Crossing*, the colocation of eldercare and childcare may prove valuable. A model worth investigating further is that of Virginia Tech, whose *Neighbors Growing Together (NGT)* program combines adult day services with its child development center. At a minimum, a resource center on campus to help faculty members find information about programs currently available in the area would be welcome. See Sara Elizabeth Gentile's 2008 JMU Honors Thesis, “What Are the Unmet Needs of Employed Caregivers at James Madison University?” for a detailed exploration of eldercare issues and programs in the Harrisonburg area.

Projected cost: Unknown. For the long-term, benefits will far outweigh cost if initiatives such as NGT – which has won national, regional and university awards and grants – are considered good measures of success.

**f) Tuition Waiver and Exchange Policies**

Many universities and colleges provide some form of tuition benefit to college-age children of faculty members. Some programs allow qualified children of faculty members to attend other consortium-member universities and colleges at a reduced tuition rate or with free tuition. Similarly, many institutions offer free or reduced tuition at the home institution to qualified children of faculty members. Currently JMU has no such program in place, but the Virginia Senate has recently passed a bill authorizing such programs for universities that want to fund them on their own. At present, both the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Office of the President have expressed interest in investigating free or reduced tuition opportunities for JMU employees. The relevant portion of Senate Bill No. 1290 is excerpted in Figure 1.

We have one recommendation:

**Recommendation 21:** Form a committee or task force to investigate the feasibility of instituting a tuition exchange or remission program at JMU. This team can begin by looking at institutions (both private and public) with such programs:

- University of Richmond (private)
- Bridgewater College (private)
- St. Mary’s College of Maryland (public)

Projected cost: Unknown.
## Advocacy and Representation

Advocacy and representation constitutes faculty satisfaction with senior leadership, divisional leadership, and departmental leadership, collegiality, engagement, and quality.

On the whole, junior faculty are satisfied, if not highly satisfied, with their departments along the lines of leadership, collegiality, engagement, and quality. According to the *Provost’s Report*, this is a positive trend: “While faculty work at institutions, they work in departments; therefore, it is the departmental culture that has the most impact on faculty satisfaction and morale” (p. 32). The items below point to areas within which faculty are dissatisfied; these findings are contextualized by additional data and recommendations are provided.

### 1. Satisfaction with Senior Leadership

Both the quantitative results and qualitative comments indicate significant dissatisfaction with senior leaders. JMU faculty ranked satisfaction in the bottom 30% on every item in this benchmark area, whether compared to our peer institutions or the national cohort: President/Chancellor pace of decision-making (3.13), stated priorities (3.13), and communication of priorities (2.98); and Chief Academic Officer (i.e., Provost) pace of decision-making (3.17), stated priorities (3.14), and communication of priorities (2.97). Notably, these data were universally and significantly lower in CAL (ranging from 2.58-2.86). While former administrators (Linwood Rose, Douglas Brown) were in place when the survey was conducted, many of the below-noted perceptions endure to varying degrees.
Qualitative comments about senior leadership were consistently negative in tone and indicated a high level of rancor. This is striking, in that the faculty completing this survey had all been here less than 6 years, which is not what our task force would typically consider enough time to become jaded and cynical. One qualitative comment, for instance, described a senior administrator as “incompetent, callous, and totally uninterested in supporting the academic staff.” Another stated that JMU had the “worst leadership and set of priorities that I have ever witnessed at a single university.” We note that these are representative of the open-ended comments about senior leadership. We attribute the findings in this area to four primary concerns or perceptions that arise from the data: poor communication, senior administration pay increases, hiring practices, and athletic spending:

**Issue 1: Poor communication of decisions made by senior administration**

JMU has grown dramatically in the last 10 years. Communication methods that were appropriate in the past are no longer effective; the current communication structure – though steadily improving under Mr. Alger’s leadership (e.g., QEP video series, e-mails that communicate Commonwealth of Virginia and Board of Visitors decisions) – is in need of rebuilding. Often, faculty members do not understand why decisions are made, despite attempts such as a fall 2012 campus-wide presentation on allocating the university budget. It is important to note that each department also has a Faculty Senate representative who is voted upon or assigned within the home department.

