

4-29-2019

Faculty Workload Policy

Jonathan Hilpert and Faculty Welfare Committee
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hilpert and Faculty Welfare Committee, Jonathan, "Faculty Workload Policy" (2019). *Faculty Senate Index*. 698.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/698>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Senate Executive Committee Motion Request

Approved by the Faculty Senate: 5/21/2019

Not Approved by the Faculty Senate:

Approved by the President: 6/12/2019

Not Approved by the President:

Approved by the President's Cabinet:

Not Approved by the President's Cabinet:

Faculty Workload Policy

Submitted by: Jonathan Hilpert

4/29/2019

Motion(s):

Motion to Approve the Faculty Workload Policy

Rationale:

The proposed faculty workload policy will position faculty to secure and maintain workloads that are ideal for their success and productivity. It was approved by the faculty welfare committee by a vote of 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstain. The proposed text, a revised version of the policy developed by the ad hoc committee, rectifies problems with the current policy which may lead to increased workloads for faculty without clear recourse. The proposed policy contains important protections for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty that will allow them to pursue their career objectives in differentiated ways.

Response:

SEC: Approved to move to the floor.

Minutes 5-21-2019:

Motion – Faculty Workload Policy – Jonathan Hilpert (COE), Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair & Dustin Anderson (CAH), Faculty Workload AdHoc Committee

Motion: “The proposed faculty workload policy will position faculty to secure and maintain workloads that are ideal for their success and productivity. It was approved by the faculty welfare committee by a vote of 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstain. The proposed text, a revised version of the policy developed by the ad hoc committee, rectifies problems with the current policy which may lead to increased workloads for faculty without clear recourse. The proposed policy contains important protections for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty that will allow them to pursue their career objectives in differentiated ways.” This motion seeks to rectify problems with current policy. Richard Flynn (CAH) made a move to approve. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) seconded.

Discussion: Discussion began with Jim Harris (COE) noting that the current policy specifies a twelve-hour load, and a department chair can change loads with approval of the dean. He questioned why we are changing the current policy when the current one seems to offer some flexibility. Michelle Haberland (CAH) explained that this new workload policy does allow for variation and is focused on negotiations between faculty member and department chair, which the committee though would ensure most flexibility. Dustin Anderson (CAH) added that department chairs come and go, so faculty need recourse. Christy Moore (WATERS) stated that her college asked specifically for this policy change because negotiations between department head and dean have left faculty with little recourse. She stated that the current policy does not allow sufficient negotiation.

Richard Flynn (CAH) Jack Simmons (CAH) commented that this policy looks like an improvement from the previous version. Simmons (CAH) stated that he appreciates the work of the committee. His concern was with paragraph seven and workload percentages. He asked that the percentages be omitted. He also was concerned with this sentence which he believed might enable administration to change course loads: “These should generally be made on an annual basis to support an individual faculty member’s career objectives as well as departmental needs and/or resources.” Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) suggested that we end the sentence with the word ‘objectives’ and omit the rest. Jack Simmons (CAH) stated that he approved of this amendment. Dustin Anderson (CAH) noted that ultimately the authority lands with dean and department head, but this policy provides clear explanation for faculty workload and contingency based on need.

Chris Cartright (CAH) acknowledged that the revised proposal seeks to empower faculty when negotiating for workload, but he expressed concern with the statement that “dean will either accept or modify” workloads. While this is, in fact, our procedure, he wondered if this statement was necessary. Might this statement undercut the sentiment of the policy to increase the power of faculty? Is this sentence necessary given that the policy seeks to give strength to faculty

negotiation? Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that this statement simply acknowledges the process and lays clear the chain of responsibility. The committee wanted the language as clear cut as possible. Wayne Johnson (CEC) said that discussion of this statement did come up in Faculty Welfare discussions. Rob Pirro (CBSS) suggested beginning the preceding sentence with the phrase “dept chairs *and college deans* must clearly articulate the outcomes expected for” The subsequent sentence would be struck because it is implied: “The dean will either accept or modify.” This amendment would address the concerns. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH), speaking on behalf of Welfare Committee, expressed her belief that striking this clause would not change the policy. She agreed with that the phrase is redundant in regards to the sentiment of the policy.

