



## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, November 7, 2013 - Taylor 306

**In attendance:** McGraw (Speaker); Art & Art History: Welter; Biology: Rife; Comm. Sci. & Disorders: Johnson (alternate); Comm. Studies: Nelson; Comp Info Sys & Bus Analyt: Wang; Computer Science: Heydari; Economics: Grant; Engineering: Harper; English: Hefner; Finance & Bus Law: Drake (alternate); Foreign Languages: O'Donnell; Geology: Whitmeyer; Health Sciences: Burnett; History: Davidson; Hosp., Sports & Rec MGT: Shonk; ISAT: Benton; Justice Studies: Parsons; Kinesiology: Nye; Learning, Tech & Leadership Ed.: Estes; Lib & Ed Tech: Mungin; Management: Stark; Marketing: Larsen; Mathematics and Statistics: C. Lubert; Media Arts & Design: Leidholdt; Mid, Second & Math: Carbaugh; Music: Hayes; Nursing: Knopp; Philosophy & Religion: Piper; Physics: Giovanetti; Political Science: H. Lubert; Psychology: DuVall; Social Work: Poe; Sociology/Anthropology: Solometo (alternate); Theater & Dance: Sherrill; Writing Rhetoric & Tech Comm: Lunsford; Part-time Faculty: Harlacker; Student/SGA: Humphries; **Guests** – Provost: Benson; Vice-Provost: Gonzalez; Breeze: Chan.

**I. Call to Order** – 3:44p

**II. Approval of October's Minutes** – Approved

- **Approval of the Special Meeting on Athletics Minutes** – Approved

**III. Provost's Report**

- a. **Faculty Survey via JLARC** – The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) was commissioned by the legislature to examine higher education. Their first report, released in September, was on auxiliary services (including athletics), and the next report, Review of Academic Spending and Workload at Virginia's Public Higher Education Institutions, will be released on December 9 (publicly available); solicited a great deal of budget information, credit-hour production for various majors, etc.
- b. **Compensation Advisory Council (see attached)** – During their first meeting, they proposed one recommendation coming from the Compensation Task Force that an adjustment be made to the salary bumps that are given from assistant to associate and from associate to full professors. Proposal is that the following modifications be enacted: \$3,500 to \$5,000 for associate & \$5,000 to \$7,500 for full professor. Over time, this will help us some with the compression that has developed. Implementation would mean that faculty previously promoted would not be retroactively compensated. Also, someone who is being promoted with the proposed bump may have a salary higher than some existing, especially recently promoted, faculty at the new rank. If decided, it could go into effect for the faculty going up this year.
  - a. Take this info back to your departments and colleagues for feedback.

- c. **Honorary Degrees** – President Alger has been interested in formalizing the process and making the process more purposeful to help advance us as a university. Planning committee worked on this process. Criteria will be released to the University in terms of candidate selection.

#### IV. Speaker's Report

- a. **Budget Committee** – Chair, Nancy Poe, has decided to step down due to workload issues. The committee has elected a new chair, Art Hamilton (Business & Finance Law); his Alternate is filling in for him this semester, but Art will be able to join us for meetings in the spring semester.
- b. **Final Exam Schedule 2014** – Graduation in the spring on Friday, May 9, 2014 (i.e., no exams on Friday 5/9). For 2014, there is not a lot we can do, as it is a constraint that we must work around due to the extent of planning that has occurred and contracts that are in place. The original plan announced by the Registrar was to use Saturday 5/3 as a regular exam day, but after feedback from the Senate, the Registrar has put Friday 5/2 into place as the first final exam day. The Academic Policies Committee has been assigned to discuss recommendations for 2015.
- c. **Athletics Issue** – We have several resolutions currently on the table. We can continue further discussions on the resolutions during future Senate meetings. Today is a first reading, so Senators can take the resolutions back to their department for feedback.
  - a. David's proposed resolution (see attached) is framed in light of the long-term needs of the Senate in relation to the Administration. Over the past year, we have had a good working relationship with the Administration and have made good progress because of such. David's proposal also highlights the kind of things we want the Administration to focus on, such as the academic culture and for students to get a good value for their money.
  - b. The Administration may have more facts than we do to inform their final decision; therefore, a mere thumbs-up or thumbs-down vote may be mute.

