

Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, September 8, 2008
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.

The chair called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM.

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: T. Anderson, D. Bell, K. Brown, G. Buckley, S. Gradin,
P. Jung, J. Lein, S. López-Permouth, G. Matlack, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, S.
Patterson, B. Quitslund, W. Roosenburg, A. Smith, J. Webster

College of Business: W. Gist, L. Hoshower, T. Stock

College of Education: V. Conley, T. Leinbaugh

College of Engineering: C. Bartone, J. Gieseey, D. Matolak, H. Pasic

College of Fine Arts: A. Reilly, E. Sayrs, D. Thomas, R. Wetzel

Group II: A. Hall, C. Naccarato

College of Health and Human Services: D. Bolon, S. Marinellie, J. Thomas

College of Osteopathic Medicine: P. Coschigano, S. Hatty

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: S. Brogan, J. McKean

Regional Campus—Eastern: T. Flynn

Regional Campus—Lancaster: P. Munhall

Regional Campus—Zanesville: J. Benson, K. Collins

Scripps College of Communication: J. Bernt, N. Pecora, J. Slade, S. Titsworth

Excused: D. McDiarmid, E. McGown

Absent: M. Clouse, T. Heckman

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. Eric Fingerhut, Chancellor of the University System of Ohio
 - II. President Roderick McDavis
 - III. Executive Vice President and Provost Kathy Krendl
 - IV. Roll Call and Approval of June 9, 2008 Minutes
 - V. Chair's report—Sergio López-Permouth
 - VI. Collective Bargaining Resolution
 - VII. New Business
 - VIII. Adjournment
-

Minutes of the meeting

- I. **Chancellor Eric Fingerhut**

- **Fingerhut** thanked the senate for inviting him to speak. He stated that **López-Permouth** has represented the Faculty Senate well at the state-wide faculty council and that he appreciates the chance to visit with faculty. He noted that, while he gets to spend a lot of time with leaders like President McDavis and Provost Krendl, deans, trustees, etc., he is often unable to spend as much time with faculty as he would like. He stated, “The reality is we’re trying to build a great university system and faculty is the core of what we do.”
- **Fingerhut** announced that **Barbara Gellman-Danley** is the new vice chancellor for academic affairs. **Gellman-Danley** was the president of Antioch University.
- **Fingerhut** noted that it has been a year since Governor Ted Strickland signed the order creating the University System of Ohio. He stated that it has been an year and asked senators to reflect on what a significant endeavor they are a part of. Ohio University is the oldest public institution in Ohio and has a beautiful location—he opined that OU possesses the most beautiful university campus in the state—as well as breadth and depth of academic programs, quality of students, etc. These are all indications of the quality of this institution. OU is now part of a larger university system that consists of 14 universities with 24 regional branch campuses, 23 community colleges, and an adult workforce education and training network—operating in more than 200 locations—that literally stretches across every county in Ohio. He stated that this system is the greatest recourse the state has as we move into a global economy. He noted that it is not only a big system but also a quality system. He pointed out that the latest *U.S. News & World Report* ranked three OH public universities in the top tier of universities. He reported that Ohio is tied for third place for states with the most universities in the top tier: OU, Ohio State University, and Miami University. The state is tied for sixth in terms of public and private universities. Ohio is sixth in the nation in research, 9th when both public and private universities are included.
- **Fingerhut** stated that the University System of Ohio is not only large and significant and high quality; its institutions are also affordable. He stated that he wants to increase state support, but, despite current challenges, the system is offering affordable education. He noted the example of OSU: in-state tuition at OSU is less than an in-state student pays at such universities as Penn State, Michigan, Indiana, or Illinois.
- **Fingerhut** point out that universities in Ohio are much more flexible than people think. He pointed to such examples as two plus two degrees, transfer and articulation agreements, and the commitment to make every general education course in Ohio transfer among all universities in the USO.
- **Fingerhut** maintained that the university system is driving the economic future of the state. He noted that the number 1 goal of the strategic plan is to raise the educational attainment of the people of Ohio. He stated that the single greatest indication of economic achievement is education and that the better educated we are the better we are able to compete in the global market place.
- **Fingerhut** admitted that there is no question that this is a tough economic time in the nation and in the state of Ohio. He noted that he served in the Congress and in the State Assembly and stated that the difference between the two is that in Washington they get to print money; Ohio can’t. He maintained that, considering

