Joint Faculty Senate/Provost's Task Force on Shared Governance

Final Report — Spring 2023

Co-chairs

Smita Mathur, College of Education, Faculty Senate
Bethany Nowviskie, JMU Libraries

Members

Audrey Burnett, University Studies
Sasha Kokhan, College of Science and Mathematics, Faculty Senate
Kristen McCleary, College of Arts and Letters, Faculty Senate
Hala Nelson, College of Science and Mathematics, Faculty Senate
Elizabeth Oldmixon, Faculty Affairs and Curriculum
Linda Thomas, The Graduate School

Ex Officio

Michael O'Fallon, Faculty Affairs and Curriculum
Meg Sander, Associate University Counsel
Ben Selznick, School of Strategic Leadership Studies

Table of Contents

1. Task Force Charge and Context

2. Introduction to Shared Governance
A brief definition of share governance
Why is shared governance important?
Key stakeholders and the relationships among them

Principles of shared governance
Processes of shared governance
Areas of primacy
Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Shared Governance
Conclusion

3. Task Force Recommendations
Meta-recommendations
M1-6: For campus as a whole
M7-10: For future joint Senate/Provost's task forces like ours
Core Recommendations
1: Shared Understandings
2: Policies
3: Structures and Practices
4: Campus Climate
5: Feedback and Voting
6: Learning and Problem-Solving
7: Accountability

Bibliography and Recommended Readings

Appendices
Draft Institutional Statement on Shared Governance
State of Shared Governance as Reflected in Climate Study and COACHE
Fall Report and Task Force Meeting Agendas

1. Task Force Charge and Context

The following charge was presented to the Joint Task Force on Shared Governance by Faculty Senate Speaker Kathy Ott-Walter and Provost Heather Coltman on October 13, 2022:

> *Comprised of four Faculty Senate representatives, four academic administrators, and three ex-officio members, this joint task force will deepen and expand our collective understanding, expertise, and best-emerging practices for activating shared governance across the range of activities, responsibilities, and areas in Academic Affairs and across campus.*

The Task Force met 14 times from late September 2022 to May 2023, including for one full-day writing retreat. We collaboratively developed operating agreements, critically interrogated our charge and initial set of expressed goals, built a working library of shared documents and resources, and grounded our discussions in readings and research. Task Force members undertook numerous additional working sessions in small groups to develop draft recommendations that speak to ongoing faculty concerns, held joint discussions about campus needs, collaborated on shared documents asynchronously, and engaged in conversations with their constituencies.

This work was undertaken in the context of 1) a recent Campus Climate report that suggested the need to revisit shared governance practices; 2) tensions among faculty and Academic Affairs leadership; and 3) the backdrop of university life more fully emerging from the shared trauma of the COVID-19 pandemic. This challenging context animated our efforts in several important ways, informing ongoing conversations and driving recommendations with a bent toward practical action.

The Joint Task Force on Shared Governance worked collegially together in adverse circumstances to discuss difficult issues, respectfully weigh differing opinions and perspectives, and create common ground in the best interest of the institution. Through this process, we remained conscious of the danger of falling into a managerial mindset about possible outcomes — either based on our original charge and goals, or on perceived shortcomings of JMU's current shared governance environment.

The group developed the critical ***Introduction to Shared Governance*** that follows, and worked together to generate and refine **44 core recommendations**. All proposed recommendations were brought back to the full Task Force for synchronous and asynchronous discussion. Forty of these are grouped into seven critical areas of focus: Shared Understandings; Policies; Structures and Practices; Campus Climate; Feedback and Voting; Learning and Problem-Solving; and Accountability.

We additionally collaboratively developed a set of **10 important meta-recommendations**. Six of these are meant to support the health of shared governance generally as a crucial and sustaining higher education practice at JMU. The final four meta-recommendations are offered to support the fruitful formation of future joint task forces like ours.

2. Introduction to Shared Governance

Shared governance has emerged over the past 50 years as the optimal response to a question that rests at the core of higher education institutions: ***How should decision-making occur in a distributed organization with multiple sources of authority?***

Certainly, shared governance is not the only form of governance, nor is it uniformly practiced in the same way across all higher education institutions that strive toward its implementation. Yet, in this degree of ambiguity rests the true value of shared governance: once contextually understood and locally operationalized, it can be progressively implemented in durable ways that become core to institutional life and identity.

This introduction draws on resources provided by key informational actors, such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), but was also drafted to speak to our local context. We therefore hope it provides **connections between external resources and internal thinking**, as well as serves as a living document guiding future action.

In this spirit, we quote and endorse the closing sentence of the introduction to the AAUP's 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities: "*A University in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems."

A brief definition of shared governance

In brief, shared governance is a methodology. It is the practice, facilitated by structures and processes, through which core institutional stakeholders—primarily governing boards, administrative leadership, and faculty—engage **mutual understanding** to exert **joint effort** over decisions that affect the institution.

While the influence and decision-making authority of each stakeholder group will necessarily vary depending on the applicable domain, legal context, and institutional structure—shared governance at JMU rests on a commitment to responsible and meaningful collaboration.

Why is Shared Governance important?

As decades of scholarship and practice indicate, shared governance is important because it acknowledges and embraces the complexity of decision-making within the special context of higher education organizations. Born out of practice and sustained throughout the literature base, one way to think about this complexity is through Birnbaum's paradigm of the *dualism of controls* that exists between leadership structures (e.g., Board of Visitors, President, academic leadership) and faculty. Each group should have a voice in how the University operates, though their sources of authority differ—governance/leadership through positional authority, experience, and expertise; and faculty, beyond appointed or elected positions (e.g., Faculty Senate leader), through their positional responsibilities, experience and expertise. In order to effectively deliver on the mission, vision, and values of a university, this **'inescapable interdependence'** between and among constituencies must not only be recognized, but realized.

Scholarship by leading authors (e.g., Birnbaum, Kezar) and professional reports (e.g., AAUP, AGB) emerging during the past two decades have paid particular attention to the importance of shared governance in addressing the challenges confronting postsecondary education in the 21st century. These challenges have included: a sustained decline in state support for public institutions; changing student populations and increasing imperatives among stakeholders for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion; greater attention to research and knowledge production; and a host of issues idiosyncratic to institutional identity (e.g., location and competition).

Broadly, scholarship indicates that working toward an ideal state where all organizational members experience social justice and equity requires trust among faculty, administrators, and board members. Trust, in turn, must be formed by policies, practices, and cultures through which voices are listened to and held as legitimate. The discourse on shared governance, then, seeks at every turn to remind key stakeholders that there are many common values and priorities, and that the mission of universities can be best realized through acting collaboratively in a paradigm of **full opportunity.**

Key stakeholders and the relationships among them

With respect to shared governance as a practice and process of decision-making, three main constituencies are established in the literature: **board members, senior administrative leaders, and faculty.** We also briefly consider the role(s) of **students.** We briefly describe each

constituency and then move to consider the principles and processes of shared governance and areas of primacy that apply to them.

> **Board of Visitors:** The James Madison University Board of Visitors (BoV) is comprised of 15 voting members appointed by the governor. A student representative and the Faculty Senate Speaker also serve. The BoV manual lists, as a recommended qualification and competency for service, that board members demonstrate "respect for the concept of shared governance and the distinction between the Board's duties and the role of the President and Administration" (p. 17). The BOV's authority is codified by statute in the Code of Virginia § 23.1-1602 and 23.1-1301.
>
> **President and Senior Administration:** The President and senior administrator team are essential actors in shared governance via their positional authority and influence over strategic institutional decisions. This constituency notably includes the Provost and other senior Academic Affairs administrators, who must work collaboratively with faculty to implement the academic mission of the university.
>
> **Faculty:** Faculty comprise instructional, administrative, and professional faculty at James Madison University. In matters of shared governance, instructional faculty function individually within their own working academic units (e.g., departments). They also have opportunities to exercise their viewpoints collectively at the department level and through their representatives in the JMU Faculty Senate. (We address a gap in the Senate representation of *professional faculty* members in shared governance at JMU in our meta-recommendations below.)
>
> **Students**: Students include those at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, who are enrolled either part- or full-time at the university, whether as regularly admitted or as transfer students. Regarding shared governance, students should be involved in feedback processes concerning issues that directly impact them, such as academic-related policies, student-written resolutions, and proposals for new committees and student-focused campus programming through the Student Governance Association and Graduate Student Association—both of which are student-led and student-run organizations. With respect to these areas of direct impact, students should be afforded substantial agency in exercising their voices in decision-making, both individually and collectively.

While the remainder of our report primarily treats shared governance among Board, faculty, and administrative constituencies, we further offer these guiding words from the 1966 joint

AAUP statement: “If institutional support [for students] is to have its fullest possible meaning, it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view, and idealism of the student body.” Striving toward shared governance that is inclusive of student perspectives holds substantial promise for delivering the best possible learning and developmental experiences for students.

Principles of Shared Governance

Traditional and established principles of shared governance include:

1. **Collaboration & Consultation:** Shared governance involves collaboration among different stakeholders, such as faculty members, students, and administrators. All stakeholders must work together to achieve the institution's goals.
2. **Communication:** Open communication is critical for shared governance to work effectively. All stakeholders should have access to relevant information about the institution's operations, policies, and decision-making processes.
3. **Inclusivity:** Shared governance should be inclusive and involve all stakeholders who are affected by the institution's decisions. This includes students, faculty members, staff, and administrators.
4. **Shared Responsibility & Transparency:** Decision-makers should take responsibility for their decisions and be accountable to other stakeholders. They should be willing to explain and justify their decisions and be open to feedback from other stakeholders.
5. **Equity:** Shared governance should be equitable, and all stakeholders should have an opportunity to participate in decision-making processes. This includes ensuring that underrepresented groups have a voice in governance.
6. **Continuous Improvement:** Shared governance should be an ongoing process of continuous improvement. Institutions should regularly evaluate their governance structures and processes and make changes as needed to improve their effectiveness.
7. **Alignment to Institutional Mission and Values:** Shared governance is guided by the institution's mission and values. Decision-making processes are based on the institution's goals and objectives, and all stakeholders work together to achieve them.
8. **Flexibility:** Shared governance is flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances. Decision-making processes are responsive to the needs and challenges facing the institution, and stakeholders work together to find innovative solutions.

Processes of Shared Governance

What follows are general, top-level guidelines surfaced in the peer-reviewed and professional literature base concerning principles and processes of shared governance. Instantiation of shared governance through these principles and processes requires *trust and reciprocity among stakeholders.*

Roles & Responsibilities

The essential roles and responsibilities of the **faculty** are to ensure academic quality, provide high quality curriculum and instruction, conduct research, and adhere to self-directed departmental standards. To be successful in these endeavors, faculty must operate in a context that prioritizes **academic freedom** and **academic responsibility.**

The essential roles and responsibilities of **presidents/senior administrators** are to provide institutional leadership, create and sustain an institutional vision, ensure the financial health and ongoing viability of the institution, and lead in strategic planning. To be successful in these endeavors, senior leadership must solicit input from key stakeholders, which include faculty, administrative staff, and students.

The essential roles and responsibilities of **governing boards** are to provide fiduciary oversight, hire and oversee the President, and ensure that the institution fulfills its mission. To be successful in these endeavors, governing boards must have a healthy relationship with the President and solicit input on strategic decisions from key stakeholders, including administrators, faculty, students, and community members.