#### V. Committee Reports

##### A. Treasurer's Report

- Flower Fund Account: \$5,019.74; Funds collected at last two meetings: \$674.06; Interest earned \$0.04
- Flower Fund Used: One donation for Paul Bierly

##### B. Faculty Concerns – No report.

##### C. Academic Policies

- Met October 24; one item discussed the possibility of implementing a reading period prior to final exams similar to what is implemented at other universities; spring semester is three days longer than fall semester; if we do this in the spring, the fall presents more challenges due to when grades are due, entered, and released by the Registrar's Office. For example, even if we were to begin the fall semester a couple days earlier, it would impact many calendars, including when students move-in, sports teams, and the grounds staff's projects.

- Met with Theresa Gonzalez and Dean Gowan (COB) - Starting next fall, most COB courses will have a differential tuition of \$50/credit hour. Of the additional revenue generated through differential tuition, 15% will stay in the Provost Office; 15% for financial aid to COB students; 70% will go to the COB to support their program – e.g., labs, grants, other program costs. There is no stipulation that the fees cannot be used for salaries. However, primary goal is to attract and retain COB faculty. There is the potential that differential tuition could be applied to other programs that meet the criteria set forward for the COB decision.

**D. Student Relations** – No report.

**E. Faculty Appeals** – No cases to report.

**F. Budget** – Nomination and election of Art Hamilton as the new chair.

**G. Nominations and Elections** – No report.

**H. Other Committee Reports**

- **Course Evaluation Steering Committee (Morgan Benton)**
  - Student Evaluations of Teaching Task Force (Spring 2012; has since disbanded).
  - Motivation – Need to provide an eval for online courses (implemented in Summer 2012); provide a uniform experience; save time, paper, and money.
  - History and Timeline – Fall 2011 (proposals from various companies → eXplorance Blue); Spring 2012 (Student Eval of Teaching Task Force – report); Summer 2012 – Blue for Online Courses; system will become available for all faculty to use by Fall 2014, but not required.
  - Features of Blue – Eventually available via MyMadison; instructor can add up to 10 scaled questions and 10 open-ended questions (only faculty member would have access to those questions); dept. questions would be accessible by AUH; comments would be in digital format, which would make developing the annual reports and tenure packages more manageable; can be generated individually, aggregated, and presented as longitudinal reports.
  - Current Status – Informational website to launch soon; pilots continuing through Spring 2014; system will be available for all departments beginning Fall 2014; Eventually, all depts. will be expected to adopt this system, but no timeline has been set.
  - Five University-wide items (these are required):
    - i. The course was intellectually challenging.
    - ii. Instructor conveyed enthusiasm about the course.
    - iii. Instructor was well prepared for classes.
    - iv. Instructor explained course material clearly.
    - v. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.

- Issues/Concerns
  - i. Access to data/reports (evaluation of teaching will remain the purview of departments).
  - ii. Response rates/quality (based on research, averages tend to stay the same and qualitative comments tend to be longer - although the response rates are lower than traditional format).
  - iii. Requirement to use/implementation schedule (still an unresolved issue).

## **VI. New Business**

- **Resolution on Domestic Partner Benefits (see attached)**
  - Originally from the College of William and Mary
  - Move for First Reading – approved
  - Take back to your departments for discussion within the next month - discussion to follow during December's meeting.
- **Resolutions on Athletics Issue (see attached resolutions)**
  1. Louwers Resolution - Summary: The Senate approves the move to FBS if it can be done without raising student fees, and assuming alumni and athletic donors increase to a certain level. Motion had first reading; discussion during December's meeting.
  2. Harper Resolution – Summary: The Senate urges the administration to consider a wider range of options in its analysis, including the option of having no football team. Motion had first reading; discussion during December's meeting.
  3. McGraw Resolution – Summary: The Senate identifies the values that it wishes the administration to consider in making a decision on football conference changes, but does not specify a certain outcome with respect to moving to FBS. Motion had first reading; discussion during December's meeting.
  4. Political Science (Lubert) Resolution – Summary: The Senate urges the administration and BOV not to make a decision to move to FBS in the January 17 BOV meeting. Motion had first reading; discussion during December's meeting.

## **VII. Old Business – None**

## **VIII. Adjournment – 4:48p**

## Promotion and Tenure

Action	\$ Increase	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
Promotion with Tenure to: Professor	\$5,000	1	2	5	1	--
Promotion to: Professor	\$5,000	28	10	21	20	16
Promotion with Tenure to: Associate Professor	\$3,500	34	34	33	32	25
Promotion to: Associate Professor	\$3,500	2	--	--	1	1
Tenure Only	\$3,500	2	5	3	4*	3
Promotion to: Assistant Professor	\$2,000	2	--	--	--	1
Total \$\$ Increase (excluding benefits)		\$282,000	\$196,500	\$256,000	\$231,000	\$183,500
# of Faculty Impacted		69	51	62	58	46

