WRITING PROGRAM WORKLOAD PROPOSAL
6/30/05

INTRODUCTION
Few UCSC Writing Program Non-Senate Faculty (NSF) are paid at 100% of their full-time equivalent salaries, but many have workloads equivalent to or exceeding full-time. This proposal aims to rectify the disparity between the payroll and workload definitions of a 100% appointment.

Writing Program NSF and Senate faculty together approve the effort to bring salary (percent time) in line with workload. The Writing Program proposes a six course/two course equivalency (6/2) workload for most Writing Program NSF, and half-time appointments (3 courses/1 equivalency) for the remainder.

Class size affects both student performance and faculty workload. For these reasons, the system-wide Committee on Preparatory Education recommends a reduction in the size of first-year writing courses at UC to match national recommendations: a limit of 20 for first-year writing courses and 15 for developmental writing courses. Though this proposal does not directly address class size, Writing Program faculty strongly endorse this aim.

What is workload?
Workload in writing courses is determined by three main variables:
• Number and type of courses an instructor teaches
• Total number of students (class size)
• Educational expectations and the associated curriculum: amount of work to be assigned: amount and quality of individualized responses to student work

In addition, workload is affected by the following:
• Professional standards and the expectation of instructional excellence on the part of the campus, the program (institutionalized in personnel procedures), and instructors (reflected in personal satisfaction and rewards)
• Opportunities for intellectual and professional stimulation, learning, and growth
• Reality that not all kinds of work are fungible (when one can no longer read any more student papers well, one can effectively mentor colleagues)

An equitable, efficient, profitable workload balances the following four goals:
1. It makes possible satisfactory professional standards that allow for high-quality educational objectives;
2. It is sustainable, both by the institution and the individual worker (that is, the workload is a formula neither for insolvency nor burn-out);
3. It makes it possible to recruit and retain excellent faculty members;
4. It pays full-time wages for full-time work. It does not ask the program or faculty members to choose between acceptable quality and professional standards on the one hand, and full-time appointments on the other.
Writing faculty workload at UCSC
The eight-course full-time workload for Writing Program NSF has never met the above criteria. For most of the last 30 years since it was instituted, the Program encouraged lecturers to teach no more than six courses per year. Even though financial exigencies and increasing concern about retirement benefits have caused several faculty members to teach seven or eight courses to achieve full-time or near-full-time appointments, most have opted to take a reduction in salary rather than an increase in courses. The situation has been exacerbated by the following:

- An increase in class size, in the majority of first-year writing classes, from 20 to 25. for a full-time load of 200 students rather than 160—effectively, an increase from eight courses to ten:
- Loss of supplemental tutoring:
- A severe decrease in the responsibilities specifically remunerated by course equivalencies (consulting, co-teaching, independent studies, etc.) and an increase in the work associated with remaining equivalencies:
- Loss of the upper-division curriculum with the concomitant loss of opportunity for professional growth, variety, perspective for instructors.

WORKLOAD PROPOSAL
This workload proposal has been developed within the context of a state-wide budget crisis. Its recommendations are thus relatively modest, and the estimated cost of the proposal is not so much an infusion of new funds but a reallocation of some campus TA

---

1 An EOP/Writing Program proposal to restore funding for tutoring has recently been denied.
2 Some NSF have appointments approaching 100% time, made up of a combination of courses and fractions of course equivalencies meant to compensate them for additional work they perform: e.g., scoring Analytical Writing Placement Exams, serving on the Personnel Committee, serving as College Writing Coordinators (CWC). The system of equivalencies aimed to ensure both that the program’s necessary work was completed and that NSF were compensated for the work they did beyond teaching. In recent years, however, the system of equivalencies has eroded significantly: in some cases (e.g., CWC, Personnel Committee), the work involved has increased while the pay has not; in others, such as supervision of tutors associated with Core courses paid for by the colleges, there is no longer funding available to compensate faculty for work that they do.
3 Teaching upper-division courses allows instructors to teach first-year courses with students’ writing futures firmly in mind. With extremely limited exceptions, Writing Program faculty no longer teach upper-division students. This restriction affects students (whose classes will lose some of the richness provided by teachers who teach a range of classes), faculty (whose professional horizons are thus limited), and campus (which is thus less able to tap the resource provided by writing faculty whose expertise is needed across campus). It will likely affect faculty retention if nothing changes. (The faculty mentoring included in the 6/2 model would potentially help compensate for the loss of upper-division teaching.)
resources to a program that has generated TA resources through its enrollments (see appendix, “Workload Calculations,” for detail). It assumes
  • that funding for the Writing Program will be tied to the size of the entering class;
  • that course equivalencies will be paid at the same rate as courses;
  • that the number of Senate faculty and NSF together will exceed the number of GSIs teaching in any academic year.