the current economy, universities have been well protected but also insisted that we are not immune from what happens in the economy. He stated that universities are the solution to the state's economic challenges and that we have to redouble our efforts to become a driver of the state's economic future. He stated that we have to be a generator of the state's revenue, not just a consumer. He insisted that we have got to the solution and that we cannot let the ups and downs of the economy to deter us from moving the state in an upward trajectory. He concluded his remarks by stating that, if we are succeeding beyond people's wildest imaginations in driving the state's economy and we tell them our story, people will invest in us: people want to hear that we're a world class system and that we need help and support to continue on this upward trajectory.

Questions for Fingerhut

- **Rudy Pasic** asked whether the chancellor has thought about being engaged abroad as a system, since it is often difficult for individual universities to initiate global programs. Fingerhut responded that we clearly have to be engaged in the world and noted that accountability measures in the system's strategic plan include international ones. He stated that he is very interested in opening up partnerships around the world and believes that as a system we can maintain the quality of our programs. He stated that, if each university chose a program to internationalize, we could make it work. He continued: it's not only the academic exchange that could put Ohio on the map; we are one of the leading export nations. He suggested that the state has a love-hate relationship with the global economy. But, he said, we have to get rid of the hate part; we have no choice, since the economy has changed—it *is* global. According to **Fingerhut**, the only question is whether we're going to compete in it. He stated that, as the state works to compete and participate, our universities are already global and have international contacts, more than business leaders do. He maintains that this is something we can contribute to our state and that we can do a lot in the global arena. He suggested, for example, that universities look at where their international graduate students do their undergraduate degrees and figure out what relationships they can build there.
- **Joseph Slade** asked about an article in the *New York Times* business section that criticized universities on the fact that businesses increasingly have to go overseas to find innovation. He asked whether it is worthwhile to explore initiatives in this area and to relax some of our research methods, for example, to be more innovative? **Fingerhut** noted that the article claimed that universities are too focused on patents to license it; not pursuing research for research sake. He stated that his office is committed to being an economic driver. The state has invested in new research faculty across the state: one position was awarded here at OU, for example, in the largest investment in research faculty in 30 years. He pointed to the Division of Economic Advancement in his office, which is helping him think through these issues. He stated that he will have a strategy soon to maximize the innovation base. He wants the state to continue to invest in high research faculty and these kinds of research investments and align it with our businesses and