Jack Simmons (CAH) stated that his previous concern about percentages was still an issue. He was concerned that it could cause unfairness between campuses because of distribution of resources. Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that the reference to 100% makes clear that no one will have a workload over 100 %.

Wayne Johnson (CEC) had a question on procedure: Item I mentions a ‘College Executive Committee.’ He asked what this was. Richard Flynn (CAH) explained that every college is required to have a college executive committee, but this committee is called Faculty Governance Committee. Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that this name could be amended. Christy Moore (WATERS) thanked the ad hoc committee for their work on this policy.

Amendment to Motion: Following this discussion, these amendments were made paragraphs 6 and 7 of the proposal: the sentence beginning ‘these should be generally made’ will end with the word ‘objectives.’ The statement “deans will accept or modify” will be struck. The amended sections will read as follows:

“For all full-time faculty, workload percentages must add up to 100%. Specific percentages should follow departmental norms related to actual teaching load assigned, scholarly expectations, and service assignments. These should generally be made on an annual basis to support an individual faculty member’s career objectives as well as departmental needs and/or resources. Workload assignments for faculty members will be negotiated with the department chair as part of annual review. No workload assignment or negotiation can yield a workload that will prevent a faculty member from achieving requirements for advancement (tenure, promotion, post-tenure, or any other) described in the faculty handbook, college guidelines, or department guidelines.”

“Department Chairs *and College Deans* must clearly articulate the outcomes expected for a particular workload division of effort, and appropriately reflect that division of effort in the annual review process. The dean will either accept or modify the teaching load. Faculty members

whose workloads are not commensurate with the expectations of their position, hiring agreement, or career objectives can utilize 1) college faculty executive committees and 2) college and university grievance processes to reach a compromise. In the event a faculty member contests a workload agreement, no changes in workload will take place until the faculty member's grievance can be heard through the college and university grievance processes. “

Attachment below: Faculty Workload Policy

Georgia Southern University Faculty Workload Policy **(Language Amended 6/12/2019)**

Preamble:

In the absence of Board of Regents policy governing faculty workloads, Georgia Southern University promulgates the following Faculty Workload Policy. As with all institutional policies, this policy operates within the parameters of the University's *Statutes* and in the spirit of shared governance. "Shared governance involves faculty and administration participating mutually in the development of policies at the departmental, college, and university levels." (§ 323, Faculty Governance/Shared Governance, *2019-2020 Faculty Handbook*) The Faculty Workload Policy should provide faculty with equitable workloads that serve them and the institution in a mutually beneficial manner. While the Faculty Workload Policy provides faculty with a recourse for ensuring equitable workloads that facilitate their success and productivity, it should not be interpreted as an abdication or abridgement of administrative oversight. University *Statutes* clearly define the oversight responsibility of administrators: Article II, *Section 2*, the president is granted "jurisdiction over the formulation and organization of bylaws and operating policies of all departments/schools, colleges, divisions, and administrative offices of the University;" Article III, *Section 2*, grants the provost and vice president for academic affairs "administrative jurisdiction over academic matters and academic personnel", and Article III, *Section 3*, charges the deans with serving as the chief executive officer of their college.

Purpose:

The goal of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Workload policy is to distribute workload responsibilities among faculty in a way that most equitably and efficiently advances the university mission. The policy is designed to promote quality teaching, support excellent research and creative activity, and encourage meaningful service to the institution, profession, and community. It is also designed to enable colleges, schools, departments, and individual faculty to pursue and plan for unique objectives and commitments among the faculty activities, allowing individual assignments to vary.

Policy:

The superseding guidelines for this policy are the faculty workload expectations established by the University System of Georgia. In meeting the system expectations, Georgia Southern University faculty members are expected to be productive in the areas of teaching, service, and (for tenure-track and tenured faculty) scholarship and/or creative activity. The distribution of effort among these areas of responsibility may vary among faculty members and from year to year through the course of their careers.