7/1 Model (rejected)
The 04-05 discussion of program workload began with the 03-04 Humanities Division Workload Report’s recommendations for a 6/2 workload and included for comparison the possibility of a 7/1 model. Rough calculations suggested that a 7/1 model with 25 students per class would cost about $5000 more than our current model: at 22 students per class it would cost $17,000 more. Writing Program NSF reject this option, understanding that its only advantage—full-time contracts—would come at the expense of excellent teaching. Writing Program Senate faculty concur.

The 7/1 model requires that faculty teach three courses in at least one quarter. Unless educational objectives are modified—e.g., via fewer and less ambitious paper assignments—this is an unacceptable workload for most even with 22 students per class rather than the current enrollment of 25. (Three courses with 22 students a piece exceeds national recommendations for writing faculty workload.) Though faculty would gain a full-time appointment, they would have an increase in workload and a considerable decrease in flexibility, while regularly handling a course-load that is, for most, incommensurable with maintaining the standard of excellence in the classroom required for continuing contracts.

6/2 Model (approved)
Faculty approve the effort to bring salary (percent time) in line with workload via a six course/two course equivalency (6/2) workload for most Writing Program NSF, and half-time appointments (3 courses and 1 equivalency) for the remainder. The 6/2 model assumes no more than two five-unit classes per term or the equivalent, and no more than six five-unit courses per academic year. The 6/2 model would allow for a sufficient number of continuing faculty, and an appropriate number of courses per lecturer, to maintain the quality and character of the first-year writing curriculum: it would provide the campus with enhanced pedagogical training, and reliable employment, for graduate student instructors both within and beyond the Humanities Division; and it would regularize the equivalency system to ensure that Writing Program faculty would be paid for the work they do.

Rough calculations suggest that this model would cost about $80,000 more than the current arrangement—the cost of about 15 sections taught by graduate students—but would resolve a number of workload, work satisfaction/professional development, and funding problems. (See the appendix for details on calculations.)
IMPLEMENTATION
For the reasons noted above, Writing Program faculty enthusiastically endorse the 6/2 workload model. Any transformation from one system to another is bound to raise concerns, however. The following concerns would need to be addressed should the campus, as well, endorse the 6/2 model:

**Job security**
Would the shift from the current system, in which very few people have full-time appointments, to a 6/2 system, in which most would have full-time appointments, require the program to reduce the number of regular, benefits-eligible faculty? (Currently there are 18 Writing Program faculty members who are either continuing NSF or slated to come up for the initial continuing review in 2005-06 or 2006-07.) On the model of other campus transformations, rather than layoffs we would expect some sort of transition period during which we’d gradually introduce the new system as anticipated separations occur.

Rough calculations (see appendix) suggest that with a flat freshman enrollment of 3100 per year through 2009-10, the number of NSF we would need to run the program would match the number of current faculty we expect to remain in 2006-07, assuming that anticipated separations take place and that some full-time appointments include a course or two of work for other units—e.g., to teach an ELWR section of college Core.

**Flexibility**
Would a move to full-time appointments preclude the possibility of appointments constructed mostly of Writing Program courses and partly of courses or other duties offered by other campus units?

Currently, a number of Writing Program faculty have regular appointments with other units. The most common is teaching one or two ELWR or C2 sections of a college Core class. Appointments that emerged out of necessity when the number of ELWR sections of Core required to meet student need exceeded the number of Core classes (24) the Writing Program is budgeted to fund. These appointments, we believe, should count as part of a 100% appointment in the Writing Program as the courses covered satisfy or help satisfy campus composition requirements. There are fewer cross-departmental appointments: some are quite regular annual positions, and some are not. We understand the need to make such appointments well in advance for planning purposes: we also greatly value the opportunity to work with other units. In the absence of our own upper-division curriculum, such work provides an enormously valuable means of remaining in touch with the trajectory of student work outside the first-year writing curriculum, and in turn enriches our teaching of that curriculum. Equally important, appointments partly made up of work for other units would allow the campus to tap the expertise of Writing Program faculty and promote the kind of intellectual exchange that enriches the campus as a whole.
Program business
What work will be accomplished by NSF for their course equivalencies?