JMU is no longer a small university, as indicated by one COACHE survey respondent: “Recognize that the growth of the university means faculty salaries and teaching loads should be reevaluated.” Another stated that we should “stop clinging to the fiction that JMU offers an experience akin to a small-size liberal arts institution.” Furthermore, according to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV, 2012), on-campus student enrollment for all degree- and non-degree seeking students is projected to increase by 1.5% during the 2013-2014 academic year, with additional projections pointing to an increase to 1.7% by 2015-2016.

This task force believes that open, transparent communication is a powerful arbiter. Transparency entails enhancing communication channels, thus empowering the Faculty Senate to fulfill its stated responsibilities, while giving faculty at all ranks the opportunity to liaise with administrators on integral decision-making processes (e.g., athletic spending, budget decision-making, etc.). Specifically, our recommendations entail the following:

- **Recommendation 22:** Work at sharing information (verbally and in writing) about *how and why* decisions are made. There is a gap between administrators’ and faculty members’ perceptions of transparency. Assumptions should be espoused and reinforced across all levels. It was suggested that the Provost meet with unit heads on a regular basis, so that the unit heads would feel included in the administrative decisions of the university. Further, unit heads would have someone to communicate with directly and in person, so that when they hear a concern welling up from the ground level, they could ensure that it be addressed in a timely fashion. Other suggestions to improve communication include periodically hosting an open house (e.g., Dean Lovell does this on a regular basis for any faculty in the College of Health and Behavioral Sciences), or establishing monthly or bi-monthly meetings that involve different members of the upper administration and invite faculty to engage in open dialogue. In addition, the administration might partner with a faculty entity (e.g., Senate, Center for Faculty Innovation) to host events that allow administrators to inform faculty regarding decision-making. For instance, the president of Manchester University, which was designated an “Honor Roll Institution” on the Chronicle of Higher Education’s 2012 “Great Places to Work For” survey, has regular meetings (3-4 per semester) with faculty and staff, at which they are welcome to bring up any concerns.
To enhance the role of the departmental Faculty Senate representative and increase transparency in general, we encourage each department to allow its departmental senator to provide an overview of important topics discussed at the most recent Senate meeting. A town hall meeting with a question and answer session or listening tour approach may also be effective, similar to what President Alger has conducted during the first eight months in office. The faculty ombudsperson could also work to facilitate communication between faculty and upper administration, during the events suggested here or through other mechanisms. Also, we recommend that JMU periodically convene a task force to reassess the current state of the relationship between faculty and senior administration, and to put forth evolving recommendations to strengthen these ties.

Projected cost: None

✓ **Recommendation 23: Systematically engage faculty in the decision-making process**, so that even if they do not agree with the decisions, they understand them and feel that they have a voice in the process. Importantly, selecting representative faculty in a systematic fashion, from a wide array of disciplines and with a variety of experience would better serve the university’s decision-making process. For instance, the administration may consider sending out an electronic poll to inquire about faculty members’ previous experience and interest level in serving on university-wide committees. Additionally, Faculty Senate representatives may serve to recruit interested faculty from their academic units to serve on university committees and task forces. Alternatively, sending an invitation letter via campus mail from the upper administration to recruit faculty to participate in strategic planning-specific committees tends to be very effective.

Projected cost: None

✓ **Recommendation 24: Give more power to the faculty**. The Chronicle of Higher Education identifies collaborative governance as one of 12 key factors in identifying great places to work in higher education. Currently, the JMU faculty body has little power in comparison to that of peer institutions. Consider the Faculty Senate, supposedly the highest-level faculty body on campus. A look at its website shows that its purpose is “Offering suggestions…”, “Consulting with…”, “Offering recommendations…”, “Participating in…”, and “Working with…” In conjunction with the Board of Visitors, the Faculty Senate could be given real power over curriculum, courses, degree requirements, awards, and honors. The Senate should also have a stronger voice regarding admission requirements, as well as the university calendar and course schedules. Finally, we note that the AAUP is re-forming on campus to help ensure faculty representation in decision-making, and we encourage the senior administration to support this effort.

