

Union Voice

Workload Report/Workload Committee

Madeleine Picciotto - Lecturer, Warren College

Charged with examining issues relating to the workload of Unit 18 lecturers, particularly those in foreign language and writing programs, UCSD convened a committee in the spring of 2005 to assess lecturer workloads and recommend any necessary changes. The committee, which consisted of administrators, Senate faculty, and non-Senate lecturers, split into two subcommittees: one focusing on the situation of foreign language lecturers, the other focusing on the situation of lecturers in the campus's writing programs.

Because foreign languages are taught within a variety of departmental and divisional units at UCSD, the potential for inconsistencies and inequities among the departments was of particular concern. Other problematic issues involved compensation for lecturers administering foreign language competency exams, and difficulties in providing lecturers with extra compensation for teaching first-time courses in cases where the lecturer already has a 100% appointment.

Questions regarding potential inconsistencies also arose with the writing programs, since each of UCSD's six undergraduate colleges has a unique and independently-administered writing program. Of greatest concern to those examining the workload in the writing programs was the fact that UCSD does not award full instructional workload credit for the teaching of a composition class. While the full-time workload for a Unit 18 lecturer in any other discipline is three courses per quarter or nine courses per year, for lecturers in the college writing programs the full-time workload is currently four courses per quarter or twelve courses per year. In other words, a writing programs course receives 3/4, rather than 1.0, instructional workload credit.

After gathering information about lecturer workload from questionnaires, interviews, and other means, the two subcommittees combined their findings to produce a final report that was delivered to UCSD Associate Vice Chancellor David Miller. The report recommended a reconsideration of the instructional workload credit assigned to writing programs courses, arguing that such courses should receive full credit.

The committee also noted that additional instructional workload credit for teaching a course for the first time needed to be applied more equitably, and that appointments split between lecturer and academic coordinator titles needed to be more consistently delineated.

The committee's recommendations are currently under review by UCSD's Office of Academic Personnel, which has already moved to allow 117% appointments for a single quarter so that lecturers can receive additional credit for first-time teaching or high enrollment. UCSD's Academic Affairs division has also initiated a fund to compensate lecturers who provide language testing, to be administered by the Department of Linguistics. Further changes regarding instructional workload credit are still being considered.

Professional Development Fund

Professional development funds secured in the current Memorandum of Understanding for Non-senate instruction, unit 18, will be available again for the next term. We encourage you to apply for funds for research, curriculum development and attending conferences.

The next application deadline is February 28, 2006. The guidelines for applying and the application can be downloaded from our Local's website:

<http://www.cft.org/councils/uc/>

GET-TOGETHER LECTURER MEETING - THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23rd, 3:00 - 5:00

The Librarians, Unit 17 (also UC-AFT represented employees) will be voting on their tentative agreement with the University on January 11 (from 11:00 - 2:00) and 12 (from 10:00 - 1:00) in the Access Services Conference Room in Geisel Library.

See the update on the web:

<http://www.cft.org/councils/uc/unit17/Unit17.Bargaining.2005.08.23.html>

Their struggle over salary is very likely a preview of the sort of fight that NSF will have to wage when Unit 18 has salary re-opener negotiations starting in late 2006.

We will be featuring different articles of the MOU to help familiarize you with the Lecturer contract. You can also access the MOU on line:

<http://www.cft.org/councils/uc/2003contract.html>

ARTICLE 7a - NSF APPOINTMENTS

A. General Provisions

This Article applies only to NSF with appointments that commence within the first six years of employment at the same campus. An appointment in the first six (6) years of employment does not create an entitlement to reappointment.