\*5 Individuals were granted tenure but only 4 received the increment because of time interval

*Impact if Increase to \$5,000/\$7,500 using 2013 data*

\$5,000 to \$7,500 Additional	29 x \$2,500	\$72,500
\$3,500 to \$5,000 Additional	38 x \$1,500	\$57,000
Total P&T Bump (excluding benefits)		\$411,500

### Note:

Promotion and Tenure increments were increased by the BOV in 2004 to the following amounts:

Assistant to Associate	\$3,500
Associate to Professor	\$5,000

Faculty who receive tenure but are not promoted at the same time will receive a \$3,500 increment. If a faculty member is promoted and tenured in the same year, or if the tenure and promotion occur within three years, the faculty member is only eligible for one such salary increase, absent extraordinary circumstances approved by the provost and vice president for academic affairs, upon recommendation of the academic unit head and dean.

The increment for promotion to full professor is \$5,000 even if the individual has already received tenure within the last 3 years. (Executive Council Minutes, March 14, 2007)

Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor does not have any formally approved Board increment and does not happen often, but the Provost chose to award any individuals in this category a \$2,000 increase, and that practice has continued.

INSTITUTION	PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
JMU Current	\$3500 <sup>1</sup>	\$5000 <sup>1</sup>
<b>JMU Proposed</b>	<b>\$5000</b>	<b>\$7500</b>
Comparative Data		
ODU	\$4000	\$8000
GMU	\$1500	\$2000
VA Tech	\$3000	\$4000
Univ. of Mary Washington	\$2000	\$3000
Auburn	\$4000	\$6000
Clemson	\$5000	No report
Miss. State Univ.	\$5000	\$7500
Univ. of Mississippi	\$5000	\$8000
NC State	5%	7%
Univ. of Alabama	10%	10%

## Same-sex Domestic Partner Benefits Resolution

(Based on resolution adopted by The College of William & Mary Faculty Assembly on September 24, 2013)

*Whereas* over 300 colleges and universities across the country, both public and private, are now granting same-sex domestic partner benefits to their faculties as a routine part of their compensation package, and

*Whereas* state institutions of higher education in Virginia suffer from a distinct disadvantage in attracting and retaining qualified scholars and teachers by not offering such benefits, and

*Whereas* the cost of such benefits has proven to be small, and

*Whereas* same-sex domestic partner benefits are already offered by many corporations within the Commonwealth, in businesses such as information technology and financial services vital to the growth of the Commonwealth, and in multinational corporations whose business the Commonwealth desires,

the Faculty Senate of James Madison University resolves that all benefits associated with employment at James Madison University should be extended to all employees as appropriate to their employment status, without regard to sexual orientation or gender identity. Benefit equality specifically includes, but is not limited to, same-sex domestic partner benefits.

We urge the state universities in the Commonwealth to eliminate the existing discrimination in benefits as soon as possible.

Resolution in Support of Moving to FBS Football  
T. Louwers

Whereas there are many positives associated with moving up a level in college football, including raising University visibility on a national scale, increasing the University's ability to recruit out-of-state students within a new conference's regional "foot print", and reconnecting with alumni who may have lost contact with the University, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports (or doesn't oppose) the Athletic Department's proposed move to the FBS-level of collegiate football *as long as the move does not negatively affect the academic mission of the University by increasing student fees to subsidize the reclassification*. To demonstrate that this would not be the case, the JMU Faculty Senate calls for the JMU Athletic Department/Duke Club to solicit an **increase** in alumni and friend commitments totaling at least \$12 million over a five-year period *prior* to applying for reclassification.



## Resolution in support of a more thorough decision analysis before making a final decision on JMU's Football Program's future (Presented by Steven Harper)

Whereas rational decision making and decisional analysis are a strong cornerstone for successful national organizations, and,

Whereas, James Madison University vision is to be a national model, engaged with ideas and the world, and,

Whereas, a analysis of the case for James Madison University's Football program shifting a BCS league has been performed, and,

Whereas, this range of choices for the future of the Football program at James Madison University is broader than this one analyzed BCS transition case,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of James Madison University request that the Athletics Department and Administration of the University expand the decision space for the future of the Football program to include the following options:

(1) do nothing; stay in the current conference (do nothing should always be a consideration) – there seems to be some indication from the Athletics Director t that this is an untenable position – these should be documented as well as the level of certainty of these events happening, financial implications, etc.

(2) move to a FBS league – much work has already been done here by the Intercollegiate Athletics Department, while there are still some questions about the results, this is a sound start. Again, more thought on the level of certainty, effects on academics, etc. should be explored.