Projected cost: None

**Issue 2: Senior administration pay increases**

In spite of a lack of raises for faculty, staff, and other administrators, the senior administration continues to see its pay increase – in some cases dramatically (Collegiate Times, 2012). For example, former President Rose received a $66,000 raise in 2008, and four senior administrators received raises last year totaling over $210,000 (Collegiate Times). While some pay increases are perhaps justifiable by changes in responsibilities or comparisons with peer institutions, many faculty members see this as unacceptable at a time when they, and lower ranked staff, are being asked to make sacrifices. Such increases also make a statement to faculty that administrators do not consider themselves “all together one” with their academic counterparts. For instance, one faculty respondent to the COACHE survey voiced his or her concern as follows, “[Administrators] are only concerned for [themselves]. [An example is] the $60k raise the [former President] accepted when no other faculty has had a raise in 5 years. That is disgusting.”
The qualitative data indicate that faculty dissatisfaction with administrators is tied to the compensation crisis. Finding ways to increase pay for faculty and staff is central, thus reinforcing the recommendations made by this task force regarding compensation. While it is true that there are budgetary constraints, the view of many faculty is that the senior administration has control over far more than it will admit. There are basically two main sources of funds: the state and the students. While the state maintains tight control over how state funds are spent, the senior administration and Board of Visitors decides how much students pay, and what portion of those funds goes to tuition versus fees. Given the quality of our institution and its faculty, it should not be a point of pride that JMU is inexpensive when this lack of investment in faculty harms the very students we aim to help.

**Issue 3: Hiring practices**

The COACHE data point to a perception that we do not apply the same hiring practices for the senior administration that we do for all other positions in the university. Anecdotally, it is often stated as a point of pride that 60% of the senior Vice Presidents have never worked for any place other than JMU, 40% graduated from the University, and several have been promoted without having gone through a national search process. On the other hand, faculty members are almost always hired through rigorous searches, bringing rich experience and perspectives from other institutions. When faculty perceive that this is not true of the upper administration, it is easy to see why there is lack of overall trust and respect. Rigorous hiring practices and external searches are critical to hiring the most competent senior leaders and to maintaining diversity of perspective. Our recommendations are as follows:

**Recommendation 25: Conduct rigorous external searches for all administrative hires.** The University has already moved in this direction, since President Alger was hired externally and through a multifaceted search process. However, Mr. Alger has made one interim position permanent and promoted one administrator from within – both without having conducted national searches. This task force also recommends the hiring of administrators whose terminal degrees endear them to faculty as traditionally trained scholars.

*Projected cost:* Minimal (and infrequent). Costs would be incurred in advertising positions nationally and in bringing in candidates from outside the area.

**Recommendation 26: Increase diversity in the senior administration,** especially in terms of discipline background. Per COACHE data, the senior leadership is viewed most negatively by faculty in the College of Arts and Letters, and to a lesser degree by the College of Science and Mathematics. JMU prides itself on being a large public university that has the advantages of a small liberal arts college (e.g., an expansive academic curriculum). In fact, JMU points to the liberal general education program with great pride. However, there is minimal representation (i.e., currently only two faculty members) from the liberal arts serving in senior administration at JMU. One open-ended COACHE survey response suggests that the administration “[d]evelop and enforce a culture based on objective standards and principles, and genuine respect for and active protection of diversity beyond their appearance on paper or in talk. Programs such as this survey are useful steps in such a positive direction.”

*Projected cost:* Minimal.

**Issue 4: Spending on athletics**

According to the American Council of Trustees and Alumni [ACTA] Report (2012), administrative costs at James Madison University increased by 125.3 percent, whereas instructional costs grew by a mere 62 percent. While JMU claims to have a mission related primarily to academics, many junior faculty see a large disconnect between stated values and observed values. The two biggest ticket items are: 1) the
expanded football stadium (cost: $62.5 million, paid for primarily with student fees) and 2) the athletic fields at Neff and Port Republic. While funds have not been available for faculty raises, monies appear available for adding on to the football stadium and building intramural sports fields – expenditures that are not seen by faculty as central to the mission of the institution, as evidenced by one faculty member’s comment that “the expansion of football stadiums, the accumulation of administrators, and the like can wait.”