The Writing Program would agree to conduct all of the business of the program, including a newly enhanced mentoring program for graduate students teaching writing courses, via the two course equivalencies per full-time NSF that the new system would provide. The only exceptions, we would argue, should be the administrative work of the chair (an LSOE who, under the current arrangement, receives two equivalencies for service as chair) and the administrative work of the ELWR coordinator (currently an NSF receiving three equivalencies in 2005-06). Program business also includes all of the work currently accounted for via equivalencies (e.g., service as a College Writing Coordinator, service on the Personnel Committee, reading and scoring Analytical Writing Placement Exams and appeals to the C requirement, and more).

Divisional resources
What Divisional resources would be required to make the new system work?

The Writing Program calculates that it would need about 15 courses annually taught by graduate students to meet the needs of first-year students. Under the current arrangement, unlike any department in the Humanities Division, the Writing Program is responsible for paying the salaries of graduate students teaching its classes. Under the proposed arrangement, the Writing Program’s GSIs would be paid for out of the Division’s allocation of TAships and would reflect the enrollments the Writing Program provides to the Division. We recognize that the allocation of TAships to the Division is already a serious concern. But regularizing the Writing Program’s commitment to graduate students would provide employment and valuable pedagogical training to graduate students in the Division for whom other opportunities to teach have closed or are closing. While the Writing Program remains committed to recruiting graduate students from across the campus, we could certainly imagine a set-aside for Humanities graduate students.

CONCLUSION
Though fiscally conservative, the 6/2 model would provide the campus important benefits. It would allow the campus to tap the expertise of Writing Program faculty, provide sufficient means for completing the essential work of the Writing Program while radically simplifying the equivalency system and appointment process, and build a workload system easily adjustable for growth should the size of the incoming class increase. It would provide a regular allotment of Writing Program courses to graduate students. Regular mentoring would enhance the graduate students’ experience and their value on the academic job market, and simultaneously provide NSF an excellent opportunity for professional development by working with graduate students at the beginning of their professional careers. This model would also regularize the equivalency system: for two course equivalencies per full-time NSF and one per part-time NSF, the Writing Program would conduct all of the business of the program: mentoring GSIs; service on the Personnel Committee or as a CWC: assessing outcomes.
in Core and Writing Program courses: scoring Analytical Writing Placement Exams and attending faculty meetings. The change to a 6/2 model would streamline staff work in appointing NSF to the Writing Program. Altogether, save class size. we believe this system to be an efficient, effective means of addressing most workload concerns within the Writing Program.

TIMELINE
In order to write a curriculum plan for the following year, the Writing Program will need to know whether the proposal has been approved by November (thus, November 2005 for a 2006-07 curriculum plan, and so on).
Appendix
WORKLOAD CALCULATIONS

Background
Writing Program Workload Committee meetings with VP/DUE Ladusaw operated using the assumption that any proposal on workload must work within the current budget. The Writing Program’s base budget is 12 FTE, or $620,440. The cost of mounting the curriculum routinely exceeds the base budget. The assumptions and calculations below are meant to demonstrate what would happen if we went to a 6/2 workload model. On that model, assuming a steady frosh enrollment of 3100 per year, we’d have a fixed number of NSF teaching and would cover courses they could not teach via graduate student instructors. The 6/2 system assumes the availability of graduate students whose courses would be paid for out of a Divisional TA allocation rather than out of the Writing Program’s base budget, the model used by other departments in the Division.

These calculations address concerns about employment for NSF and graduate students: (a) At 6 courses and 2 course equivalencies, how many full-time lecturers could the Writing Program afford on its base budget? (b) How many graduate student-taught classes would we need to deliver the rest of the curriculum to students?

Assumptions
Incoming class 3100 students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAS cost of delivering 05-06 curriculum</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less cost of 13.5 course equivalencies (ELWR, CWC, “a,” etc.)</td>
<td>$80,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of delivering classes only</td>
<td>$659,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS budget, for reference</td>
<td>$620,400*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average salary of WP NSF (pre-6 and continuing)</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of current WP NSF (regular faculty only)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(one of the NSF is at 1/2 time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because benefits are not paid out of TAS, they are not a direct concern of the Writing Program, but they are a concern to the campus. Benefits are calculated at 13.5% of a person’s full-time salary, plus $6700.

---

4 A bare bones base budget, compounded by unfunded merit increases and increasing numbers of ELWR courses, has resulted in annual requests for supplemental funding to the Division. Because typically the Humanities Division has covered much or all of the shortfall between our base budget and the sum required to mount our curriculum. I have opted to use an estimate of the real TAS cost of delivering next year’s curriculum rather than our allotted $620,400. (The figures, including average salary, come from the curriculum plan for 2005-06 that the Writing Program submitted to the Division in early 2005.) Clearly that decision affects the calculations in this appendix.