Communication and feedback channels

Enacting shared governance requires open lines of communication between and among key actors. This includes communication within groups (e.g., board-member-to-board chair; President-to-Provost; faculty-to-faculty), as well as across groups (e.g., Board-to-President; Provost-to-faculty). Such communication can take a wide variety of forms, including formalized efforts through organizing bodies (e.g., Faculty Senate) and many informalized efforts (e.g., intra-departmental communications).

To best enact shared governance, communication channels must be created to solicit and interpret feedback on university-wide matters, as well as provide avenues for voicing and resolving disagreements and other disputes. At all turns, communication should strive to reaffirm the principle of **mutual understanding,** while also ensuring that areas of faculty, administrative, and board primacy are respected.

Decision-making process

The best decisions are well-informed ones, grounded in accurate information and solid communications practices. That said, it is important to remember that shared governance is **not** the idea that a lot of conversation must happen within and among many campus groups—board members, administrators, faculty, staff, students—before *any* decision gets made. To illustrate this, it is helpful to consider academic and non-academic decisions.

Senior administrators and board members should typically respect the expertise of the faculty on curriculum; subject matter and methods of instruction; research; appointment, reappointment, and non-reappointment of faculty peers; tenure, and faculty promotion.

In non-academic matters, decision-making processes can vary greatly. One general rule of practice is that non-academic decisions should, to the best extent feasible and possible, involve those organizational members who will be subject to the outcome of such decisions and who have relevant subject-matter expertise. Such decisions can involve hiring and evaluation of administrators, development of the university's physical plant, and strategic planning.

Certainly, there are many decisions that involve all parties. For these decisions, it is recommended that **joint planning** is engaged to reach decisions that include many voices, center equity, and are aligned with the mission, vision, and values of the university.

A related principle is **joint effort** engaged by core constituencies. Expression of this principle is especially important (for instance) in budgeting, broadly defined in the 1966 AAUP statement as "the allocation of resources among competing demands." Given its connection to decisions between and across insitutional levels, **budget decision-making is an instructive example** of an area where key stakeholders "should...have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities," and in which choices are best guided by access to information. The differing roles of the governing board, administration, and faculty in budgetary matters "should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions" (para. 16).

In short, decision-making processes based in **clarity of roles**, **mutual understanding, joint planning, and joint effort** are essential to effective shared governance practice.

Transparency & Accountability

It is likewise essential to ensure transparency and accountability when engaging shared governance. Practices such as the publication of meeting minutes and agendas, for example, are helpful in broadcasting the activities of units, including the governing board and faculty senate. However, the scholarly and practice literature frequently remind us that such required forms of transparency alone are insufficient and must also be supplemented through other avenues. Additionally, there is valuable commentary in the literature on the relationship between transparency and accountability in, to quote Tierney and Minor (2003), creating "the conditions for trust" (p. 19). Such conditions are vital to engaging **joint effort.**

Continuous Improvement

As reflected in a 2017 statement on shared governance issued by the Association of Governing Boards: "*Effective shared governance, focused on open communications, shared responsibility, a commitment to accountability, and alignment of institutional priorities, is broadly seen as advantageous but is less commonly achieved"* (p. 3). This quote serves as a helpful reminder that shared governance is **an evolving practice** that is dependent upon university actors and the development of shared norms reflected both formally (e.g., policies, documents) and informally (e.g., patterns of communication). As such, engaging in shared governance requires continued improvement through joint action.

Areas of Primacy

Here we outline the areas over which each constituency might best be positioned to exhibit primacy. It is important to remember that shared governance does not—and operationally, provided the scope of work, *cannot*—mean that all actors must share authority for all decisions. Instead, it is vital to consider, based upon factors such as expertise, the **weight of each voice** in making decisions that affect the overall university and its components (e.g., divisions and colleges).

A recent survey by AAUP (Tiede 2021) demonstrates that institutions vary widely in terms of which groups have **dominance** and **primacy** over decisions. (It treats 29 areas of institutional decision-making, grouped for interpretation into three main categories: **academic**, **personnel**, and **administrative**. See Figure 2 in the article linked above. The survey categorizes department chairs as "faculty" in decision-making *only* if those chairs are "chosen by departmental election

on a regular schedule." Administrators at the associate dean/associate provost level and above are categorized as "administration" in the survey, regardless of whether they also hold faculty rank.)

In addition to concepts of dominance and primacy, some institutional decisions are made through negotiation, collaboration, diplomacy, and **joint authority,** in which groups (e.g., faculty and administrators) exercise balanced influence. More explicit definitions quoted from the AAUP shared governance assessment tool (p. 2) are as follows:

> **Dominance**: This level of participation means that a group is making decisions in an area essentially unilaterally. The other group is informed of the decision or consulted in a pro forma fashion, but generally has no influence on the outcome.
>
> **Primacy**: This level of participation means that a group has primary authority for an area, but that the other group has an opportunity to participate meaningfully in the final decision. If there is disagreement between the two groups, the group that has primacy normally prevails.
>
> **Joint Authority**: This level of participation means that both groups exercise equal influence in making decisions in an area.

As referenced above, principles of shared governance recommend that **faculty** hold **dominance** over many aspects of curriculum development, instruction, and the pursuit of their research and creative responsibilities.

Board members and senior administrators hold **dominance** in areas that concern the fiscal health and daily operations of the university, including ensuring that the university follows relevant regulations and laws. They also hold **primacy** in setting the long-range vision and strategic plan for the institution, administrative hiring, and broad adherence to the institution's mission.

At the risk of oversimplifying matters, **joint authority** can be—or at least holds the opportunity to be—exercised over the many other challenges that confront university life. Two examples from the 2021 AAUP survey found joint authority highly present across institutions in areas such as establishing programs (41.6% of institutions surveyed) and intellectual property policies (44.4% of institutions surveyed).

Though broad, the language of **dominance, primacy, and joint authority** can be helpful in better understanding *where in the governance structure certain decisions rest*, and *the extent to which those locations are agreeable to all stakeholders* within an institution. Areas where dominance, primacy, and joint authority are agreeable and well-practiced might serve as exemplars for further considering those areas where disagreements may emerge. As revealed by the 2021 AAUP report, these areas vary among institutions, most notably with respect to whether key decisions hold administrative primacy, joint authority, or faculty primacy.

Such variation again reflects the idea of shared governance as an ongoing and evolving process. It also reflects the importance of emphasizing **mutual understanding** in shared governance practice.

Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Shared Governance

It is necessary more explicitly to express the close relationships that exist between **academic freedom, tenure, and shared governance**. A 1994 statement issued by the AAUP reflects on and articulates this relationship. Echoing sentiments expressed above, this statement advances three main reasons why it is essential for areas that have historically been ascribed faculty dominance and primacy to remain so: 1) Allocation of authority is the best way to accomplish the university's ultimate objectives; 2) Teaching and research are the very purpose of academic institutions; 3) "Allocation of authority to the faculty in the areas of its responsibility is a necessary condition for the protection of academic freedom within the institution." All three matter greatly, and this third reason holds *substantial importance* in the current climate of higher education.

Tenure—its progression, achievement, granting, and maintenance—is an important avenue through which the work of shared governance and expressions of academic freedom come to be fulfilled. Indeed, it is the bedrock of the educational enterprise and a necessary condition for the cultivation of the very best teaching, research, creative activity, and service. It is often tenured faculty who are asked to serve in representative capacities on behalf of their colleagues, sometimes in ways that conflict with the ideas of administrative leaders. In addition, it is often tenure that provides distinctive opportunities for faculty to engage in open-ended forms of expansive inquiry, which drive those forms of innovative inquiry that propel the university's mission forward.

All of our faculty, regardless of tenure status, should be afforded the protections of academic freedom. However, together tenure and academic freedom create a uniquely safe environment

for faculty to participate in open and honest discussions with colleagues and administrators. Without these protections, faculty may be reluctant to challenge authority on institutional issues or advance knowledge through new and potentially controversial research, thus undermining both shared governance and the purpose of higher education. Therefore, **it is in the best interest of universities that value shared governance to support and protect tenure and academic freedom**, and to understand the crucial connections among these three concepts.

Conclusion

As Birnbaum writes in his 2004 paper on the topic: *"Shared governance may often be frustrating and exasperating, but I believe that it is **the most effective process through which academic institutions can achieve their indefinite goals**"* (p. 8). It is through this collaborative paradigm that we have introduced this report, offered guidance from the literature and best-practices knowledge base, and introduced core concepts for consideration.

In the coming pages, we provide specific recommendations that respond to the charges of this task force, aiming to provide pathways toward enacting improved shared governance at James Madison University now and, hopefully, well into the future.

3. Task Force Recommendations

With these understandings in mind, grounded in research and practice, we now turn to a set of **44 recommendations** that speak to the **7 priority areas of attention** that the Task Force on Shared Governance developed in response to our charge.

However, in a spirit of shared governance, we first offer the following **10 meta-recommendations.** These are meant to benefit the campus writ large and to support the the establishment and work of future joint Provost/Senate task forces similar to ours.

Meta-Recommendations for campus as a whole:

M1. Protect tenure and academic freedom.

The Task Force recognizes the **crucial connection between tenure and academic**

freedom for faculty, on the one hand, **and genuine shared governance** on the other. JMU must reverse trends toward contingent hiring in the academy (both adjunct teaching faculty and those on other time-limited, non-tenure-track faculty contracts) in a concerted effort to restore an historic balance of tenured faculty in our faculty ranks and avoid the adjunctification that is sweeping higher education. (Local data analysis on this issue would be key.) This is the most primary and fundamental step JMU could take to creating a *sustainable* ongoing culture of meaningful shared governance. Substantive and meaningful faculty participation is a function of the health of the faculty as a whole, including the percentage of tenured faculty who have the necessary job security and academic freedom to speak truth to power.

M2. Slow down.

Wherever possible, and particularly in areas of joint authority and faculty primacy, JMU must resist the frenetic pace that seems to drive us to rapid decision-making and action as a default stance. We should recognize that we often make mistakes as a campus by moving faster than is necessary or supportive for shared governance. Slowing down is not an obstructionist tactic, and (importantly) does not mean that all parties must agree before action is taken; it simply leverages the power of shared governance to **employ campus expertise more fully** to inform decision-making and seek positive outcomes. A **slower pace wherever possible** would support better communications among stakeholders and encourage all parties to verify assumptions before acting. Key to breaking a pandemic-induced cycle of treating all action as emergency action will be the embracing of procedures that call for meaningful faculty input and require effectively "closing the loop" in communications.

M3. Advance these recommendations as one JMU.

This Task Force report and set of recommendations should be **received jointly** by the Faculty Senate and the Provost's Office, **jointly owned, taken forward, and considered to be a living document**, with regular reporting to the President's office and BOV, as well as clear intervals established for re-assessment of progress made and new initiatives needed to support the health of shared governance on campus.

M4. Include all faculty.

To ensure full and effective voice for JMU's instructional *and* professional faculty in matters of shared governance, and the fair representation of faculty with *professional* appointments among our A&P faculty ranks, the JMU Faculty Senate should create a pathway to election and representation of **JMU's professional faculty members** on the Senate. This could be similar to the recent inclusion of adjunct faculty senators or could entail the creation of new structures to represent A&P faculty concerns.

M5. Meaningfully include staff and students.

More attention should be paid to **the role of staff members and students in shared governance** at JMU, perhaps even through future examination of this issue in a dedicated committee or task force.

M6. Stay accountable for progress.

