

WHEREAS, an increasing number of faculty are expressing discontent with arbitrary changes in policies, procedures, and decisions by administrators;

WHEREAS a straw poll of all faculty members was conducted in May 2023, and with a response rate of over 50%, more than 80% of respondents supported a no-confidence vote if there was no significant improvement over the summer;

WHEREAS the follow-up poll conducted in August 2023, with a response rate greater than 65% (with 272 out of 409 eligible full-time faculty voting) indicated that 56.7% (232) of faculty support the senate's continuation of the process of a no-confidence vote as they do not feel enough change was demonstrated over the summer;

WHEREAS, expectations and hopes for improvement over the summer were not met despite Senate leadership efforts;

WHEREAS, the issues outlined below are a direct reflection of an absent and unengaged president, and administrators whose multiple leadership positions may be a conflict of interest that have led to siloed systems and a breakdown in effective communication which are demonstrated by:

- Failure of many cabinet members to engage in and commit to shared governance with a lack of understanding by the cabinet that mono-directional quarterly meetings will not rectify this situation especially at the cost of requested monthly meetings with the president and bi-monthly meetings with the provost.
- Persistent reluctance of certain cabinet members and administrators to meet with representatives of the faculty and openly discuss the factors of most concern to faculty.
- Failure to revise policies that allowed for significant changes (both in the creation and elimination) of administrative positions and entire offices without faculty input.
- Communication issues that remain unaddressed, including failure to share documentation that should be publicly available (or available to the external community through FOIA) in a timely manner.

WHEREAS, there remain a large number of faculty concerns – both previous concerns as well as new ones including but not limited to:

- Perpetual faculty and staff shortages resulting from a failure of the budget to properly prioritize that which is in the best interest of students, thus contributing to GGC's graduation rate continuing to be a USG low of 18% for six-year within system graduation. For more information: <https://www.ggc.edu/about-ggc/institutional-research-and-analytics/institutional-effectiveness/student-success-profile>
 - Evidence and consequences of such failures include increased course capacities, over ten percent of full-time faculty departing the institution over the last two years, failure to provide sufficient lines to fill vacancies, and insufficient salary offers such that many searches are unsuccessful.
- A faculty compensation structure created with limited faculty input and implemented before faculty had a chance to review and question the methodology and data. Faculty concerns include long term consequences such as pay that will continue to fall at or below the 25th percentile for most GGC faculty, reduced incentive to serve our campus at

exceptional levels, questionable peer selections with regards to cost of living differences, and negative repercussions for our ability to hire and retain excellent faculty.

- While current pay may exceed the 25th percentile, as the plan was presented, the distribution will shift over time, slowly increasing the 25th percentile salary. Faculty will see no market adjustments until their salary falls below the 25th percentile, at which point they might only expect increases to bring them to this level contingent on available funding. Other than full professors (and lecturers ineligible for promotion) with 7 years in rank at GGC who might end up at the median of their group (again contingent upon funding), remaining faculty with more than 3 years at GGC can expect salaries in the long run to persistently hover around the 25th percentile.
- Inclusion of schools in communities with significantly lower costs of living from Gwinnett/Atlanta also creates unreasonable minimums and 25th percentile marks. Expectations that we can fill new lines offering the minimum from this distribution – from communities where the median home price is less than half the median price in Lawrenceville – is reducing the number of qualified faculty interested in pursuing a career at GGC. While the Senate is thankful for the amazing new hires we did secure, we are also aware of numerous unfilled positions whereby multiple candidates declined offers due to the offered salary.
- Poor planning for increasing enrollment:
 - The failure of the MOU/plan to bring over graduate students to teach certain GGC courses and the late decision to allow overloads to GGC faculty, thus resulting in many first-year students attending orientations with NO English 1101 availability and limited course options outside of eCore. These decisions were made at the administrative level and not by Chairs who are supposed to oversee scheduling but lack power over the budget.
 - In addition to poor planning and lack of available sections, course capacities for classes are regularly exceeded without warning or input from faculty.

