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Increased Teaching Load for Temporary Faculty Moore reported that a motion passed in March regarding a statement from administration to reduce workloads once the current budget crisis has received a response from the President.

Moore read as follows: Motion: “We move for the Faculty Senate to request a formal declaration from the Administration stating the increase in teaching load for temporary faculty is one forced solely by the current and temporary budget woes of the state and will be reduced when the present budget situation improves.”

President Grube’s response: “Following review of the motion presented to the Faculty Senate at the March 24, 2009, Faculty Senate meeting, as provided in your memo of March 25, 2009, I have not approved the motion below presented to the Senate by Dr. Sonya Huber-Humes.”

“It is the practice of Georgia Southern University to employ temporary faculty to manage teaching responsibilities that cannot be either tenured or tenure track faculty. The primary role of temporary faculty, therefore, is devoted to teaching, rather than either research or service. Therefore, the expectation that temporary faculty will commit the entirety of their 15-hour workload in the instruction of students is appropriate. It is not the intention of the University to reduce this expectation at some later date.”
The response has been posted on the Senate website. Michael Moore (COE), Acting Chair, Senate Executive Committee, then acknowledged Cliff Price from the gallery.

Cliffton Price (CLASS) clarified that he and Tina Whittle had made the motion for a declaration on faculty teaching loads at the March Faculty Senate meeting. He added that Senator Huber had presented the motion on their behalf. He added that the motion asks for administration to make a statement that the increase in teaching load to a 15-credit load for all temporary faculty was based solely on the budget because that was how it was first presented earlier in the year.

Dr. Grube’s answer, Price argued, does not say anything about the budget, so Price asked if there are reasons beyond the budget for increasing teaching load. Price added that in 2003-2004 academic year, GSU had faced a similar budget crisis. At the beginning of that academic year, according to Price, then Provost Vaughn Vandegrift made an announcement to his Deans and Department Chairs that the teaching load for temporary faculty was going to be increased across the board for all temporary faculty to a 15-credit hour load. In March of that year, Price and Whittle brought a similar motion before the Senate, and it was approved. At the end of the year, Dr. Grube and Provost Vandegrift issued a statement saying that the change was not tied solely to the budget, but they were also not going to change anybody’s teaching schedule at that time.

Price added that he now found himself in the same position five years later. He questioned why he hasn’t been teaching 15 credit hours per semester all along if the teaching load is not tied solely to the budget.

Price concluded by referring to Article V, Section 5 of the University Statutes which states, “If a recommendation from the Faculty Senate to the President is not accepted, the President shall report in writing to the Faculty Senate the reasons for rejecting the recommendation and upon two-thirds vote of the Faculty Senate, the matter shall be referred to the faculty for consideration and recommendation.”

Price argued that teaching load is an important enough matter to follow up on because the motion had received unanimous support from the Senate, and the motion made five year ago had also received unanimous support from the Senate. He asked the Senate Moderator and Bob Cook, the Parliamentarian, the correct process for calling for such a two-thirds vote.
Sonya Huber (CLASS) expressed concern about Cliff and Tina’s motion and the move to increase the teaching load to five courses a semester for temporary instructors. She added that the move was initially described as a budgetary issue and added that the Writing and Linguistics Department had been trying to figure out where money could be saved, especially enough money to justify the degree of chaos that was being introduced into the academic units as a result of the budget crisis, and especially in departments that rely heavily on temporary instructors.

She added that she had also heard that the justification stems from BOR policy, but added that no BOR policy is being referenced. However, her research revealed that BOR policy states, “It is recognized that the following are proper functions of the academic authorities, rather than at the Board, to prescribe the teaching load to be carried by each member of the faculty.” Since issues about teaching are not something that is under the Board’s purview, Huber argued, the question of invoking BOR policy is confusing. After citing other points (equity, job classifications, contracts) adding to the confusion, Huber concluded that President Grube’s response raised more questions than it answered.

Michael Moore (COE), Acting Chair, Senate Executive Committee advised Price and Huber that additional information could be gathered through rfi’s and discussions with their faculty representatives on the Senate Executive Committee.