Teaching

Teaching is the primary function of university faculty. The teaching load for faculty in tenured and tenure-track lines is 12 credit hours each semester; however, it is generally expected they will teach the equivalent of a 3-3 course load annually (Fall/Spring) to allow for their scholarship expectations (pre-tenure) and/or continued scholarly production (post-tenure). The teaching load for other faculty classifications with no scholarly expectations is 15 credit hours each semester; however, it is generally expected they will teach the equivalent of a 4-4 course load annually (Fall/Spring) to allow for service or

professional development activities. Limited-term and temporary faculty are expected to teach 15 credit hours a semester with no service or scholarship expectations.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to actively pursue research or creative activity. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are generally expected to focus 30% of their workload toward scholarship and/ or creative pursuits; however, scholarly workload and creative activity assignment will depend upon faculty career objectives and scholarly outcomes.

Service

All permanent faculty are expected to assume an adequate share of departmental committee work and/or service to the institution, profession, and community, including institutional governance.

Attendance at departmental, college, and university meetings is expected of all faculty regardless of workload. It is generally expected for tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as non-tenure track faculty in positions with service expectations, to focus 10% of their workload toward service work; however, service activity assignment will depend upon faculty career objectives and service outcomes.

Colleges, schools, and/ or departments are required to establish, in writing, specific explanations outlining the outcomes, expectations, and timelines for faculty effort in each of these areas. As a department, faculty will establish course load norms appropriate to the discipline relative to particular teaching effort assignments (e.g. number of courses for particular loads, adjustments for very small or very large courses, etc.), as well as equivalencies for non-standard faculty activities (e.g. supervision of significant student research or clinical/practicum activities) and for courses where contact hours differ considerably from credit hours (e.g., clinical supervision and laboratory courses). Likewise, disciplines with writing-intensive courses, laboratory courses, studio and field experiences, and the like, or with unusually heavy supervising and mentoring responsibilities, shall establish teaching load equivalencies through shared governance processes outlined in the faculty handbook.

For all full-time faculty, workload percentages must add up to 100%. Specific percentages should follow departmental norms related to actual teaching load assigned, scholarly expectations, and service assignments. These should generally be made on an annual basis to support an individual faculty

member's career objectives. Workload assignments for faculty members will be negotiated with the department chair as part of annual review. No workload assignment or negotiation can yield a workload that will prevent a faculty member from achieving requirements for advancement (tenure, promotion, post-tenure, or any other) described in the faculty handbook, college guidelines, or department guidelines.

Procedure:

During the annual review process, Department Chairs, in consultation with faculty members, will recommend a workload for each faculty member that divides effort between teaching, scholarship, and service. The recommendation will be based upon the faculty classification (e.g. tenured/tenure-track, lecturer, etc.) as well as the service, scholarly, and creative activities of the faculty member. The negotiated workload must support the faculty member in meeting tenure and/or promotion expectations of the unit, while ensuring fair distribution of work assignments by the point of major evaluations (P&T, 5-yr review, etc). Department Chairs and College Deans must clearly articulate the outcomes expected for a particular workload division of effort, and appropriately reflect that division of effort in the annual review process. Faculty members whose workloads are not commensurate with the expectations of their position, hiring agreement, or career objectives can utilize 1) college Faculty Governance committees and 2) college and/or university grievance processes to reach a compromise. In the event a faculty member contests a workload agreement, no changes in workload will take place until the faculty member's grievance can be heard through the college and university grievance processes.

Appendix:

References: Language used in portions of this policy were developed using materials from Boise State University (Faculty Workload Policy) and Kennesaw State University (Faculty Handbook).

Amended:

May 21, 2019 by Senate. Unanimously approved.

Ad hoc Committee Members:

Diana Cone, Chair (Vice Provost, Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs) Dustin Anderson (SEC, College of Arts & Humanities)

Alicia Brunson (College of Behavioral & Social Sciences) Sungkon Chang (College of Science & Mathematics) Nedra Cossa (College of Education)

Daniel Cox (Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering & Computing) April Garrity (Waters College of Health Professions)

Catherine Gilbert (Waters College of Health Professions) Brian Koehler (College of Science & Mathematics)

Dan Pioske (College of Arts &

Humanities) Rand Ressler
(Parker College of Business)
April Schueths (College of Behavioral & Social
Sciences) Stacy Smallwood (Jiann-Ping Hsu
College of Public Health) John Stone (College
of Science & Mathematics)