(3) cancel the football program – although this will be an unpopular decision by many (if not most), this possibility does seem to have the most certainty. Running the financial number here, the effects on academics, athletics, etc. should be done to set a baseline for the other decisions. This may turn out to be unaffordable, but until we investigate, we are doing ourselves a disservice by excluding it from the solution space.

These three choices seem to cover were JMU Football is, and covers the range of possibilities of where it could possible go. There are possible choices between these two extremes and if one of these intermediate positions is chosen, then due diligence with each (e.g., consider financial, academic, athletic, reputation, uncertainty and risk, and sustainability implications) should be done before a decision is made.

## Resolution Regarding Intercollegiate Athletics

### (McGraw Proposal)

The Faculty Senate of James Madison University believes that academics must remain at the core of the University's mission, which is that "we are a community committed to preparing students to be educated and enlightened citizens who lead productive and meaningful lives." While athletics can help to provide a more meaningful collegiate experience for some of our students, we exist primarily because of our core responsibility to educate students. Our University's utmost priority must be academic quality. As recently restated by the Madison Future Commission, "we are dedicated to exemplary learning experiences because they are the essence of our mission." Whatever decisions are to be made with respect to athletics should always be made with the understanding that academic quality is our primary emphasis.

The Faculty Senate believes that the culture of our University should be primarily focused on academics, and are concerned about a possible erosion of our efforts to create an academic culture emphasizing rigor and scholarly pursuits. The Senate urges the administration to think in a deep and nuanced way about the effects athletic decisions may have on the culture of our University.

The Faculty Senate is concerned with the rising cost of education, and with ensuring that our students receive a quality educational experience for the tuition and fees required of them. We believe that the current practice of allocating 17% of our students' tuition and fees is too high, and does not maximize the student's academic experience for the amount charged. We urge the administration to work towards a long-term strategy that will seek ways to reduce the financial burden of the University's athletic programs currently passed on to our students.

The Faculty Senate regrets some of the past decisions of the University that have committed too many resources towards athletics, and have undermined the primacy of academics at JMU. While we recognize that decisions made in the past cannot be undone, we urge the administration to learn from the lessons of history about the long-term effects of committing resources towards athletics.

We commend the administration for the unprecedented transparency demonstrated in its decision-making process, and we are deeply appreciative of the invitation to participate in the discussion of this matter. We are encouraged by this administration's demonstrated desire to work collaboratively with the faculty on issues of concern to the University.

Therefore, the Faculty Senate recognizes the complexity of the decisions facing the JMU administration in balancing the interests of many constituent groups in a rapidly-changing athletic environment. We recognize that the University's President and Board of Visitors have been entrusted with making these decisions, but the Faculty Senate urges the administration to keep the above principles at the forefront as they make these difficult decisions.

Resolution re. Division 1-A Football  
(Political Science Proposal – Howard Lubert)

Whereas currently students pay more than \$25 million annually to subsidize athletics at JMU;

- and whereas the vast majority of that money subsidizes the JMU football team;
- and whereas the Carr report expressly states that if JMU moves to Division 1-A football those fees will increase;
- and whereas it's likely that such a move will lead to much higher travel, scholarship, and coaching budgets;
- and whereas *USA Today* reports that JMU revenue from ticket sales and alumni giving currently covers less than 10% of the annual expenses incurred by athletics;
- and whereas a 2010 study shows that the average Division 1-A football school spends nearly 7 times more money on each athlete than on each regular student;
- and whereas student attendance at home games is consistently under-capacity;
- and whereas an increase in the number of football scholarships may legally require that JMU eliminate other men's sports teams;
- and whereas we live in an era where *decreased* State support for higher education is the norm;
- and whereas decreased State support in conjunction with increased football expenses will place additional strains on the academic mission of the University;
- and especially whereas JMU faculty and students have only recently been made aware that JMU had hired a consulting firm to look into the possibility of moving to Division 1-A football, and thus have not had adequate time to consider the pros and cons of such a move;
- and whereas such a decision, which is certain to substantially raise costs, should not be made without input from all constituencies (past and future) at the University;
- and whereas the University just released an exhaustive strategic plan that makes no mention of moving to Division 1-A football;
- and whereas that same report expressly worries about finding the money to fund the priorities it does identify;
- and whereas such a momentous decision should not and need not be made hastily,

the Faculty Senate urges, in the strongest language possible, that the administration and the Board of Visitors forgo any decision to move, or not to move, to Division 1-A football during the Board of Visitors meeting in January, 2014.