

SUMMARY of Comments from Graduate Council Members Regarding the Proposed SIUC Overload Policy, Received from Susan Logue on October 26, 2010

A. Regarding the scope of the policy: The policy needs to either be more narrowly defined, or more broadly inclusive.

If it is meant to address situations with distance learning and specific courses with identifiable funding streams it should define that more clearly. (As written many will interpret it more broadly and it has potential for abuse as a means for differential compensation and thus a potential grievance machine in some departments.)

If it is intended to be broadly applicable it needs to be more inclusive of other types of overload, such as service and research. (If so, units will need to modify operating papers to address the policy.) **RESPONSE PROVIDED AT GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING:** How do we incentivize research in such a way that it does not take away or change the emphasis here, which it is to go after new markets and have the flexibility to compensate faculty appropriately?

B. Regarding the definition of “Overload”: If faculty lines are not allowed to be filled, some current faculty will need to teach overload to even cover required courses. For some, this would add overload courses to their current 3/3 normal teaching load, plus being grad director/program coordinator, or other department service requirements.

Currently, there are departments where 2/2 is considered the normal load and anything above that is overload. What consideration has been given to load equity issues across campus when revising the overload policy?

C. Doesn't all of this have to be bargained with the FA?

D. Specific issues corresponding to policy outline:

1. Upon whose judgment is “adversely affect the performance” decided?

2b. How was the “not exceed 20%” standard set? Why not 25% or 18%?

Does this apply to summer school? If yes, the total compensation should be changed from 20% to 22.2% to allow some faculty to teach two summer courses. **RESPONSE PROVIDED AT GC MEETING:** You can make up to three months in the summer in certain guidelines, and that's not overload, that is summer support.

Page 1, Item 2.b. What happens if a faculty member has a course that exceeds 20%? If they can only be paid for half that amount of money, does it go back to the college or to the department? Do we need to clarify whether or not these are state dollars or whether this is coming from cost overrun or cost recovery, such as Continuing Education?

RESPONSE PROVIDED AT GC MEETING: These would not be state dollars. There would be no opportunity to have an overload for state dollars. It would be to generate new tuition, traditional undergraduate/graduate tuition or generate revenue from courses paying for non-credit services; basic cost recovery. There could be service related activities you are asked to do which would technically be coming from our internal tuition pool. You would not be able to, outside of grant generating activity with another agency, be able to generate more state dollars from overload.

2c. Why would anyone waive extra compensation?

3a. Are there standards for the course (e.g., enrollment, program required course, etc) for an overload assignment?

Can this item be modified to read "Compensation may be paid for teaching courses and working on externally funded research grant or any other revenue generating scholarly or service activities as overload an assignment?"

3b. The "credit-free" clause is risky. This could encompass a variety of things that may be very difficult to define and justify within a program and across programs (and who will decide what is justified?). If the university is not creating credit-hours, how does this make sense especially in our current budget situation (i.e., administrative leaves that don't pay folks for doing the work they have been assigned)? Does this refer to things such as "Continuing Professional Development Units" teachers earn and Continuing Education workshops on campus? Should there be an insertion between items 3.b, 3.c. or 3.a., of something to indicate research and activities as well, within the constraints of research policies?

3c. This actually makes sense, if the "if funding permits" clause is dropped.

It doesn't make sense to award overload pay for developing "distance learning courses outside the normal workload" and not for developing any old course outside of the workload. Developing another course for an out-of-workload assignment should be covered by this as well, unless this is nothing more than a way to juice distance education, in which case this should be re-titled from "overload policy" to "distance education overload policy." Perhaps Item 3.c. could be broadened to indicate significant work that needs to be done for course development. Or one could just excise 3.c. from the entire document.

3d. This looks ripe for favoritism for certain programs and individuals with the right connections. How can the campus pay some individuals to do important "spot" presentations when faculty travel in general has been cut?

RESPONSE PROVIDED AT GC MEETING: There are some constraints on overloads from funded sources and we need to make sure language and practices are acceptable to the National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Institute for Health Research (NIHR).

4a. From where is the money coming if it is not a cost recovery activity? Is it assumed that departments or colleges have extra funds available? Or will the Provost/Chancellor's office fund these activities?

6. There is a limit of 2 overload credit courses; what about limits on non-instructional activities? If research activities are included as overload then "No person shall be paid more than 2 months of salary in any year as overload research or any other scholarly assignments."

Will there be policies at the department level to prevent this from becoming an ad hoc informal process?