The Provost's Office and Faculty Senate should commit to and publish **a timeline for regular cycles** of ongoing, joint faculty/administrator/board assessments of the state of shared governance at JMU. These assessments should lead to **the development of action plans** to address areas identified for improvement.

Meta-recommendations for future joint task forces:

M7. Continue crafting charges jointly.

For the establishment of future joint Faculty Senate/Provost's task forces, it is crucial to ensure that members of the Provost's Office/JMU senior administration and elected representatives of the faculty (through the Faculty Senate, college councils, appropriate department-level faculty committees and groups, etc.) have a **co-equal and substantive opportunity** to shape charges, goals, and timelines. This will enable the best choices to be made as to leadership and representation or membership for any given charge, and will allow for shared understanding as to goals and expected outcomes to be built and transparently communicated to all constituencies.

M8. Broaden involvement.

We further recommend that **intentional pathways** be created to ensure that different individuals (administrators and faculty) are nominated to task forces when multiple, interconnected efforts or parallel task forces are ongoing simultaneously. This could include, for example, open calls for participation and self-nominations. This will broaden leadership opportunities, help minimize confusion among efforts, maximize institutional knowledge and the diversity of perspectives represented, and avoid the misperception that broad, shared, and critical institutional efforts are driven by special interests or bound to reach foregone conclusions.

M9. Balance representation.

Likewise, where possible, task forces should be designed with attention to **balanced representation** across JMU's colleges and relevant administrative units. Task forces should additionally commit to ensuring that the voices of all relevant faculty constituencies and stakeholder groups (tenured, tenure-track, professional faculty, adjunct faculty, and those on other contingent contracts, such as RTA appointments) are represented through open comment periods and other **inclusive feedback** mechanisms.

M10. Communicate frequently.

Joint Provost/Senate task forces should have a standing invitation to Faculty Senate as part of "Other Committee Reports" and an **expectation of reporting out**. They should also be expected to join periodic meetings of Academic Council. In both cases, this would be to share work in-progress and present emerging questions or requests for feedback.

We now address 44 core Task Force recommendations grouped into seven themes: Shared Understandings; Policies; Structures and Practices; Campus Climate; Feedback and Voting; Learning and Problem-Solving; and Accountability.

Core Recommendations by Theme

1: Shared Understandings

JMU should **build a resource library and broadly accessible "gateway" page on shared governance.** This could include definitions and research-based best practices, as well as a JMU campus statement on shared governance.

1a. Landing Page

Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs should jointly create and maintain **a simple landing page for shared governance** at JMU. Models for such a page can be found at Virginia Tech and Grand Valley State University.

1b. Shared Governance Statement

The most prominent feature of this page should be **a common statement of values around shared governance**. This Task Force—based on research and deliberative discussion—has crafted a starter draft for the common statement, shared here as an appendix. It now needs to be socialized, further edited, and adopted by the campus.

Once Senate Steering and the Provost's Office agree on the content of this statement, we recommend it go to Academic Council and the full Faculty Senate for further discussion and possible approval. Next, we imagine it would be shared with the President's cabinet and taken to the Academic Excellence subcommittee of the BOV for consideration and potential adoption by the board and campus as a whole.

1c. Continuous Improvement

Once the gateway page from 1a is established, it should be **continuously improved upon** based on models from other institutions and in conversation with relevant campus offices and groups. Its publication should launch **a broader institutional effort to foster conversations** about shared governance at the college and department level, in support of a cultural shift in favor of implementing and embracing shared governance at all levels. See area 6 below ("Learning and Problem-Solving") for related suggestions.

2: Policies

JMU should **make visible and accessible a set of links to existing university and Academic Affairs policies particularly relevant to shared governance.**

Such a library would also help support ongoing policy development needs. During the work of this Task Force and informed by our conversations, the Provost's Office created **a new round-up page** of faculty-related Policies, Handbooks, Reports, and Manuals in Academic Affairs. This is a good start.

2a. Maintaining a Policy Round-Up

We recommend that the page linked above be located on or linked to the "landing page for shared governance" we outline in recommendation 1a, and that the Faculty Senate and Provost's Office develop and document a shared understanding about **who should maintain** this round-up page and what its **regular review and revision cycle** should be.

2b. Revising the Faculty Handbook

Commission a joint faculty/administrative group to undertake a **comprehensive review and wholesale re-write of the Faculty Handbook**, to carefully consider and address flaws and points of confusion in handbook areas in need of greater clarity, such as the faculty grievance policy. This group should make such revisions with an eye to developing and enhancing structures and policies related to shared governance. Establish a regular schedule of whole-scale refresh and re-consideration (alongside the regular, more incremental work of the handbook committee). Give special consideration to the role of shared governance throughout.

2c. Creating Clarity on Appeals

In cases of disagreement between faculty and administration/board leadership, where both have responsibilities (e.g., tenure), the faculty handbook and other governing documents should clearly state **how disagreements are addressed**/appealed and by whom.

3: Structures and Practices

JMU should **ensure that shared governance structures and communication practices at the campus- and college-levels are robust and well-documented,** and we encourage faculty to engage actively in shared governance opportunities, as essential stewards of the university's mission. To promote awareness of existing structures and ensure that documentation reflects active governance bodies and practices in place at all levels, it must be created or confirmed as accurate with faculty input.

3a. Documentation

In accordance with section IV.A of the JMU Faculty Handbook, every college (and academic unit or school that does not exist within a college) should determine "the specific structure and membership of its governance bodies," to include "elected faculty representatives from each academic unit of the college."

We recommend that, by a deadline to be determined by the Provost's Office and Faculty Senate, **these college-level structures and memberships/membership practices be posted on the colleges' publicly-accessible web pages.** Any shared governance structures created or described as part of this process should address meaningful faculty participation in areas of curriculum, personnel, and budget and planning, with attention to faculty advisory and oversight roles, as defined in the handbook for each of the three areas.

3b. Refresh and Reaffirm

We recommend **regular refresh/reconsideration and reaffirmation** by faculty and academic leadership of all guiding documents at the college level. A planned schedule for periodic reaffirmation should be published.

3c. Communicating Across Divisions

Regular campus-level communication practices should be created to ensure that faculty are aware not only of strategic planning activities in Academic Affairs, but of all JMU division-level **strategic planning** (e.g., Student Affairs, Access & Inclusion, Advancement, etc.).

3d. Communicating in Colleges and Units

Every college and administrative unit of Academic Affairs in which faculty are employed

should communicate to all faculty and staff a plan for (or a reminder of) their shared governance pathways and **ongoing, intended communication practices,** designed to keep lines of discussion open and foster effective bi-directional communication between faculty and administrators. This plan should be developed in consultation with faculty governance bodies.

3e. Shared Governance at the Unit Level

Section IV.B of the Faculty Handbook merely says, regarding academic unit-level governance, that it should exist. It then only specifically references the role of the AUPAC. Just as college-level structures and communications practices are addressed in 3a and 3d above, every academic unit should be charged with **documenting and publicly/transparently communicating its unit-level governance practices**.

3f. Senate Engagement

The Provost's Office should **actively engage the full Faculty Senate as an advisory body** to provide meaningful faculty input on matters of budget and strategic planning that cross all colleges. To ensure effective representation in this advisory role, Faculty Senate should be encouraged to hold an open discussion about its own methods for engagement with with administrators and fellow faculty. We acknowledge that all sides can do better in collaboration with each other on matters of mutual concern.

3g. Access to Information

Data and documents pertaining to non-confidential/non-personnel issues should **be stored and communicated in uniform and familiar ways,** equitably accessible to faculty and administrators alike. This applies equally to information compiled by administrative offices, departments and colleges, and by the Faculty Senate. We recommend that non-confidential information relevant to faculty, such as departmental bylaws, etc., be stored in more transparent, easily accessible places, including—where appropriate—behind simple password protection or on the open Web.

3h. Senate Transparency

The Faculty Senate should **clarify, streamline, and make more transparent its own processes and voting practices**. Participation and transparency on the part of faculty would be increased, and opportunities for dialogue with a broader array of administrators would be created, by instituting **robust and publicly-accessible ways of tracking issues and faculty concerns** from the moment they are introduced, either to

amicable resolution or to creation of a formal Resolution. One possible model is the Virginia Tech Resolutions Tracker. Best practices for feedback and voting are addressed in section 5, below.

3i. Senate Subcommittee on Shared Governance

The Faculty Senate should add a **standing subcommittee on Shared Governance** charged with leading and participating in ongoing conversations and initiatives to improve the state of shared governance at JMU.

4: Campus Climate

JMU must **openly address issues relevant to perceptions of the state of shared governance** documented in the most recent COACHE survey and Campus Climate Study reports. For a full summary of findings related to shared governance in those two reports, please see Appendix B, drafted by a small faculty working group in response to our charge and task force goals.

It is important to note that the 2021 COACHE survey report itself summarizes Spring 2020 feedback, and the 2022 Campus Climate Study report summarizes Fall 2021 feedback from JMU faculty and our broader campus community.

4a. Climate Study Reporting

We recommend **regular reporting back from the Climate Study Implementation Group** to the full Faculty Senate and Academic Council.

4b. Faculty Voices on Climate Implementation

In keeping with COACHE recommendations and best practices of shared governance, we also recommend the **addition of more faculty voices on the Climate Study Implementation Group**.

4c. Focus on COACHE

We recommend that the **Faculty Senate prioritize its attention to the COACHE survey recommendations** and follow up with faculty and administration on those recommendations as originally planned. Open reporting of progress made is key.

5: Feedback and Voting

JMU must create **better-documented, more trustworthy and transparent systems for voting, conducting surveys, and other faculty/staff feedback-gathering and data collection activities** relevant to shared governance.

5a. Best Practices Manual

Create a **draft manual of best practices with data management and the development of qualitative/quantitative surveys** (including ballot develoment, records management policies/retention schedules, ensured confidentiality, etc.) from experienced areas at JMU, such as the Office of Institutional Research, Libraries, IRB, and Center for Faculty Innovation (CFI), as well as from knowledgeable faculty. A strong model for this now exists in the College of Science and Math, and working documents are available from the Task Force upon request.

5b. Community of Practice

Foster, resource, and publicize a cross-college **community of practice for continuous improvement** of survey and feedback processes in Academic Affairs.

5c. Documented Processes

Every academic department and administrative unit in which faculty are placed should **document its processes and practices related to online and in-person voting/survey-taking**. These should be aligned with the best-practices document described in 5a above.

5d. Default to Open

JMU should promote open deliberation, voting or use of feedback mechansims, and sharing outcomes of deliberations in a transparent manner as **the go-to way to inform decisions** across the board. It is important that these approaches include open calls for feedback and discussion, and that all voices can be included in deliberations.

5e. Conflict of Interests

An Academic Affairs policy or guidelines document should be created that covers **conflict of interests** (COI) more broadly than merely speaking to Virginia statutes related to nepotism and financial COI—and that also treats the *perception* of conflict of interests (e.g., a person on the ballot should not be overseeing an election process). Individual academic departments should use this as a starting-point for documents specifically related to conflict of interests in connection with voting and survey processes.

5f. Dispute Resolution

Should a dispute arise from the creation, interpretation, or deployment of surveys or ballots, we recommend **creation of an ad hoc committee that includes all stakeholders** involved to resolve the issue together. We recommend that there be a clear and shared formula to follow in the registration of a need for such a group and in the creation of these ad hoc committees.

6: Learning and Problem-Solving

JMU should develop **an action-oriented program for ongoing campus conversations, shared learning, listening, and concrete problem-solving** around the lived experience of shared governance.