5 “Regular” faculty refer to pre-six or continuing NSF to whom the Writing Program is committed to providing a half-time appointment.
Models

Model 1: 6 courses, 2 course equivalencies, 24 students/section

Number of classes needed: At 24 students/section, we calculate we need a minimum of **129 classes** to cover the first-year writing needs of the incoming class (3100 students ÷ 24/class).

Number of FT lecturers our budget could support:

\[ \$659,500 \text{ (TAS cost of 05-06 curriculum)} ÷ \$46,000 \text{ (average NSF salary)} = 14.3 \text{ FT lecturers} \]

This assumes that all lecturers are at 6 courses with the WP, which isn’t the case: regular NSF teach about 12 courses paid for by the colleges, meaning that 12 more WP courses could be taught by NSF on our budget. At a FT load of 6 courses apiece, that means 2 more NSF, for a total of **16.5 FT lecturers**. \(^6\)

Number of grad-taught classes needed:

14.5 lecturers x 6 classes each = 87 + 12 = 99

129 classes needed – 99 taught by NSF – 24 taught by LSOEs = **6 classes for grad**

This assumes that LSOEs will teach their full allotment of 6 courses apiece—not typically the case. Conservatively, one may subtract a minimum of 2 courses for chair’s relief: **8 classes for grad**. Projecting ahead to an expected LSOE hire, one may subtract an additional 3 courses for coordinating the ELWR: **11 classes for grad**. (In 2005-06, LSOEs will teach 15 courses—a smaller-than-usual number, but reflective of regular calls on LSOE service.) In addition, over the years, NSF have made several long-standing arrangements with other units—a course for Anthropology, 2- and 3-unit courses for colleges, and so on. Planning conservatively, it is realistic to assume that at least 3 additional courses would be available to graduate students because of long-standing NSF commitments to other units: **14 classes for grad**. Finally, any professional or personal leaves will result in another course available for a graduate student—perhaps 1 course per year: **15 courses for grad**.

Cost: about $80,000, not counting benefits

Model 2: 6 courses, 2 course equivalencies, 22 students/section

Number of classes needed: At 22 students/section, we calculate we need a minimum of **141 classes** to cover the first-year writing needs of the incoming class.

Number of FT lecturers our budget could support:

**16.5 FT lecturers** (using the same calculations as above)

Number of grad-taught classes needed:

141 classes needed – 99 taught by NSF – 24 taught by LSOEs = **18 classes for grad**

Using the same assumptions as above—about another 9 classes for grad—we arrive at **27 classes for grad**.

Cost: about $143,000, not counting benefits

---

\(^6\) Currently, there are 19 regular NSF in the program. One has declined an initial continuing review; one is expected to separate within two years: and one—possibly two—is only interested in a part-time position. That means that there are 15-16 NSF current regular faculty hoping or planning to stay employed full-time at UCSC. and 1-2 part-time—a match for the 16.5 full-time lecturers our budget would allow.
Models 1 & 2
Benefits: The benefits effect would be the same in both models: in 04-05, 24 NSF (including pool lecturers) were up to benefits. In both models above, whether there are one or two part-time NSF, 17 lecturers would be eligible for benefits.

Part-time: Splitting one FT position into two PT (3/1) positions wouldn’t add any further cost to TAS but would increase by one the number of benefits-eligible NSF in the WP.

ELWR coordinator: For every additional c.e. beyond 2 that the ELWR coordinator receives, add a class taught by a grad student.
Appendix
WORKLOAD CALCULATIONS

Background
Writing Program Workload Committee meetings with VP/DUE Ladusaw operated using the assumption that any proposal on workload must work within the current budget. The Writing Program’s base budget is 12 FTE, or $620,440. The cost of mounting the curriculum routinely exceeds the base budget. The assumptions and calculations below are meant to demonstrate what would happen if we went to a 6/2 workload model. On that model, assuming a steady frosh enrollment of 3100 per year, we’d have a fixed number of NSF teaching and would cover courses they could not teach via graduate student instructors. The 6/2 system assumes the availability of graduate students whose courses would be paid for out of a Divisional TA allocation rather than out of the Writing Program’s base budget, the model used by other departments in the Division.

These calculations address concerns about employment for NSF and graduate students: (a) At 6 courses and 2 course equivalencies, how many full-time lecturers could the Writing Program afford on its base budget? (b) How many graduate student-taught classes would we need to deliver the rest of the curriculum to students?