For example, course caps in first-year English courses have risen from 20 students up to 25 students in fall 2023, effectively creating an additional course to teach with no additional compensation, and decreasing the likelihood of student success in these first-year courses and at GGC. Smaller writing classes increase retention at the college level (Blatchford et al., 2002; Horning, 2007), and the English professional organization CCCC recommends classes of no more than 20 students, or a total of 60 students per instructor. Poor administrative planning or administrative disregard for student success continues to inflate class sizes at GGC.

Similarly, in Math support courses capacities are being determined by the number we can legally fit into a classroom rather than what is in the best interest of students. Even with the increased capacities, there were insufficient seats available, and many non-STEM students were advised over the summer to delay taking their Math course due to the lack of availability.

All of this occurs despite the recommendation in the Momentum Approach that students start with English and Math in their first semester.

- Faculty covering unstaffed sections for adjuncts when the hiring process is not complete. Students will have no interaction with their actual faculty member until

after add/drop has ended. Not all sections may be fully covered for all class meetings, and for faculty picking up the slack for such courses, there is no additional compensation.

- A misinterpretation of SACSCOC guidelines regarding faculty qualifications and a failure to defend faculty flagged by SACS who are certainly qualified to teach courses in their respective disciplines.
- Insufficient notification to faculty accepting “additional faculty assignments” such as assistant chairs, CTE Fellows, Senate Leaders, etc., that they would lose the ability to earn additional income through opportunities such as eCore, and failure to provide BOR policy dictating the change.
- The implementation of a summer compensation plan that incentivizes teaching asynchronous and lower level courses while allowing the schools to profit off of instruction. This occurs despite the fact that GGC’s subsidy from the state includes credit for summer enrollment and all while the institution expects additional unpaid work in terms of service and student engagement. There is discussion of revising the compensation plan for next summer, but concerns remain over the unwillingness of the administration to subsidize faculty summer appointments beyond the revenues generated from tuition.

WHEREAS, faculty are increasingly concerned by the irresponsible allocation of the \$18 million in year-end funds for FY23 and question the funding priorities of this administration, specifically noting the following issues:

- Almost all decision making on expenditures was made at the Cabinet level with limited to no faculty input.
- The Cabinet expected significant year end funds during Fall 2022 but collected no input despite increased calls for shared governance.
- Faculty remained largely unaware of the magnitude of year end funds until after the fiscal year ended and plans were solidified.
- Faculty voices are often silenced in the college wide budget committee meetings, with faculty being told to direct questions to the Provost privately. Questions are therefore limited, and there is no allowance for discussion or debate in what is supposed to be a committee meeting.
- Decisions on end of year expenditures included the pre-payment of more than \$2.3 million of expenses on the new Gateway building, with \$1.2 million of that allocated towards furniture, fixtures, and equipment for that building, and another \$675,000 for outdoor furniture, expected to have minimal effect on recruitment, retention, and graduation.
- Despite significant year end funding and increased reliance on online courses, the college discontinued support for faculty to pursue Quality Matters (QM) Certifications and has failed to start a search to fill a critical position in the Center for Teaching Excellent, vacated this Spring. Such decisions undermine faculties’ ability to offer high quality, engaging, and transparent online courses for our students selecting this modality.
- Drastic cuts to summer compensation and additional faculty assignments previously available over the summer were announced late in the spring semester, a time when the Cabinet was well aware of funding levels (including more than \$6 million in a hiring lag fund.) While many faculty may have benefited financially from this summer’s pay, that was largely the result of a last minute decision to offer a 3% base and an unexpected increase of 14% in summer enrollment. Some faculty opted not to teach this summer, while others

earned considerably less than normal – all while our administration had the financial resources to offer ALL of our faculty more funding for summer courses, as well as additional compensation to cover student engagement and service activities that often go unpaid during this time. Faculty understand that the current fiscal year might present financial challenges and that July 2023 (the second half of summer) falls in FY24, but we also believe it was possible to improve faculty compensation further in June with year-end funding.

- Insufficient lead time and budgets to successfully hire and retain faculty focused on teaching and student engagement, thereby reducing our collective efforts to contribute to our students' success and improve our retention and graduation rates.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE that an official vote of no confidence in GGC administration, specifically of... is called and organized by the Senate within the day following the passing of this resolution.