Experiments with programs, such as the ones described here, should focus on *campus practices* associated with shared governance, instead of on establishing a *campus definition* of shared governance. The task force agrees that we can consider shared governance to be adequately defined in the literature (as outlined in our introduction), and that we should depend on the separate efforts recommended in 1b for the establishment of a campus statement. In other words, we hope area 6 would ***build on*** **the work of this task force and not repeat it**.

6a. Action-Oriented Fellowships

Create **a fellowship-like program for faculty** who want to learn more about shared governance and collaboratively workshop and work on real-world shared governance problems with administrators and peers. The idea would be that faculty would then return to their units or colleges to test or implement the possible solutions they develop in the program. Consider whether this program aligns with the newly-created Faculty ASPIRE associates program out of the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Curriculum, or would be a new, needed offering from CFI.

6b. Deliberative Democracy

Consider a "deliberative democracy" discussion model to foster a culture of shared governance at JMU. Deliberative democracy cannot be applied to all situations, but is an emerging, creative, and potentially effective method for fostering dialogue and shared understanding. (Working documents related to this concept are available from the task force on request.)

6c. Campus Conversations

Consider developing a **Campus Conversations Committee** responsible for hosting and facilitating regular campus conversations on critical issues or major pending changes or decision points. The committee must have a coordinator and at least a part-time support staff member. (Working documents related to this concept are available from the task force on request.)

6d. Onboarding and Ongoing Learning

As part of **routine onboarding** for all parties, regularly and actively engage and educate members of BOV, administration, faculty, and student leaders on the established principles of shared governance. We observe considerable confusion about the basic tenets of shared governance among all stakeholders, and see onboarding as a golden opportunity to address the issue. We also recommend that JMU provide **ongoing opportunities for learning** for all of these stakeholder groups.

6e. BOV Transparency

Continue positive developments in BOV transparency by communicating more broadly with faculty as to the availability of committee and full board agendas ahead of meetings, and outcomes thereafter, including the availability of minutes and a summary of key decisions and areas of conversation. Commit to earlier posting of Board agendas, open invitations to faculty to observe committee meetings, and broad circulation of the livestream for the full Board.

6f. Faculty Input

By regularly conducting town halls at the university and college levels, **provide faculty an opportunity to discuss their views on issues before the administration and Board.** Clearly communicate to faculty the decisions being considered by the BOV and the

president's executive cabinet, why those decisions are before the board or cabinet, the timetable for decisions, and the extent of the faculty's opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. Conduct periodic faculty forums with key administrative and board decisionmakers. For instance, the BOV's Rector could present to faculty on how the board makes decisions, or JMU's chief financial officer could present on how budgets are developed.

6g. Human(e) Connections

Actively develop, resource, and cultivate intentional ways to **increase social capital among administrators, board members, and faculty.** Treating each other with kindness, charity and respect is a crucial start. Then, as board members, faculty members, and administrators work together in shared governance frameworks, they will naturally develop social capital.

However, social capital also can be developed and deepened outside of a formal shared governance process. Consider these potential practices:

- With faculty leaders' awareness and consent, consider inviting board members and senior administrators to occasional faculty meetings, followed by a reception. Board members usually are impressed with the quality of deliberation at these meetings, just as faculty members usually are impressed with the quality of deliberation at board meetings;
- Seat BOV members, administrators, and faculty members in the same area at athletic events, concerts, and other special occasions, and at meetings and dinners where both are present;
- Publish BOV and faculty leadership biographies. Let faculty members know that board members may be available for invitations as guest lecturers in classes that touch on their areas of expertise;
- Invite a BOV member to participate in part of a study abroad program or field trip for students. Invite board members to celebrations of student and faculty scholarship;
- Hold a reception during BOV meetings on campus to give faculty and the broader campus community the chance to get to know the board and vice-versa.

7: Accountability

JMU should consider the following **additional recommendations related to issues of accountability, checks and balances, and transparency** in policies and processes.

7a. Communicating Accountability

Identifying responsible stakeholders is an important component of accountability. We understand the value of subsidiarity in higher education—the organizational practice that **decisions should be made at the lowest level possible**. This ensures that people most affected by decisions have voice in the decision-making process, allows academic units and the faculty therein discretion over how to fulfill their education mission, and aligns with the principle of academic freedom. This may create confusion and stress, however, as an unavoidable diversity of practices leads to inconsistent experiences across colleges and academic units.

Our emergence as an R2 institution provides an instructive example. Some members of the academic community have communicated increased expectations related to research productivity, while others have not. Faculty with questions are often directed to a myriad of places and people responsible for the changes. **Mixed messaging erodes trust.** It also most usually occurs through verbal exchanges. Therefore, we recommend writing down changes related to policies, procedures, and workload where an authority figure can be identified. Additionally, sometimes this problem is dismissed as an issue of 'centralized' versus 'localized' decision-making. We encourage academic leaders (the Provost, deans, and AUHs) to clearly communicate 1) where mandates and initiatives come from, and 2) to what extent colleges and departments have discretion.

7b. Rotating Department Chairs

Where vacancies in the AUH position arise and involved faculty are willing, **allow academic departments to select leadership from among their internal ranks and experiment with a rotating chair model.** Such a faculty-elected internal chair would come with expectation of re-election/re-affirmation on regular intervals. Implementation of this practice should acknowledge the Faculty Senate resolution already passed and build upon the experience of departments that are already testing this model.

7c. Interim AUHs

Regardless of the approach taken to 7a above, faculty feedback should always be solicited and strongly considered in the appointment of **interim AUHs**.

7d. AAUH Policies

Consider a new, standard policy or guidelines document addressing the appointment, evaluation, and participation in shared governance of **assistant and associate academic unit heads.** Models could be solicited from departments that have successfully implemented and documented such processes.

7e. Evaluation of Administrators

Ensure that **regular and transparent evaluation of all administrators** includes robust faculty feedback. Faculty should regularly be invited to provide feedback on the performance of AUHs, deans and associate deans, vice provosts, provost, and the president of the university. This should be done with attention to "closing the loop," or appropriately and without breach of confidentiality, reporting that the feedback was received and any results or actions taken by the administrator in response.

This is intended as a positive, responsive, trust-building recommendation, so that faculty can adequately speak to the work of administrators (and build understanding of the work they do on behalf of the institution). Therefore, as part of this regular performance evaluation process, administrators should provide a brief summary of their activities.

7f. Elected Faculty Representation

Increase accountability of faculty representatives to their peers by fundamentally altering the way they are placed on key task forces and committees. Currently, faculty are appointed by administrators or through Senate Steering recommendations; shift this practice, where possible, to **open election of faculty representatives to task forces and committees** by their peers.

7g. Senate Onboarding/Sharing Best Practices

Increase the accountability of faculty senators to their peers and the trust of administrators and BOV members, so that Faculty Senate represents the will of the faculty, by **improving shared senator onboarding processes** and creating **venues in which senators can share best practices** with each other, in fostering department

discussions and coming to collective decisions on the casting of votes. Questions of unevenness in department-level representation can erode trust in outcomes. See Virginia Tech's approach to senator onboarding.

7h. Faculty Input into our R2 Development

To fully leverage faculty expertise and enact shared governance in the context of our R2 transition, we recommend that a campus-wide **representative faculty body, qualified to speak to research and scholarship needs** from a faculty viewpoint, be created. In other words, a working group with a faculty majority should be established to look into typical practices of research support at the R2 level, and identify areas for improvement at JMU. The Vice Provost for Research and Scholarship should be asked to issue quarterly progress reports on JMU's efforts to align our research initiatives and resourcing with R2 priorities.

7i. Expected Response Times

To foster accountability and better respect everyone's time, administrative offices should institute a practice of publishing **expected response times**, where possible, for queries faculty make related to various policies or the routine business of faculty support. Where *standard* response times are not applicable, individual queries should be acknowledged with an anticipated response time and redirected if a query cannot be answered by the office to which it was addressed.

7j. Enhanced Mediation Offerings

Enhance JMU's faculty ombuds services to include **mediation offerings** beyond those offered by JMU Human Resources. Currently, the ombuds office is explicit about not offering mediation. The task force recommends mediation offered through a new/enhanced service more closely aligned with the university ombudsperson as a first point-of-contact, more low-stakes way of attempting resolution, especially in cases involving faculty members and their AUHs or deans.

7k. Anti-Bullying Policies

Continue ongoing conversations about the creation of an **anti-bullying policy** at the campus level.

7l. Access to Hiring Information and Trends

The Provost's Office should produce a detailed longitudinal report with information sufficient to analyze **year-to-year trends related to areas of faculty line growth/contraction**. While much of this information is available on request to deans and AUHs, we hope a report that pulls together division-wide data disaggregated by college will provide a valuable, holistic perspective. After the report is produced and distributed, the Provost's Office and Senate Budget Committee should collaborate on a plan for future data collection strategies related to frequency and necessary report elements.

The initial report should include:

- Longitudinal departmental-level data that track the number of tenured, tenure-eligible, and RTA instructional faculty for each year included in the analysis;
- Information on the rate at which vacant instructional faculty lines are replaced;
- The number of class sections taught by adjunct faculty, aggregated by department, for each year included in the analysis.

7m. Faculty Input in Budgeting

College-level structures to **involve faculty in budgeting deliberations and decisions** are mandated by the JMU Faculty Handbook (IV.A.2). In academic units and at the division level, where such structures are absent, they should be created.

Recommended Readings

American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (1966). *Statement on the government of colleges and universities*. https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (1994). *On the relationship of faculty governance to academic freedom*. https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (2021). *AAUP Shared Governance Assessment Tool.* https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/AAUP_Shared_Governance_Assessment_Tool.pdf

Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities (AGB) (2017). *AGB Board of Directors statement on shared governance.* https://agb.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/2017_statement_sharedgovernance.pdf

Birnbaum, R. (2004). The end of shared governance: Looking ahead or looking back. *New Directions for Higher Education, 127,* 5-22.

Harris, J. T., Lane, J. E., Sun, J. C., & Baker, G. F. (2022). *Academic leadership and governance of higher education: A guide for trustees, leaders, and aspiring leaders of two- and four-year institutions* (2nd Ed.). Stylus.

Kezar, A. & Dizon, J. P. M. (2019). Renewing and revitalizing shared governance: A social justice and equity framework. In A. Kezar and J. Posselt (Eds.), *Higher education administration for social justice and equity* (pp. 21–42). Routledge.

Leveille, D. E. (2006). *Accountability in higher education: A public agenda for trust and cultural change.* Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. https://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/accountability-higher-educationa-public-agenda-trust-and-cultural-change.

Macheridis, N., & Paulsson, A. (2021). Tracing accountability in higher education. *Research in Education, 110*(1), 78–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/0034523721993143

Olson, G. A. (2009, July 23). *Exactly what is shared governance.* The Chronicle of Higher Education. https://www.chronicle.com/article/exactly-what-is-shared-governance/.

Rettig, P. R. (2020). *Shared governance: A more meaningful approach in higher education.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Tiede, H-J. (2021). *The 2021 AAUP Shared Governance Survey: Findings on Faculty Roles by Decision-Making Areas*. https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/2021-AAUP-Shared-Governance-Survey-Findings-on-Faculty-Roles.pdf

Tierney, W., & Minor, J. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report.* Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED482060.