Assumptions
Incoming class  3100 students
TAS cost of delivering 05-06 curriculum $740,000
Less cost of 13.5 course equivalencies (ELWR, CWC, “a,” etc.) $80,500
  Cost of delivering classes only $659,500
TAS budget, for reference $620,400*
Average salary of WP NSF (pre-6 and continuing) $46,000
Number of current WP NSF (regular faculty only)\(^2\) 19
  (one of the NSF is at 1/2 time)

Because benefits are not paid out of TAS, they are not a direct concern of the Writing Program, but they are a concern to the campus. Benefits are calculated at 13.5% of a person’s full-time salary, plus $6700.

---

1 A bare bones base budget, compounded by unfunded merit increases and increasing numbers of ELWR courses, has resulted in annual requests for supplemental funding to the Division. Because typically the Humanities Division has covered much or all of the shortfall between our base budget and the sum required to mount our curriculum. I have opted to use an estimate of the real TAS cost of delivering next year’s curriculum rather than our allotted $620,400. (The figures, including average salary, come from the curriculum plan for 2005-06 that the Writing Program submitted to the Division in early 2005.) Clearly that decision affects the calculations in this appendix.

2 “Regular” faculty refer to pre-six or continuing NSF to whom the Writing Program is committed to providing a half-time appointment.
Models

Model 1: 6 courses, 2 course equivalencies, 24 students/section

Number of classes needed: At 24 students/section, we calculate we need a minimum of 129 classes to cover the first-year writing needs of the incoming class (3100 students ÷ 24/class).

Number of FT lecturers our budget could support:

$659,500 (TAS cost of 05-06 curriculum) ÷ $46,000 (average NSF salary) = 14.3 FT lecturers; round up to 14.5 FT lecturers

This assumes that all lecturers are at 6 courses with the WP, which isn’t the case: regular NSF teach about 12 courses paid for by the colleges, meaning that 12 more WP courses could be taught by NSF on our budget. At a FT load of 6 courses apiece, that means 2 more NSF, for a total of 16.5 FT lecturers.\(^3\)

Number of grad-taught classes needed:

14.5 lecturers x 6 classes each = 87 + 12 = 99
129 classes needed – 99 taught by NSF – 24 taught by LSOEs = 6 classes for grads

This assumes that LSOEs will teach their full allotment of 6 courses apiece—not typically the case. Conservatively, one may subtract a minimum of 2 courses for chair’s relief: 8 classes for grads. Projecting ahead to an expected LSOE hire, one may subtract an additional 3 courses for coordinating the ELWR: 11 classes for grads. (In 2005-06, LSOEs will teach 15 courses—a smaller-than-usual number, but reflective of regular calls on LSOE service.) In addition, over the years, NSF have made several long-standing arrangements with other units—a course for Anthropology, 2- and 3-unit courses for colleges, and so on. Planning conservatively, it is realistic to assume that at least 3 additional courses would be available to graduate students because of long-standing NSF commitments to other units: 14 classes for grads. Finally, any professional or personal leaves will result in another course available for a graduate student—perhaps 1 course per year: 15 courses for grads.

Cost: about $80,000, not counting benefits

Model 2: 6 courses, 2 course equivalencies, 22 students/section

Number of classes needed: At 22 students/section, we calculate we need a minimum of 141 classes to cover the first-year writing needs of the incoming class.

Number of FT lecturers our budget could support:

16.5 FT lecturers (using the same calculations as above)

Number of grad-taught classes needed:

141 classes needed – 99 taught by NSF – 24 taught by LSOEs = 18 classes for grads

Using the same assumptions as above—about another 9 classes for grads—we arrive at 27 classes for grads.

Cost: about $143,000, not counting benefits

\(^3\) Currently, there are 19 regular NSF in the program. One has declined an initial continuing review; one is expected to separate within two years; and one—possibly two—is only interested in a part-time position. That means that there are 15-16 NSF current regular faculty hoping or planning to stay employed full-time at UCSC, and 1-2 part-time—a match for the 16.5 full-time lecturers our budget would allow.
Models 1 & 2
Benefits: The benefits effect would be the same in both models: in 04-05, 24 NSF (including pool lecturers) were up to benefits. In both models above, whether there are one or two part-time NSF, 17 lecturers would be eligible for benefits.

Part-time: Splitting one FT position into two PT (3/1) positions wouldn’t add any further cost to TAS but would increase by one the number of benefits-eligible NSF in the WP.

ELWR coordinator: For every additional c.e. beyond 2 that the ELWR coordinator receives, add a class taught by a grad student.