According to the NCAA Finances Database published by USA Today Sports (2012), JMU subsidizes athletics more than most universities. In addition, JMU has one of the highest percentages of tuition that is allotted specifically to athletics (USA Today reported 14%, which was $1,114 of the in-state mandatory tuition of $7,860 in 2010), which has affected faculty morale. For instance, one faculty member remarked, “morale is extremely low because there have been no raises for 5 years, yet the university can spend a great deal of money on building a new football stadium, etc.” It is clear that there are academic buildings also being built; however, there are concerns about how funds are allocated to academics properly-so-called, as evidenced by one junior faculty member’s open-ended COACHE survey response: “We have a new football stadium but no new classrooms, we need more faculty but [dollars are] spent on ‘digital measures,’ ‘classroom technology,’ ‘assessment,’ Gen-ed… Meanwhile, traditional departments such as biology, psychology, philosophy, English, sociology, have NO money, low faculty morale, and no ability to expand.”

**Recommendation 27: Delay athletic expansion until salary issues are remedied.** This task force acknowledges that the other side of the football stadium will also be expanded in time and that JMU may be joining the bowl series. Among faculty, this points to an increase in spending, which leads to inferences regarding a downturn in academic support. JMU should wait to expand athletics until it has raised the funds through external sources and then be very public about the fact that students will not be paying for that expansion.

**Projected cost:** None

### 2. Satisfaction with Units

There is a relatively strong sense from the data that faculty are satisfied with their departments and with leadership at the unit head level. Faculty are fairly satisfied with their deans, also. Data are as follows:

- Head/Chair pace of decision-making (3.88), stated priorities (3.94⁸), communication of priorities (3.86), ensuring faculty input (3.99), and fairness in evaluating work (4.13);
- and Dean pace of decision-making (3.44), stated priorities (3.45), communication of priorities (3.23⁹), and ensuring faculty input (3.29).

This is very important and the administration at JMU should see this as an area of strength. There are likely many reasons that faculty feel a stronger level of support for their unit heads than for the senior administration. This discrepancy suggests that the manner in which department heads are being selected, and the jobs that they are doing, is a strength that should be further built upon.

Nevertheless, at least in some departments, a positive perception of the academic unit head is not the case, as evidenced by one COACHE survey respondent.

I think the administration needs to become more aware and more pro-active in dealing with

---

⁸ This item scored significantly higher than both the cohort and peer group means.

⁹ Amongst the Dean scores, this was the only item that scored below the cohort and peer group means.
department problems. Our department is ruled by a small group of senior faculty that dominate every aspect of the department life - direction, vision etc. No change is possible when the senior faculty hold all power and refuse all efforts at change or revisions to the program or the way in which the department functions.

Another open-ended COACHE survey comment indicated that “[t]here is absolutely no sense of accountability, fairness, or respect. I see favoritism, decisions made to benefit those in power, a lack of commitment to diversity, sexism, a total lack of leadership and collegiality in my department.” Such negative perceptions - albeit not the norm - warrant further attention and should be addressed. Some suggested efforts include regular departmental meetings (once or twice per semester) between individual faculty members and the academic unit head, and department-based task forces or committees that meet regularly to specifically discuss and address current departmental issues. This could include supervising department chairs, as one COACHE respondent suggested. Finally, some training for new AUHs would be beneficial.

VII. Summary and Next Steps

This report’s recommendations focus on areas within which the faculty and administrators of James Madison University may work to improve its policies, practices, and morale of the faculty. As is the case in most reports from committees and task forces, emphasis is necessarily placed on areas that require attention and renewal. Still, the University’s strengths – its best areas – should not be underscored. The COACHE data demonstrate significant highlights, among them our quality of colleagues, support of colleagues, and sense of fit. With regard to our faculty members’ satisfaction with quality of colleagues and support of colleagues, for instance, it is notable that we rank second amongst our peers and 9th in the national cohort. Faculty are also satisfied with the recognition and appreciation they receive – for teaching, scholarship, service, outreach, and advising – from their colleagues and unit heads.