Appendices

Draft Institutional Statement on Shared Governance
State of Shared Governance as Reflected in Climate Study and COACHE
Survey Task Force Meeting Agendas, September 2022-May 2023

Appendix A.

Draft Institutional Statement on Shared Governance at JMU

Successful universities are marked by close and healthy collaboration among faculty and administration. The complexity of current issues within higher education requires the multiplicity of perspective, diversity of approach, and collective intellectual capacity that can only happen when shared governance flourishes. This statement affirms the significant role of shared governance at James Madison University and asserts that it is the most effective means by which our institution can respond efficiently and effectively to a continuously changing environment.

JMU is guided by principles of shared governance drawn from established and well-tested philosophical and practical perspectives in higher education.[1] Such principles provide a "full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort," informing the creation and ongoing development of institutional policies, and guiding interactions among our Board of Visitors, senior administration, and expert faculty, including through representative groups such as the Faculty Senate.[2] JMU strives to meet and, where possible, exceed core conditions for high-functioning shared governance, including "trust, collaboration, communication, transparency, inclusiveness, honesty, and integrity," and to approach all deliberation with a commitment to mutual respect.[3] JMU fully recognizes that safeguarding the academic freedom of faculty members is "a prerequisite for the practice of governance unhampered by fear of retribution."[4] Across all shared governance efforts, JMU seeks to engage contemporary approaches to centering social justice and equity by creating spaces for conscious public comment, widening the circle toward full participation, inspiring transformative discourse, and reflexively embracing our dynamic higher education and societal landscape.[5]

---

[1] E.g., Birnbaum, R. (2004). "The end of shared governance: Looking ahead or looking back." *New Directions for Higher Education, 127,* 5-22.

[2] American Association of University Professors (1966). *Statement on government of colleges and universities*. https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities.

[3] Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities (2017). *AGB board of directors statement on shared governance.* https://agb.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/2017_statement_sharedgovernance.pdf.

[4] American Association of University Professors (1994). *On the relationship of faculty governance to academic freedom*. https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities.

[5] Kezar, A. & Dizon, J. P. M. (2019). "Renewing and revitalizing shared governance: A social justice and equity framework." In A. Kezar and J. Posselt (Eds.), *Higher education administration for social justice and equity* (pp. 21–42). Routledge.

Appendix B.

The State of Shared Governance at JMU based on Climate Study and COACHE Survey

Introduction and Definitions

Shared governance has a long tradition and is a keystone in American universities. American Association of University Professors (AAUP) defines *shared governance* as "the joint responsibility of Faculty, administrations, and governing boards to govern colleges and universities. Differences in the weight of each group's voice on a particular issue should be determined by the extent of its responsibility for and expertise on that issue." The Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities ("AAUP Statement") is the AAUP's central policy document developed and formulated jointly by the Association of Governing Boards of American Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, and the AAUP. It lays out standards and best practices in higher education.

JMU needs a campus-wide statement or policy about shared governance.

JMU standards will be similar to the principles common to most higher education institutions, given the interconnectivity of Administration, Faculty, staff, and students in our work. JMU, like other institutions, will benefit from adherence to shared governance and accreditation standards. JMU Faculty already have extensive experience and involvement in the evaluation and assessment of the performance of other institutions and programs. Therefore, this report analyzes shared governance practices at JMU following the AAUP principles. The AAUP Statement acknowledges the variety and complexity of the tasks performed by universities with additional challenges and variations due to governmental and legislative authorities, institutional history, and needs. All these factors produce "an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others" and require effective communication for appropriate joint planning and effort. Section 2 of the AAUP Statement specifically highlights the need for joint efforts in

(a) general educational policy,

(b) effective planning and efforts in decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources, and

(c) budgeting and allocation of resources.

Section 5 of the AAUP Statement establishes that the Faculty has "primary responsibility for curriculum subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters, the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances and for reasons communicated to the Faculty."

Section 5 of the AAUP Statement further clarifies that Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility. This area includes faculty appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. It calls for active faculty participation in determining policies and procedures governing salary increases. Section 5 also defines that the chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should typically be in conformity with department members' judgment.

The AAUP Statement also advises that agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist to present the views of the whole Faculty. Finally, it highlights the importance of communication among the Faculty, Administration, and governing board through the following means:

1. Circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees
2. Joint ad hoc committees
3. Standing liaison committees
4. Membership of faculty members on administrative bodies
5. Membership of faculty members on governing boards

Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.

The AAUP discusses budgeting as an area of shared governance: Allocating resources among competing demands is central to the governing board's formal responsibility, the president's administrative authority, and the Faculty's educational function. Each component should therefore have a voice in determining short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. All should understand the

function of each component in budgetary matters; allocating authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

SEVERAL DERIVATIVE DOCUMENTS FURTHER ELABORATE the AAUP Statement and the guiding principles of shared governance in higher education. The statement "Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators" is particularly relevant to them. This document outlines the fundamental principles and procedures in the selection of administrators. It also states the need for periodic reviews to improve the performance of the administrators with broad participation of Faculty and students, as well as the need to publish a summary of the review with a statement of actions taken as a result of the review. Finally, it outlines principles for retention of administrators.

Available data from university-wide studies and surveys

Methodology for the summary quotes

We carefully chose direct quotes that illuminated common themes or reflected group concerns. We did not include quotes that were not supported by the data or which did not reflect group concerns.

Climate study

In the 2020 fall semester, JMU contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a university-wide study. Forty (40) JMU faculty, staff, students, and administrators formed the Climate Survey Working Group (CSWG). The CSWG worked with R&A to develop the survey instrument and promote the survey's Administration in the fall of 2021. Four thousand four hundred fifty (4,450) surveys were returned for a 17% overall response rate. However, the participation rates among instructional Faculty and staff were significantly higher, with 563 instructional faculty and 750 staff members responding. All members of JMU were encouraged to complete the survey. Responses to the multiple-choice format survey items were analyzed for statistical differences based on various demographic categories (e.g., JMU position status, gender identity, disability status) where appropriate. In addition to multiple-choice survey items, several open-ended questions allowed respondents to describe their experiences at JMU. Comments were solicited to give a "voice" to the quantitative findings and to highlight the areas of concern that might have been overlooked owing to the small number of survey responses from historically underrepresented populations.

The results of the Climate Study were released in April 2022. The Climate Study, Response, and Implementation Team was then formed. The Team has eighteen members. Of the five co-

chairs, none are faculty members. Only one of the other members (Dr. Aderonke Adesanya) is a full-time faculty member. There is only one representative from the full-time instructional Faculty. A number of task forces (Violence Prevention, Health, and Well-being, Shared Governance) were formed due to the report, in addition to mandated Kognito mental health training and increased mental telehealth support. However, JMU faculty are unaware of any actionable plans and associated timelines to address the issues raised in the study pertinent to the concerns raised by Faculty and staff.

COACHE surveys

In 2020, James Madison University participated in a job satisfaction survey of full-time instructional Faculty conducted by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The COACHE survey is intended to assess faculty satisfaction with various policies, procedures, and aspects of their work regarding support for their professional performance. The survey is designed so that analyses of responses can lead directly to actions that can improve the professional lives and performance of Faculty. COACHE is also a preferred benchmarking instrument, allowing universities and colleges to compare their data to selected peers and a nationwide cohort. JMU also participated in 2008, 2012, and 2016, providing valuable longitudinal data and enabling trends to be observed.

The COACHE survey was administered between February and April 2020. Fifty-one percent of JMU faculty responded to the survey, a significant decrease compared to the 68% response rate to the 2016 COACHE survey. The final report on the COACHE survey results was submitted to the Provost in January 2021. The results were analyzed by the COACHE Task Force and released to the JMU community in late September 2021. Provost Coltman addressed the results and the Task Force's 12 recommendations in a one-page letter dated 9/27/21.

Results from the Climate Study

Perception of no shared governance at JMU

The Climate Study revealed that the vast majority of instructional Faculty believe that their opinions are not valued and that there is no shared governance at JMU. Specifically, less than 8% of faculty "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that JMU leadership (e.g., Vice Presidents, Provost, Deans) meaningfully includes Faculty in decision-making processes. (Table 70). (p. 199). Only 16% (n = 67) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that JMU values shared governance practices. (p. 200). Only 23% (n = 99) of Tenured and

Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that JMU committees value faculty opinions. (p. 199). The situation is somewhat better at the department level, with 54% (n = 229) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that academic unit leadership (e.g., Academic Unit Heads, Directors) meaningfully include Faculty in decision-making processes. (p. 199). Qualitative comments from Climate Study explain the lack of shared governance. One hundred sixty-four Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents offered additional comments about service, teaching, research, tenure and promotion, and decision-making processes. (p. 200-202). Four themes emerged from the responses: lack of shared governance, tenure and promotion criteria, concerns about administrative leadership, and faculty input needing to be valued.

Respondents discussed a lack of shared governance at JMU in the first theme. This was the most often cited theme, with at least one-third of respondents commenting on shared governance. One respondent declared, "Shared governance poor," while another stated, "JMU has been having a very negative shift away from shared governance." Another respondent wrote, "This isn't my first university faculty job. Until I came here, I voted on issues. There is no faculty governance here at JMU or in my college." Some respondents commented that JMU sometimes talks about shared governance but does not follow through. One respondent wrote, "I see more lip service valuing shared governance than actual shared governance." Another respondent stated, "The new dean talks about shared governance but does not actually value anyone's opinion but her own (especially if you are a woman)." Another respondent commented, "JMU is bad on shared governance. Handpicked committees and top-down practices predominate. Lots of happy talk, but that is about it."

Other respondents stated that JMU does not value or support shared governance processes. One respondent shared, "There is no evidence that JMU values shared governance as it has persisted in maintaining a very hierarchical organizational structure in which all power and decisions come from the top down. All faculty input is advisory only." Another respondent wrote, "The university leadership has failed to signal an interest in or support for shared governance or faculty input into critical decisions." Another respondent commented similarly, "JMU does not value, let alone implement, shared governance practices. Faculty are rarely involved in key decision-making."

Respondents also explained that decision-making at JMU is not made through shared governance; respondents felt that administrators make decisions without faculty participation. One respondent wrote, "Faculty are not engaged in shared governance. It is clear that Faculty advise, but administrators ultimately decide." Another respondent shared, "Whether true or not, a consistent feeling among faculty is that administration makes decisions and then brings in faculty to have those decisions reinforced." Respondents described how Faculty may be

included in the discussion, but then the decision is made by senior leadership. One respondent wrote, "Since Summer 2019. Include Faculty in decision making but then do things the way they always intended to do them." Another respondent shared, "It is not uncommon to do a fair amount of work on a committee making policy and gaining consensus only to have the AUH change everything before it is added to the departmental handbook." Respondents also commented on how JMU leadership has become very top-down and hierarchical. One respondent wrote, "Over time, JMU has become more of a 'top down' corporate institution." Another respondent stated, "JMU management style is far too top-down." One respondent elaborated, "I have felt many times during my time at JMU that most important decisions are made top-down. Faculty may be consulted, but in reality, the decision has already been made. Faculty are consulted as a way to 'tweak' what has already been decided, but not in a meaningful way that can influence the actual decision.

