

Why we still say: please vote YES to delay!

This letter is not going to be full of assumed numbers and speculation regarding reprisals from the UC. For us it is simply a matter of turning a chaotic situation regarding how to implement major changes to language course offerings at UCB through a well-planned, thoughtful and collaborative process.

AT THIS POINT NO ONE HAS A CLUE HOW DIFFERENT COURSES ARE GOING TO BE WEIGHTED IN THE 6 TO 5 CHANGE.

In the new contract language, the reduction in full time workload standards from six courses to five applies to “foreign language courses.” What does this even mean? What constitutes a language course counted as 40%? How will a team-taught course be weighted? How about a beginning language course versus a third year reading course? Do they count for the same percentage or is one weighted more? What about pedagogy courses? Or coordination? It seems foolish to implement the 6 to 5 change immediately when, there is no clarity regarding which courses be counted at 40% and which will remain at 33%.

Why the rush? Delaying will allow US to better influence important and complicated decisions about our programs and our jobs. It is true that if we delay, there will be less pay for some people next year than if we implement immediately. Some courses that will undoubtedly be pegged at 40% will instead be at 33% again, **just for next year**. But we don't know which courses should fall under that rubric yet. It may be fewer than people assume. No doubt pre-six and LCTL lecturers are specifically vulnerable in a chaotic implementation situation. Those of us who are post-six and in somewhat safer positions, albeit not 100% safe, should seek to secure the best appointment climate for those vulnerable colleagues under these hard financial realities.

YES TO DELAY is not a re-opening of negotiations. **The contract stands. Our raise is secured and will be paid**, but the clause on workload was not articulated clearly enough to allow for implementation without further discussion between lecturers and program chairs and staff. The delay will allow us to engage in a productive process about how we can conform to the idea represented by the clause. The timing of the contract was nearly simultaneous with when budgets needed to be submitted. If it is implemented now, program chairs and staff will have to make hasty decisions in a challenging and chaotic budget environment. To avoid misunderstandings and grievances we should take the time to figure out how to implement.

We need more time to talk, quite simply.

Let's get real.

There is no hidden cache of money available to the Division of Arts and Humanities or the Division of the Social Sciences that departments can draw on to pay for significant increases in salary. They don't have access to the funds used to pay administrators, etc. Departments have access to funds that are given by Central Campus for Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS), and only 20% of the TAS money budget actually comes from Central Campus. Most of TAS is provided by the Dean's funds, and those funds are not linked to the kind of money alluded to in the “say no letter”.

Contrary to the “say no letter,” we are not interested in scaring fellow lecturers, and we don't want to change the contract. We are asking for time to figure out how to implement it. The departments are acting in good faith in paying for the raise mandated by the contract. And they will pay for the

increased cost of workload reduction as well. But there is simply not an endless stream of funding. There will in all likelihood be some layoffs -- how many depends on how the implementation of workload reduction is organized.

NO ONE WANTS LAYOFFS. So we will do what we can to prevent that. But it is unrealistic to imagine that the kind of cost increase represented by the raise plus workload reduction, along with dwindling TAS budgets, will not yield some layoffs. We don't know what implementation will cost or how many jobs might be lost precisely because the contract is too vague to understand how to implement it... no one is hiding anything.

Departments want to continue language programs as they are, and they do not want to lose lecturers. For Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTCs) the new work load standards are especially problematic, particularly for the “*One lecturer = One language*” languages. **And the majority of languages offered on campus are LTLCs**, in which we often teach classes that "depend" on the prior class in the sequence. Cutting the 6th course could eliminate a major in a given language – it is precisely here that planning and program review is important for the lecturers to be an integral part of the implementation. Implementing 6 to 5 in the current financial climate means in reality that 1/6th of language courses will NOT be offered next year. Because we do not for a second believe that it is realistic that departments have the money to hire new lecturers to teach the one course a year that they are short.

It is not “*laughable*” that lecturers will be invited into the conversation. If lecturers are not at the table in these discussions, we forfeit the right to have input on how the university ought to implement the workload clause. It is not at all the case that the union and the university will be able to figure out what would best serve lecturers.

No one is proposing to renege on the contract. On the contrary! We want both sides to understand how to implement it. So we need more time to get those answers. If the departments are placed in a position of having to interpret the contract themselves, it may not be what union members would like. We prefer to avoid misunderstanding and mistakes and grievances by getting everyone on the same page before implementation. Some lecturers may think they know how to implement, but each department is different and the question is complex. It is naive to suppose that everyone understands perfectly how to act in this case without further discussion.

YES - We voted yes to the new contract.

YES - We will get our raise.

YES - We will get a workload reduction. But we must implement it effectively. If we implement now, we will have it all now, but at what price?

PLEASE VOTE YES FOR THE SAKE OF **ALL** LECTURERS – for pre-6, for post-6, for a constructive transition from 6 to 5!