This task force requests that the senior administration make transparent the decisions made in response to our recommendations. We look forward to opportunities that involve future dialogue with administrators, faculty, and other University-level committees and task forces.
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IX. Appendices
**Appendix A: Summary of Recommendations**

*Group* refers to the clustered benchmark area from the COACHE dataset analyzed by this task force.  
*Recommendation* refers to this task force’s empirically derived conclusion.  
*Level* refers to the area of university structure or governance that may be charged with carrying out the recommendation.  
*Priority* refers to the level of immediacy that should be assigned to carrying forward the noted recommendation. Level 1 priorities should be exacted first, followed by Level 2 priorities. Level 3 priorities are of importance to faculty, but may necessitate additional time for exploration and action.  
*Reference* refers to the page in the COACHE Provost’s Report wherein the corresponding data are revealed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career enhancement and development</td>
<td>Identify exemplary models of tenure clarity.</td>
<td>Faculty10</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career enhancement and development</td>
<td>Conduct a comparative analysis of the tenure review information across Units.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career enhancement and development</td>
<td>Develop a strategic process for identifying exemplary models of faculty mentoring (internal and external).</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Bring salaries to the 60th percentile.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Reindstate annual increases to faculty salaries and apportion merit increases.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>p. 21, p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Triage inversion/compression salary remedies by focusing first on those units with lower salaries overall and with larger inversion/compression problems.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>p. 21, p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Investigate differential tuition models.</td>
<td>Senior; collaborate with faculty11</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Focus on academic giving – and involve faculty in the campaign.</td>
<td>Senior; collaborate with faculty</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Add gender identity and expression to JMU non-discrimination policies.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Provide health insurance and FLMA-style coverage for domestic partners (and their children).</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Clearly state the University’s practice of FMLA paid leave benefits in writing.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Develop a uniform peer coverage plan.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Establish a pool of money in the university budget to help defray the departmental costs of peer coverage implementation.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 At this level, this task force recommends empowering a faculty group (e.g., senate, AAUP, CFI, task force or committee) to carry out the recommendation.  
11 The full task force report recommends various media for senior administrators to collaborate with faculty in support of these recommendations, e.g., committees, task forces, CFI fellowship groups, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holistic support for faculty</th>
<th>Develop an opt-out (automatic stop-the-clock) rather than an opt-in policy.</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>p. 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Create a well-defined spousal hiring policy or protocol at the university-wide level.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>p. 21, p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Allow spouses and partners to access the resources of the Office of Career and Academic Planning (CAP) in order to seek local employment.</td>
<td>Senior; collaborate with CAP</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>p. 21, p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Create a mechanism whereby unit heads consult with Human Resources regarding available positions for “trailing” spouses/partners.</td>
<td>Senior; collaborate with unit heads</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>p. 21, p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Consider the creation of 1.5x appointments.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>p. 21, p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Investigate the creation of an on-campus, full-time daycare center.</td>
<td>Senior; collaborate with faculty</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Investigate the plausibility of an eldercare center.</td>
<td>Senior; collaborate with faculty</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic support for faculty</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of instituting a tuition exchange or remission program.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and representation</td>
<td>Work at sharing information (verbally and in writing) about how any why decisions are made.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>p. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and representation</td>
<td>Systematically engage faculty in the decision-making process.</td>
<td>Senior; collaborate with faculty</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and representation</td>
<td>Give more power to the faculty.</td>
<td>Senior; collaborate with faculty</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>p. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and representation</td>
<td>Conduct rigorous external searches for all administrative hires.</td>
<td>Senior; thoroughly involve faculty</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and representation</td>
<td>Increase diversity in the senior administration.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>p. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and representation</td>
<td>Delay athletic expansion until salary-related issues are remedied.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>p. 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>