Several respondents identified recent changes to hiring practices as an example of the lack of shared governance. One respondent wrote, "The Administration is either in denial or deeply cynical. Shared governance is the LAST thing it really wants or values. Oh, it pays lip service to the idea, but departments cannot (now) even rank job candidates applying for instructional (tenure-line) positions." Another respondent commented, "You must be joking regarding the 'JMU leadership includes faculty' stuff! The Administration has just rewritten the guidelines for FACULTY searches, disallowing the ranking of candidates by search committees! That is willfully choosing ignorance." One respondent shared, "The recent changes in academic hiring procedures away from AAUP guidelines with no faculty input are a serious affront to shared governance. There seem to be more and more of these decisions without faculty input." Another respondent explained, "The idea of shared governance is often touted but rarely enacted. In fact, what there is of it has been significantly diminished in recent years. For example, searches for Faculty and administrative positions now actively reject the input of the Faculty on the search committee to such an extent that I am inclined to refuse to participate in any future search process, especially for a position like Dean, Director, Provost, etc., since upper Administration will select their preferred candidate regardless of the evaluation of the faculty hiring committee."

Concerns about Administrative Leadership

Respondents shared their concerns related to administrative leadership. (p. 204-205). Some respondents criticized the leadership of JMU's senior Administration. One respondent noted, "Senior leadership appears feckless and lost," while another respondent declared, "JMU's administration is opaque, secretive, and in my experience, untrustworthy and occasionally callous…" One respondent observed, "Admin is VERY in-bred. They are hiring double dukes and promoting from within. Causes navel gazing and insular views. Boots on the ground, we are not

as great as they think we are." Another respondent shared, "Of these, the biggest is a lack of transparency and an absence of presidential leadership. We cannot even talk with the president as he is inaccessible and intentionally makes himself inaccessible to diverse people. He has fear. A few protects him. Therefore, he never knows what is happening with those in lesser positions."

Other respondents shared their frustrations that the senior leadership needs to relate to the Faculty, which has led to a lack of understanding, respect, and support from the Administration to the Faculty. One respondent remarked, "The upper Administration is dominated by people with little or no experience working in classrooms, conducting meaningful research, or serving communities local to global. They do not and cannot comprehend the lives of Faculty, who they often treat as fungible." Another respondent shared, "As a faculty member, it increasingly feels that university administration is less and less involved with those of us whose main role is teaching and research." Respondents noted the lack of academics in senior leadership positions. One respondent observed, "I do not think the senior leadership team really understands what we do at a university, especially as it involves teaching and research. This is not surprising, however, because very few members of the SLT have an academic background." Another respondent stated, "The Provost should not be the only academic involved in senior leadership."

Respondents were also concerned about the direction of JMU and what the Administration was prioritizing. Some respondents wanted more clear vision. One respondent shared, "The goals of upper administration remain somewhat opaque." Another respondent wrote, "Lots of great people working in admin and working very hard but no clear vision from the president and provost, so difficult to see meaningful change being enacted in the near to mid-term future." Another respondent shared, "I feel disconnected from the administration (above the Dean level, save those times when it is obvious that the Dean is hamstrung by someone at a higher level), and find that the administration seems more interested in managing public relations and burnishing a facade of relevance, while commitment to scholarship and the academic purpose of the university remain neglected." Another respondent explained, "The upper Administration at JMU (President and VPs) is more concerned with PR than with the healthy and sustainable operation of the university. The upper Administration (minus the Provost) is dominated by white men and their values, lacks transparency, seeks to reproduce the white-centered experience, and fails at meaningfully recruiting students, Faculty, and staff of color."

Faculty Input Not Valued

Lastly, respondents discussed whether they felt that the Administration values faculty input (p. 205-206). Some respondents commented that it varies whether they felt listened to or not. One

respondent wrote, "There is a difference between the support I receive from my AUH and what I receive from my Dean. My academic unit head meaningfully includes faculty opinions. My Dean pretends to." Another respondent shared, "I think deans frequently value faculty input. The upper Administration does not seem to value faculty input in the same way, or perhaps they are just listening to a very small group of Faculty." Other respondents did not think faculty input was valued and flatly stated that "Faculty opinions are largely ignored" and "I do not believe our new unit head values any faculty input."

Some respondents described how JMU goes through the motions of soliciting faculty input, but that faculty input is not what drives the decision-making. One respondent noted that there is a "Veneer of listening, but not truly listening." Another respondent shared, "I have served on committees that were to be a rubber stamp. If we reached a different conclusion, a new committee was formed." One respondent commented, "Most of the time, faculty input is valued. There are times it feels like a decision is already made by the Administration, and the faculty input is collected for formality or to check a box." Another respondent wrote, "Faculty are not consulted on decisions even when their expertise might help shape administrative responses to a wide range of events/issues. The repeated convening of task forces under the guise of new names, which draw on Faculty to produce recommendations and suggestions, and which never result in meaningful action, is evidence of this." [The following paragraph is a critique of how senior leadership handled the Covid-19 pandemic].

Fear of Retaliation and Effect on Morale

Faculty primacy in hiring, promotion, and reappointment decisions is at the core of the AAUP Shared Governance Statement. Thirty-six percent (n = 466) of Instructional Faculty and Staff respondents indicated that they had observed hiring practices at JMU (e.g., hiring supervisor bias, search committee bias, lack of effort in diversifying recruiting pool) that they perceived to be unjust or that would inhibit diversifying the community. (p. 181). Twenty-nine percent (n = 373) of Instructional Faculty and Staff respondents indicated that they had observed promotion, tenure, reappointment, and reclassification practices at JMU that they perceived to be unjust. Subsequent analyses indicated that of those individuals, 32% (n = 118) indicated that the unjust practices were based on nepotism/cronyism, 20% (n = 76) on gender/gender identity, and 18% each on racial identity (n = 68) and position status (n = 66). (p. 182). Only 56% (n = 237) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the tenure and promotion process was applied equitably to Faculty in their unit. (p. 192).

Table 71 indicates that only 38% (n = 30) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the criteria used for contract renewal were clear (p. 207). Fifty-one

percent (n = 40) of Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated (p. 208).

As noted in Table 76, only 36% (n = 197) of Instructional Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they can report problems that they have experienced or witnessed without fear of retaliation (p. 220). Not surprisingly, the perception that there are no clear and transparent hiring and promotion criteria, the ability to report and address workplace issues, and fear of retaliation contribute to an overall low level of morale. Sixty-seven percent (n = 378) of Instructional Faculty respondents and 62% (n = 464) of Staff respondents had seriously considered leaving JMU in the past year (Figure 53) (p. 278). Three-quarters (73%) of tenured Faculty considered leaving JMU.

"Concerns about leadership" were identified as one of the common reasons to consider leaving JMU. Page 302 contains qualitative details with a recurring theme of negative changes happening in the last few years. Several respondents felt that "Leadership is lacking at JMU." One respondent described the problem as "bad, ineffective, biased leadership," while another respondent stated, "Poor leadership (Dean, Provost, Academic Affairs, President) makes this job very difficult and unenjoyable." Another respondent shared, "There have been periods where toxic individuals in positions of power were allowed to quietly perpetuate a hostile environment, sometimes for months or years." Respondents did not trust the actions of the Administration. One respondent wrote, "JMU administration is not trustworthy, and it makes being a faculty member difficult when we are told one thing, but the admin does another." Another respondent stated, "I have witnessed incongruence between stated values and actions of leadership that are troubling." One respondent explained, "I have considered leaving because JMU does not have values that they live up to, and they make decisions based solely upon money and reputation. Not a single decision is made for the best interest of students or employees."

Some respondents felt that JMU leadership lacked the direction or vision to lead the university successfully. One respondent wrote, "The culture has changed drastically in the last ten years; there is little to no vision starting at the top; it's clear that senior leadership does not get along, nor can they agree on much; it is bleeding down through the institution." Another respondent commented, "Over the past three years+, which included significant staff transitions at the senior leadership, I have felt that the strategic direction of the university has been somewhat compromised." Respondents commented on how the JMU administration refuses to lead in difficult situations. One respondent shared, "JMU fails to be proactive; from department to Sr. Mgt, the response is always reactive. The lack of planning or sharing of the goals/plan is and continues to be an issue." Another respondent wrote, "Administration does not show real moral leadership or stand by their Faculty and staff in the face of public criticism. The motto of

the university seems to be 'Do not make waves.'" Another respondent noted, "JMU leaders are not seriously willing to lead the institution in a way that ALL JMU community members feel comfortable and welcomed."

Some respondents commented on the decision-making processes of JMU leadership. One respondent explained, "The governance structure at JMU is very undemocratic, and it allows higher-ups total authority to bully and make important decisions. The upper Administration and AUHs seem to protect each other and the students. No one advocates for Faculty or supports Faculty. This is a backward, sexist governing system not fit for a university of R2 status." Another respondent wrote, "I am often confused by the decisions made by mid/level leaders. The AUHs and Deans lack transparency which is so disengaging for me." One respondent stated, "Our Dean has created a climate of distrust amongst Faculty and with Administration (Dean's Office, Provost's office). The expectation of repercussions if speak out in disagreement or critical feedback." Another respondent described a specific hiring experience, "As I have seen several times here, our AUH was hired against the recommendation of every single person on the search committee. The Dean had the final say, and honestly, why did we even have a committee at all? Our new AUH is a nightmare, truly. And the year has only just begun."

A few respondents identified individuals within leadership whom they saw as disruptive and problematic. One respondent wrote, "Current AUH is not supportive of faculty, bullies, intimidates, lies, and generally intimidates faculty." Another respondent shared, "New Dean is vindictive. He has harmed the climate of the CoE. He is incompetent. If you don't drink his Kool-Aid and kiss his ass, you are ignored, pushed out, undermined, etc. He doesn't follow procedures for faculty governance and ignores protocols for hiring for leadership positions. He makes rash decisions and has favorites." Another respondent commented, "When the new Dean of my college arrived on campus, he made the work environment threatening, unwelcoming, and intimidating. He belittled the existing culture of our college, hired and tenured faculty members without going through appropriate channels or considerations, and silenced (through intimidation, forcing into early retirement, or excluding) Faculty who disagreed with his decisions." One respondent observed, "This place needs new leadership. The Provost, in particular, has been a real disappointment. She came in claiming to want to change the culture, but all she does is cherry-pick her pets for key positions, continue to avoid soliciting feedback or input from people who could help, and consistently display a lack of empathy or any kind of humanity for the Faculty in her care, and more."

COACHE survey findings and highlights

The COACHE Survey Report from 2020 provides scores for twenty-five benchmarks. In comparison with the cohort group of 110 institutions, the report identified the following areas

of strength: appreciation and recognition, departmental engagement, facilities and work resources, and health and retirement benefits. It also identified the following areas of concern: "governance: a shared sense of purpose," "governance: understanding the issue at hand," and personal and family policies. Furthermore, the five categories with the biggest negative changes in comparison with the 2016 survey were:

1. Leadership: Senior
2. Leadership: divisional
3. Governance: trust
4. Governance: a shared sense of purpose
5. Governance: understanding the issue at hand

It appears that in all these five categories, JMU now has either the lowest or second lowest scores from our peer group.

The COACHE Task Force formulated several recommendations and conclusions that support the work of the shared governance task force and provide structured ideas for deepening and expanding shared governance at JMU. However, due to the disruption caused by Covid, there has been little attention to the COACHE survey recommendations, as noted on the site.

https://www.jmu.edu/faculty/senate/coache/index.shtml

The Faculty Senate is charged with updating the recommendations on the COACHE site. [See p. 3 of executive study of COACHE Survey]:

https://www.jmu.edu/academic-affairs/policies-and-reports/coache.shtml

> The JMU Faculty Senate tracks the recommendations from COACHE surveys, and the responsible parties assigned to work on the recommendations. The Senate also provides regular updates on progress made toward the implementation of recommendations and the associated outcomes. Further information on JMU's history and partnership with COACHE can be found on the Academic Affairs website. All JMU faculty can gain access, with eID and password, to information about COACHE surveys conducted at JMU.