1. An NSF appointment may be terminated prior to the established ending date only in accordance with Article 17, Layoff, or Article 30, Discipline and Dismissal.
2. The appointment or reappointment of NSF shall have a definite beginning and ending date. Such appointments shall terminate on the last day of the appointment set forth in the letter, provided in §B., below.
3. Except as provided for in this MOU, the University has the sole discretion in regard to appointment and reappointment decisions and has no obligation to reappoint an NSF following the expiration of an appointment.
4. Except as provided for in this MOU, the University has the sole discretion to make determinations regarding: who teaches a course, the duration of an appointment, the assignments of an individual, and the assessment of performance. Such decisions are not subject to the grievance or arbitration provisions of this Agreement except to the extent they reflect or result from University actions that are, themselves, grievable and arbitrable.
5. One (1) year of employment is defined as three (3) quarters or two (2) semesters for academic year appointees, and four (4) quarters or equivalent for fiscal year appointees, at any percentage in any unit title in the same department, program or unit at the same campus. For the purposes of this MOU, Summer Sessions are not considered part of the regular academic year, and are neither an academic quarter nor semester, nor portion thereof.

THE UNION ACHIEVED THE FOLLOWING IN THE APPOINTMENTS ARTICLE (art. 7a, b, c) in the re-opener negotiations this summer.

- 1) An automatic two-step increase for pre-six NSF (Non-Senate Faculty, who have not yet reached their 6-year review) in their fourth years, assuming that they have not been previously awarded a merit increase of at least that amount. This is an improvement over the current one-step "bump" at year 4.
- 2) The University has agreed to review the performance of those pre-six NSF who are interested in reappointment, provided there is work, BEFORE a decision to reappoint or not reappoint is actually made. This is an improvement over current language, which only required a performance assessment AFTER a decision to reappoint had already been made.

WELCOME TO OUR NEW VICE-PRESIDENT LUIS MARTIN-CABRERA

THE UNION ACHIEVED THE FOLLOWING IN THE APPOINTMENTS ARTICLE (art. 7a, b, c) in the re-opener negotiations this summer.

- 1) An automatic two-step increase for pre-six NSF (Non-Senate Faculty, who have not yet reached their 6-year review) in their fourth years, assuming that they have not been previously awarded a merit increase of at least that amount. This is an improvement over the current one-step "bump" at year 4.
 - 2) The University has agreed to review the performance of those pre-six NSF who are interested in reappointment, provided there is work, BEFORE a decision to reappoint or not reappoint is actually made. This is an improvement over current language, which only required a performance assessment AFTER a decision to reappoint had already been made.
 - 3) Pre-six NSF who have worked in multiple departments and are currently accruing courses towards a continuing appointment in several departments may request a one-time credit of quarters/semesters that courses taught in departments outside their "home" department count towards continuing status in their home department. This request must be made by the end of November and it is limited in that the University is under no obligation to grant the request. But it is an important victory. Some departments have been prohibited from granting credit towards a continuing appointment for work done outside the department. This program is limited to courses on the same campus. This will help to solve some of the problems for pre-six NSF who work in multiple departments by getting them access to a Continuing Appointment a bit sooner.
 - 4) The University has agreed to issue Letters of Appointment for pre-six appointees by June 15, unless there is a reason that makes it impossible.
-

5) The University has agreed that all policies limiting appointment lengths must go through "regular consultative processes," which means that a Chair or Dean can not just make up a policy or rule that says that all appointments are limited to a year or two years and that reappointment after that point is impossible.

6) There are some other, smaller adjustments that clarify contract language that has caused interpretation problems over the last couple of years. See the discussion of the implementation manual below.

Achievements in Merit Review article:

1) Explicit allowance of accelerated and exceptional merit reviews. That means that early merit reviews (after, say, two years instead of three) and larger than two-step merit reviews is allowed. This was always the case, but it is now explicit in the contract.

2) The University will provide an explanation to the NSF if a merit increase is denied. This represents a change in practice on some campuses.

3) The University will now allow NSF to defer merit reviews up to one year. This represents a direct response to something that our members have raised.

Our Librarians, Unit 17 (also UC-AFT represented employees) are in bargaining with the University now: See the update on the web:

<http://www.cft.org/councils/uc/unit17/Unit17.Bargaining.2005.08.23.html>

Their struggle over salary is very likely a preview of the sort of fight that NSF will have to wage when Unit 18 has salary re-opener negotiations starting in late 2006.