ARTICLE 24
INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD

A. INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD STANDARD, COURSE DEFINITION AND EQUIVALENCIES

1. The full-time (100%) instructional workload standard for NSF for an academic year shall not exceed nine (9) instructional workload courses over three (3) quarters or six (6) instructional workload courses over two (2) semesters, or the equivalent. Instructional workloads may be lower, based upon the instructional workload standard of the campus, department, program or unit. A full-time course load for a 100% NSF who teaches writing and foreign language courses will not exceed eight (8) instructional offerings/classes/courses/sections on a quarter campus.

2. For purposes of this Article, a course as referred to in Section A.1. above, shall be called an instructional workload course (IWC) and shall be defined as an instructional offering that is regularly scheduled, requires significant academic preparation, office hours, and/or grading outside the class by the instructor, and meets a minimum of three (3) hours per week. Commencing with the first full academic term following ratification, two or more sections of a course taught by one NSF shall have the same IWC as two or more sections of a course taught by multiple NSF.

3. It is recognized that some instruction does not fit the definition of an instructional workload course as defined in Section A.2., above. Examples of instructional offerings that do not conform to the definition in Section A.2., above, are laboratory supervision, supervision of teaching assistants, very large lecture courses, grading-intensive classes, studio instruction, clinical instruction and independent studies that the University requires the Lecturer to perform. The above list is not exhaustive. The University shall determine whether a course conforms to the definition of an instructional workload course in Section A.2. above, and shall establish the equivalencies for the instructional offerings which do not conform to the definition of an instructional workload course. Equivalencies for these instructional offerings will be defined proportionate to the instructional workload course as defined in Section A.2. above.

4. The workload of the unit member in non-lecturer titles as defined in Article 5 – Description of Unit Titles, shall continue to be determined in accordance with current campus procedures. Should the University propose changes to these campus procedures, the University will meet and discuss over the changes.

5. In determining the relative workload value of instructional offerings and course equivalencies, the University shall consider the instructional and evaluation methods employed, the nature of the courses assigned, the preparations required, the number of students expected to enroll, and the availability of support employees. In addition, the University may consider other factors.

6. In determining workload, the University shall provide workload equivalencies to an NSF whenever s/he is required or clearly expected by the University to perform duties in addition to her/his assigned teaching duties, as set forth in Section A.3., above, such as serving as a dissertation advisor or performing committee work. The University and UC-AFT shall develop a list of duties that shall receive equivalencies by February 1, 2008. The procedures for the production of the list shall be agreed upon by October 15, 2007.

B. CHANGES TO EXISTING WORKLOAD

If the University proposes to change the workload value assigned to an existing instructional course or offering or the maximum Instructional Workload Credit (IWC) for a department or campus, the University shall provide at least 30 calendar days written notice to the AFT and offer to meet and discuss prior to implementing any proposed changes.

C. ESTABLISHING IWC'S FOR NEW COURSES OR INSTRUCTIONAL OFFERINGS

For new courses that have been approved by the campus Committee on Courses and Instructional Offerings for which there is no IWC or equivalency, the University will establish an IWC or equivalency according to the factors set forth in Section A above. The University shall offer to meet and discuss prior to implementing the IWC or equivalency for a new

course or instructional offering. NSF may consult by providing written or oral comments and suggestions regarding workload values to their departments.

D. MEET AND DISCUSS SHALL NOT DELAY IMPLEMENTATION

The University's obligation to meet and discuss under Sections B. and C., shall not delay the assignment of an NSF to the course or offering or the commencement of actual instruction.

E. UNASSIGNED DUTIES

Any duties not assigned to, or clearly expected by the University of, the NSF shall not be considered as part of the instructional workload.

F. SUMMER SESSION

The instructional workload for Summer Session is established under Article 23 - Summer Session.

G. OFFICE HOURS

NSF shall maintain office hours in accordance with the policies of the department, program or unit.

H. ENFORCEMENT

1. The following matters shall be subject to Article 32 - Grievance and Article 33 - Arbitration:

    a. Alleged violations in regard to the procedural applications of this article, if any, and/or;

    b. Claims by an NSF with 100% appointment that the total IWC established by the department or campus for those courses that comprise her/his assigned workload exceeds the department or campus maximum IWC. In any arbitration involving such a claim, the arbitrator's authority shall be limited to determining whether the NSF's assigned workload exceeds the department and/or campus maximum. The arbitrator shall have no authority to review whether the University allocated the proper IWC to a specific course or instructional offering.

    c. Claims by an NSF that s/he is entitled to a workload equivalency pursuant to A.6., above.

2. In the event that an NSF or UC-AFT believes that the workload value that has been assigned to a course or offering is inadequate in light of the actual work required, the NSF shall perform the duties as assigned and the NSF and/or UC-AFT may pursue the issue through the grievance procedure as specified in Article 32 - Grievance Procedure.

I. RESOLUTION OF WORKLOAD VALUE DISPUTES

Pursuant to section H.2. above, in cases where an NSF and/or UC-AFT believe that the workload value that has been assigned to a course or offering is inadequate in light of the actual work required and/or clearly expected by the University, the NSF and/or UC-AFT may pursue the issue through Article 32 - Grievance Procedure.

Alternatively, in order to achieve resolution of workload disputes as defined in H.2. above, NSF and/or UC-AFT may request the formation of an ad-hoc committee to review the workload dispute. Such a request must be submitted in writing to the campus Labor Relations office within 45 calendar days from the date on which the NSF and/or UC-AFT knew or could have been expected to know of the event or action that gave rise to the complaint.

Should an NSF and/or UC-AFT initially decide to use the grievance procedure described in H.2. above, the NSF and/or UC-AFT can still elect to have the matter reviewed by an ad hoc committee. Such election must be made no later than ten (10) days after the issuance of the campus's first written response to the grievance. The formation of an ad-hoc committee terminates the grievance process.

The make-up of the ad-hoc committee will be as follows: 1 NSF from the affected discipline; 1 NSF from a related (but not the same) discipline; 2 Senate Faculty members (one of which must be from the affected or related discipline); and 1 member of the administration.

The ad-hoc committee must be formed within 21 days of the receipt in the Campus Labor Relations office of the request for the formation of such a committee. The campus and the UC-AFT shall work jointly to appoint the members of the committee. If the ad-hoc committee is not formed within 21 days, the NSF(s) and/or the UC-AFT shall have the right to appeal the issue under Article 32 - Grievance Procedure.

The charge of the ad-hoc committee will be to review the NSF's and/or the UC-AFT's allegations concerning the workload value assigned to a course or offering. Based on the review, the ad-hoc committee shall make findings, which will include recommendations, and shall issue a report of the findings to the campus' designated official. The final report shall include the views of all the members of the committee, either in a single narrative or if the committee members can not agree on a single narrative, in separate sections in the report.

The report of the ad-hoc committee shall issue within 30 days of the formation of the committee. The designated official shall review the report and shall issue a final written decision that will be conveyed to the UC-AFT and the affected NSF. The final decision of the designated official shall issue within ten (10) days of the completion of the report by the ad-hoc committee.

The UC-AFT may appeal the final decision of the designated campus official within ten (10) days to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel at UCOP, who shall, in consultation with the Office of Labor Relations in the Office of the President and other entities as appropriate, make a final written decision that shall be binding upon the campus on which the complaint was filed. Such decision will issue within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the appeal.

The timelines set forth in this section may be extended by written mutual agreement of the parties.