The following COACHE recommendations connect directly to shared governance:

Recommendation 3 - Culture.

Faculty are eager to learn how the evolving institutional identity impacts their work. As JMU moves to a new research category (R2), it is necessary that Faculty are active in casting the

vision for the university's identity and future direction. Also related to culture is the ongoing lack of diversity, especially for Faculty of color. The COACHE Task Force recommends the university:

- Involve Faculty in shaping the university identity by engaging in ongoing and regular focus groups about what R2 means for JMU.
- Continue DEI efforts to closely examine policies that inhibit the recruitment and retention of diverse Faculty, especially Faculty of color.
- Provide ongoing leadership development and mentoring for college and division leaders to improve the climate for Faculty, including the development and nurturing of healthy interpersonal interactions, effective listening, and building consensus around important issues.

Recommendation 5 - Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand and Sense of Purpose.

While the Governance benchmarks are separate, the recommendations address the importance of the faculty role in academic governance. Faculty must have shared meaning and ownership of the university's work, driving conversations that shape the institutional identity and future. The COACHE Task Force recommended the university create a better structure for defining shared governance across the university, where consensus is built across and within colleges and divisions. Improved governance structure can ensure Faculty clearly understand their role in governing matters of the institution and may include:

• Alignment of governance processes across colleges and divisions to address ambiguity in faculty roles.

• Clearly defined terms and membership of faculty committees that are consistent across the university while protecting the unique identity and integrity of departmental identities.

• Faculty should lead the development of the handbook content, with administrator input and feedback.

Recommendation 6 - Leadership: Senior and Divisional.

Develop mechanisms for Faculty and administrators at all levels of the university to engage in ongoing dialogue through deliberative and non-threatening spaces. This dialogue can shape the future of JMU and how Faculty play a key role. Mechanisms may include:

- Regularly scheduled town hall meetings at the university level, where division leaders from Academic Affairs and other Divisions (such as Finance and Administration & Enrollment Management) receive feedback from Faculty.

- Regularly scheduled town hall meetings at the college level.
- Faculty Senate and Administration are working collaboratively to shape the institution's vision.
- Faculty and Administrators co-chair all task forces, with equitable representation of Faculty.

Recommendation 7- Leadership: Senior & Divisional.

Clear communication and listening to Faculty, especially Faculty from underrepresented minority groups, should be at the center of leadership priority. Offer leadership development opportunities for Faculty and administrators to improve the quality and depth of dialogues where various voices and perspectives can be heard. Additionally, Senior and Divisional Leadership is encouraged to improve in areas such as:

- Communication flow within and across Academic Affairs to ensure that messages Faculty receive are consistent from senior administrators and college/unit leaders.
- Providing more opportunities for faculty involvement, especially from underrepresented minority groups, so there is a broad representation of Faculty with varied perspectives. This may include ongoing focus groups of Faculty from underrepresented groups providing perspectives in a non-threatening, deliberative space.
- Pursue leadership development opportunities for leaders who engage with Faculty, such as Deans, Associate Deans, and central Administration, to develop and foster facilitative and effective listening skills.

Recommendation 8 – **Leadership: Senior & Divisional.**

Examine the tone of the university, where there is a clear distinction between balances of power on decisions that matter to the university.

Ott and Matthews (2015) reported that decision-making should not be too far toward Faculty nor too far toward administrators when it comes to issues that impact the university. The COACHE Task Force recommends:

- Improving transparency in regularly reporting the ratio of, and representation of, instructional Faculty versus Administration for decisions that impact Faculty.
- Instructional Faculty include AUHs. Administration includes non-instructional Faculty, such as Vice Presidents, Directors, and Associate Directors, as well as instructional Faculty who are reassigned to administrative roles, such as A-deans, Deans, Vice Provosts, etc.

- Develop a plan to execute an unbiased analysis of processes that govern the university and the extent to which those processes are led by Faculty vs. administrators.
- Providing a follow-up survey to faculty and/or focus groups of Faculty, ensuring equitable representation of rank and minority groups, to understand the administrative challenges faculty face.

Recommendation 9 - Nature of Work.

Faculty responses about the Nature of Work include inequities in teaching loads, expectations for the scholarship, and overextension of time in service activities. Faculty workloads vary within units, across units, across colleges, and across the university.

- The COACHE Task Force recommends the university:
- Explore models that facilitate faculty voices being heard beyond Academic Affairs, whereas workloads may be related to budget implications.
- Address equity and weights of teaching, research, and service loads across campus.
- Reassess faculty productivity expectations in light of other factors such as compensation, culture, resources, etc.
- Examine the extent to which faculty productivity and workload expectations are comparable to other institutions in the R2 category to be proactive in shaping institutional identity.

Conclusions

- JMU often puts forth a narrative that shared governance is a malleable and opaque concept. This is a myth that should be eradicated. There are clear ways to define and articulate what shared governance is, as the AAUP and the introduction to this report indicate.
- There is limited involvement of Faculty in the areas of their expertise in the governance structure at JMU. Thus, there is limited shared governance at this institution, a finding which is articulated by the Climate Study and COACHE surveys.
- Faculty fear retribution if they raise concerns and issues with AUHs and Administration because of the hierarchical structure in place at JMU. There are no consistent evaluation procedures that promote that the Administration be responsive to the needs and concerns of the Faculty.
- Because of this, Faculty are less likely to communicate their concerns since communicating them will not lead to meaningful change. Similarly, there is a fear that clear communication might more likely result in retaliation against the faculty member.

This scenario clouds the full scale of the problem of shared governance as well as the deleterious impact the lack of it has on faculty morale and trust.

- A significant number of Faculty reported observing promotion, tenure, reappointment, and reclassification practices at JMU that they perceived to be unjust.
- A significant number of Faculty has concerns about JMU's Leadership and management practices.
- There has been little attempt to move forward on the findings of either the COACHE survey or the Climate Study. The lack of follow-through might be explained by Covid-19 disruptions, but now is the time to move forward.
- Though the COACHE survey report was completed in January 2021, it was not available to Faculty, and no response from the Administration was provided until late September 2021. Furthermore, the Provost's response did not specifically address any plans and steps to address the identified issues. Due to Covid-19, the COACHE survey fell out of focus. This is an excellent time to renew attention to the COACHE recommendations as well as to follow up on them.
- The Climate Study identified similar issues. It also revealed that the vast majority of tenured Faculty seriously considered leaving JMU. Besides the formation of various committees and task forces, there are no clear steps taken to address the concerns.
- The COACHE survey provides excellent paths of action for increased shared governance at JMU.
- The Faculty Senate is the body in charge of making sure updates are occurring and reported for the COACHE survey.
- Both studies indicate that JMU is not meeting the criteria for shared governance as defined by AAUP, especially in those areas where Faculty should have primacy.
- JMU has a lack of culture regarding faculty involvement in budgetary matters.

References

1. Climate Study Report: https://www.jmu.edu/climate-study/final-report/jmu-climate-study-final-report.pdf
2. Climate Response Team: https://www.jmu.edu/climate-study/implementation-team.shtml
3. COACHE Survey Description: https://www.jmu.edu/academic-affairs/policies-and-reports/coache.shtml
4. 2020 COACHE report:
5. https://www.jmu.edu/academic-affairs/policies-and-reports/coache1/coache-report-2021.pdf
6. https://www.aaup.org/report/recommended-institutional-regulations-academic-freedom-and-tenure

Appendix C. Task Force Meeting Agendas (2022-2023)

To support transparency about our activities, agendas for 14 task force meetings held between 29 September 2022 and 12 May 2023 are appended here. Our Fall 2022 Summary Report is available on the Provost's web site: https://www.jmu.edu/academic-affairs/committees-and-taskforces/jfspsgtf.shtml

Some links in the agendas reproduced here lead to Task Force working documents or resource libraries that are only accessible to members. Links have therefore been inactivated. Ongoing Zoom meeting access information has been redacted from the agendas, as have some personal names, for instance from a first-pass to-do list for December 8th (as small groups have since combined forces or refined their goals, and those no longer accurately represent individual responsibilities).

Task force meetings were generally 90 minutes in length and included one full-day in-person retreat held on 24 April 2023. Task force co-chairs also presented on the work of the group at a Faculty Senate meeting held on 26 January 2023.

In addition to synchronous, full-group meetings, members of the Joint Task Force participated in numerous small-group working sessions and devoted countless hours to asynchronous collaboration on documents, including our recommendations and the *Introduction to Shared Governance* in our final report. The co-chairs would like to thank all members of our group for their dedication to this important work.

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

29 September 2022, 1:30pm

Zoom meeting:
[redacted]
Meeting ID: [redacted] + Passcode: [redacted]
One tap mobile: [redacted]

AGENDA

Welcome, Operating Agreements, and Discussing the Charge
Bethany — 25 minutes
Guests for this portion: Dr. Kathy Ott Walter and Provost Heather Coltman

Getting to Know Each Other
Smita — 30 minutes
Please be prepared to introduce yourself briefly, share your experience or particular interest in shared governance, and offer one thing that colleagues should understand about or expect from you.

Starting with the End in Mind
Smita — 30 minutes
Breakout groups to explore components of our charge and formulate the intended contributions of the Task Force or imagine what completed actions might be/what success would look like.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps
Bethany — 5 minutes
Capturing action items, affirming mechanics (Teams, etc.) and plans for our next meeting, including readings and a presentation by Ben Selznick.

Next Meeting: 13 October 2022, 1:30pm on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

13 October 2022, 1:30pm

Zoom meeting:
[redacted]
Meeting ID: [redacted] + Passcode: [redacted]
One tap mobile: [redacted]

AGENDA

Welcome Back and Progress Thus Far
Bethany and Smita — 10 minutes

Presentation and Discussion
Ben and all — 50 minutes
An overview and state of the field by Ben Selznick; general discussion, questions, ideas arising.

Next Steps
Smita and Bethany — 30 minutes
Reviewing group contributions to our document on possible deliverables and action items; inviting commentary and shared thinking on next steps.

Next Meeting: 27 October 2022, 1:30pm on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

27 October 2022, 1:30pm

Zoom meeting:
[redacted]
Meeting ID: [redacted] + Passcode: [redacted]
One tap mobile: [redacted]

HOMEWORK

Please read and review Birnbaum (2004), the AAUP Shared Governance Assessment Tool, and its outcome: the 2021 AAUP Survey Findings. Please also come ready to discuss contributions to our "Start with the End in Mind" document.

AGENDA

Welcome and Recap
Smita and Bethany — 5 minutes

Defining Deliverables
All — 40 minutes
Collaborative work to narrow down items proposed in our group document ,with a goal of settling on at least one deliverable for each of the 5 established Task Force goals.

Considering the AAUP Assessment Tool in JMU's Context
All — 30 minutes
Should we deploy this assessment tool for benchmarking academic decision-making at JMU against national findings? If so, how would it best be delivered, and how might the Task Force use and communicate any findings?

Confirming Next Steps
Smita and Bethany — 15 minutes
Given campus holidays, we have two more meetings established this semester. How do we want to use them? Should we schedule an additional in-person working session or retreat?

Next Meeting: 10 November 2022, 1:30pm on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

10 November 2022, 1:30pm

Zoom meeting:
[redacted]
Meeting ID: [redacted] + Passcode: [redacted]
One tap mobile: [redacted]

AGENDA

Welcome and Update on AAUP Assessment Tool plans
Smita and Bethany — 10 minutes

Defining Deliverables and Forming Working Groups
All — 1 hour
Discussion and refinement of items proposed in our group document or otherwise shared with the committee as possible deliverables. Our goal is to leave the meeting having settled on concrete deliverables that address the 5 established Task Force goals and with point people/small groups assigned to take them forward.

Next Steps
Bethany and Smita — 20 minutes
Given campus holidays, we have one more meeting established this semester. How do we want to use it?
Does continuing the current meeting schedule and format work for everyone for Spring 2023, or should we re-calendar?
Is there a desire for an in-person working session or retreat?

Next Meeting: 8 December 2022, 1:30pm on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

8 December 2022, 1:30pm

Zoom meeting:
[redacted]
Meeting ID: [redacted] + Passcode: [redacted]
One tap mobile: [redacted]

AGENDA

Reporting Out

All — 80 minutes

Having agreed on areas of focus in our last meeting, participants will share on work accomplished thus far, any needs or questions emerging for the whole group, and future plans.

- Exploring current structures and existing practices
  - [redacted], supported by [redacted], to work on a "JMU policy library" modeled on the one by Grand Valley State
  - [redacted] to ask Dr. Coltman to provide or solicit refreshed reports on college-level shared governance structures and practices.
- Assessing communications strategies
  - [redacted] to work on comparison of communications practices across colleges and departments, surfacing best practices
  - [redacted] to focus on best practices in voting and survey procedures
- Collecting relevant research from a range of higher education experts
  - [redacted] and [redacted] to create a document library that could be shared with the campus (readings, etc.)
  - [redacted] to share a round-up of other institution's published statements and/or policy libraries regarding shared governance
  - [redacted] and [redacted] to help define a concise set of key elements of shared governance/markers of a healthy culture, derived from research
- Integrating JMU Climate Study results related to shared governance
  - [redacted] and [redacted] to refine summary document on Climate Study and incorporate COACHE findings, with an eye toward recommendations that could be provided to the Climate Study Implementation Group
- Proposing a plan to implement shared governance professional development opportunities including workshops, seminars, and/or guest speakers tailored to the JMU context
  - [redacted] and [redacted] to create a first-draft proposal for campus workshops and listening/sharing sessions

Next Steps

Smita and Bethany — 10 minutes

A look at calendars and possibilities for a Task Force "retreat," and a preview of plans for the Spring semester.

Next Regular Meeting: 20 January 2023, 11am-noon on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

20 January 2023, 11am-noon

Zoom meeting:

Meeting ID:
One tap mobile:

AGENDA

Welcome and Scene-Setting for the Spring

Smita and Bethany — 20 minutes

This will include discussion of the format of final outputs and scheduling of a late-semester "retreat"/report-drafting day. *Please have your calendars handy. Bethany will propose options based on Liana's last survey.*

Regrouping Around Deliverables

All — 40 minutes

Please come prepared to give brief updates on small-group activities and describe next planned steps/needs from fellow Task Force members/blockers in working toward the six planned deliverables from our Fall Semester report (listed below). We will pay special attention to italicized items.

- A resource library or broadly accessible "gateway" page for definitions and research-based best practices in shared governance, including draft language for possible adoption of a JMU campus statement on shared governance
- A "JMU policy library," drawing together links to existing university and Academic Affairs policies relevant to shared governance
- *A plan for documentation of current shared governance structures and communications practices in place at the campus and college level, to be created with faculty input*
- A summary of findings relative to the state of shared governance at JMU from the September 2021 COACHE survey report (summarizing Spring 2020 feedback) and the April 2022 Campus Climate Study report (summarizing Fall 2021 feedback)
- Recommendations to create better documented and more trustworthy systems for voting, conducting surveys, and other faculty/staff feedback and data collection activities relevant to shared governance
- *Recommendations for an action-oriented program for ongoing campus conversations, shared learning, listening, and concrete problem-solving around lived experiences of shared governance at JMU*

Next Meeting: 3 February 2023, 11am on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

3 February 2023, 11am-noon

Zoom meeting:

Meeting ID:
One tap mobile:

AGENDA

Next Steps on Deliverables

All — 40 minutes

As we move out of small groups into whole task force feedback and contributions, *please come prepared* to give progress updates on assigned work — hopefully deposited in draft form in our "buckets." Describe next steps/needed support from fellow Task Force members in working toward our six planned deliverables. We will briefly review all six, but as with last time, will pay special attention to italicized ones.

- A resource library or broadly accessible "gateway" page for definitions and research-based best practices in shared governance, *including draft language for possible adoption of a JMU campus statement on shared governance*
- A "JMU policy library," drawing together links to existing university and Academic Affairs policies relevant to shared governance
- A plan for documentation of current shared governance structures and communications practices in place at the campus and college level, to be created with faculty input
- *A summary of findings relative to the state of shared governance at JMU from the September 2021 COACHE survey report (summarizing Spring 2020 feedback) and the April 2022 Campus Climate Study report (summarizing Fall 2021 feedback)*
- *Recommendations to create better documented and more trustworthy systems for voting, conducting surveys, and other faculty/staff feedback and data collection activities relevant to shared governance*
- Recommendations for an action-oriented program for ongoing campus conversations, shared learning, listening, and concrete problem-solving around lived experiences of shared governance at JMU

Debrief on Senate Presentation and a Request for Feedback

Bethany and Smita — 5 minutes
Hala — 15 minutes

Next Meeting: 17 February 2023, 11am on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

17 February 2023, 11am-noon

Meeting ID:
One tap mobile:

AGENDA

Welcome & Housekeeping

Bethany and Smita — 10 minutes

- a quick Teams screenshare to make sure everyone can find needed documents
- timing query and a dietary needs survey [link] for our 24 April retreat at the Farm
- proposed sequence of upcoming agendas (a bucket-by-bucket focus)

Today's focus: Deliverable 1

All — 50 minutes

"A resource library or broadly accessible "gateway" page for definitions and research-based best practices in shared governance, including draft language for possible adoption of a JMU campus statement on shared governance"

- Please review and edit/leave comments on the draft *Shared Governance Statement* [ ] in our bucket 1. Come prepared to discuss.
- Please also consider additional links and citations that would support the "resource library" portion of the "gateway page." Running list here: [ ].

Next Meeting: 3 March 2023, 11am on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

3 March 2023, 11am-noon

Zoom meeting:

Meeting ID:
One tap mobile:

AGENDA

Follow-up from last time

Bethany and Smita — 15 minutes

- Next steps for Deliverables 1, 2, and 3
- Desire for working/check-in sessions vs. deeper conversation sessions? Availability for the latter?

Today's focus: Deliverable 6

All — 45 minutes

"Recommendations for an action-oriented program for ongoing campus conversations, shared learning, listening, and concrete problem-solving around lived experiences of shared governance at JMU."

Next Meeting: 31 March 2023, 11am on Zoom (Bethany absent)

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University
March 31, 11:00 am-12:30 PM

Join Zoom Meeting:

AGENDA

- Introductory comment Smita ***2-3 minutes***

Since Bethany is at a conference, I would like to keep a detailed account of our discussion. Please consider adding your comments to this doc on teams as they come up. I will edit and clean up later.

Ben's guidance on our final product ***5 minutes***

- Trustworthy Voting Standardization and Feedback Mechanisms ***30 minutes***
    - Brief overview by ***Kristen***
    - Resolve comments (All. It will help if people add comments before the meeting)
    - Policy Proposal
- The State of Shared Governance at JMU based on Climate Study and Coache survey. ***30 minutes***
    - Brief overview by ***Sasha***
    - Resolve comments (All. It will help if people add comments before the meeting)
    - Recommendations
- Items from the floor ***10 minutes***
- Visualizing our final product ***10 minutes***

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

14 April 2023, 11am-12:30pm

Zoom meeting:

Meeting ID:
One tap mobile:

AGENDA

Welcome, note-taking for Smita, & Retreat plans/questions

Bethany & all — 5 minutes

- Screenshare preview of final report/recommendations template

Today's focus: Deliverable 7: "Accountability"

All — 80 minutes

Please review the draft recommendations document that task force colleagues have started in our Bucket 7 folder, including by taking a look at the citations linked at bottom, and come prepared to discuss.

Check-ins on Buckets 2 and 3

All — 5 minutes

- A "JMU policy library," drawing together links to existing university and Academic Affairs policies relevant to shared governance
- A plan for documentation of current shared governance structures and communications practices in place at the campus and college level, to be created with faculty input

Next Meeting: daylong Retreat!
light breakfast, lunch, & snacks provided
24 April 2023, JMU Farm
8399 Alumnae Dr, Port Republic, VA 24471
9am start time

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

24 April 2023, 8:30am-5pm — in-person retreat

JMU FARM LOGISTICS
Address: 8399 Alumnae Dr, Port Republic, VA 24471 (Google and Apple Maps are accurate!)
Bethany's cell if you need it:
Bring: We will have printouts of the draft report, but recommend a laptop and writing implements for collaborative work if possible. We may choose to divide into groups.

*Please arrive **as early as 8:30am** to enjoy each other's company and a light breakfast (fresh fruit platter; muffins, danishes, bagels with butter, jam, and cream cheese; caffeinated and decaf coffee, hot tea, iced water).*

AGENDA
8:30-9am — breakfast and settle in
9-9:30am — feedback on Introduction; many thanks for taking first crack!
9:30am-12:30pm — Buckets 7, 6, and 5 and related appendices. (Smita and Bethany populated from past meeting documents and notes)

12:30-1:30pm — LUNCH; stop working! unplug, informal conversation, explore the Farm and grounds.
Lunch is as you ordered through Liana, with attention to special requests — salmon caesars, peach BBQ chicken salads, or Mediterranean quinoa bowls with bottled water, fruit cups, and dessert.

1:30-5pm — Buckets 4, 3, 2, and 1 with related appendices. (Smita and Bethany populated from past meeting documents and notes)

*We are aware some may need to leave earlier than 5pm; we **will take breaks as needed** through the morning and afternoon sessions. Sustenance for the afternoon will include vegan roasted garam masala chickpeas, trail mix, cookies/brownies, and whole fresh fruit.*

Questions, problems, suggestions? Please just ask!

Next Meeting: 28 April 2023, 11am on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

28 April 2023, 11am-12:30pm

Zoom meeting:

Meeting ID:
One tap mobile:

AGENDA

Summary of work at the Farm for those not present
Summary and approval of subsequent edits by assigned Task Force members
Next steps on unaddressed Priority Areas and "scratchpad" notes

Next Meeting: 12 May 2023, 11am on Zoom

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Shared Governance Task Force
James Madison University

12 May 2023, 11am-12:30pm

Zoom meeting:

Meeting ID:
One tap mobile:

AGENDA

Confirm an approach to getting our report to the finish line!

Smita and Bethany — 20 minutes

- Timeline/deadlines
- Finalizing core recommendations (today's work)
- Establishing an editing team and approach to full Task Force sign-off
- Consensus on appendices

Work through remaining "buckets"

All — 70 minutes

- Priority 5: Feedback and Voting (a few items remaining)
- Priority 6: Learning and Problem-Solving
- Priority 3: Structures and Practices

No future meetings planned at this time.
Work to continue asynchronously.