- industries in Ohio. He stated that he personally thinks we have to open up our research a little more and that businesses would be interested in partnering with universities, but aren't going to sign a licensing agreement until they know it's a product they want to use. He suggested that faculty meet with business leaders regularly to discuss future lines of research
- **Glen Matlock** asked whether there is value in non-industrial research. **Fingerhut** responded that the primary reason for state and federal funding for research is for non-industrial research. He further stated that he would be suspicious of any assertion that the research Matlock does has no interest for any business or industry in Ohio. He maintained that his job is to let people know what you're doing and see what you can do with them. Matlock countered, "But what if we study a subject that really isn't of interest to business?" Fingerhut responded that he is not saying faculty *have* to do research in areas of interest to the state; rather, he stated that what he was saying is that his job is to make sure that we are leveraging what the faculty as a whole does for the state. He suggested that it is a question of us taking the collective brain power of the university system and see that everything we do has relevance. He gave an example of an assistant professor from the OSU medical school and her presentation lobbying for National Institutes for Health funding in Washington, D.C.
 - **Beth Quitlund** rephrased Matlock's question, stating that most of the faculty present spent money on our education and professors, but maximizing our economic impact wasn't our goal. She stated, "I don't think you're going to come up with much from my work that's going to power the economy." She noted that the humanities generally sound like a caboose that being hidden behind a very long train and asked whether there a way to sell some of the more intangible benefits of education. Fingerhut replied that we must remember who the audience is. Fingerhut replied that his job is to convince the people of Ohio why they should support a public university system for which they spend billions of dollars per year. He explained that he has to convince them why this is the kind of investment the state needs to make in declining economic times. He noted that we have a clear period of support from our governor and legislative leaders. He stated that we have to get to a growth economy unless we want to always be debating cuts. He said that we have the resources and assets to help the state move forward economically. He readily admitted that in the talk about research it's hard to talk about the role of humanities. He asked that faculty help him learn how to do it better and more. As he stated, the strategic plan is clear on the role of humanities, social sciences, and fine arts and that centers of excellence should include these programs; they just have to be excellent. He agreed that a well rounded education is what is needed to succeed in a global economy. He suggested that we have focused on science because we feel that we're behind – we need to catch up in these areas. He concluded that humanities and fine arts are definitely part of the plan.
 - **Thomas Flynn** stated that there must be something the chancellor wants from faculty. He asked, "What is that? What sort of change do you want?" **Fingerhut** replied that the principle change is the system. He stated that each university is no longer a completely independent entity. He stated that universities will no longer

be competing in Columbus for money, which hurt them all left them not at the level at which they could be. He said, “We are committed to this collaborative notion.” Fingerhut provided some examples of collaboration that already exists, including regional campuses focusing on Bachelor degree delivery and partnering with community colleges and the articulation of transfer credits. He explained that students should be able to move freely around the system. He continued, “If you are concerned with the level of a students’ preparation, it’s a system issue.” He stated that, while the governor called for more degrees to be granted, no one’s going to photocopy degrees. According to **Fingerhut**, faculty members are on the ground floor of quality assurance and will continue to decide what courses to mount, who teaches those courses, whether a student received credit at the end of the term, etc. He acknowledged that there is no other way to do it to make sure we have the quality we want.

- **Fingerhut** concluded by asking all faculty to consider service to the system as valid service in promotion and tenure cases. He also asked faculty to step up and offer suggestions for improvements and things we can try. He ended by saying, “We welcome input and contributions.”

II. **President Roderick McDavis**

- **McDavis** welcomed faculty back to the 2008-2009 academic year and thanked the chancellor and governor for their support for Ohio University. He stated that this is going to be an exciting academic year.
- **McDavis** devoted his report to what is happening with the budget. He stated that state revenues in August were short some \$167M, which means that the first two months of the new fiscal year have not met the budgeted goals. He said that this was due to the under performance of the state’s personal income and sales tax as a result of the high unemployment rate. He acknowledged that economic indicators are not moving in the direction everyone had hoped. Despite this, **McDavis** pointed out, OU received \$10M new dollars from the state, but he noted that he does not want to get too comfortable due to the economic numbers. Consequently, he announced that he is developing a budget contingency plan that will be presented to the Budget Planning Council next week. As he stated, the university wants to be ready for whatever happens. He explained that he is cautiously optimistic that we will be ok but does not want to give a false sense of security. He acknowledged that colleges across the country have had to take significant cuts in their budgets. He stated that he is thankful that the state has kept its promise to support higher education if we did not raise tuition. He stated, “Today all is well, and we’ve started the academic year in good shape, but I am concerned about the overall numbers.”
- **McDavis** concluded by thanking the faculty for all of the recruitment efforts that brought the great freshman class to OU. He also announced that there is good news on retention. He said, “We’re making good progress with what we’re trying to do. We just need the economy to turn around.”

There were no questions from senators.

III. Provost Kathy Krendl

- **Krendl** noted that her report is on her website. She announced that the Office of Institutional Research will not have definitive enrollment numbers until a few days after the start of fall quarter. The information she presented was based on admission indicators as of Friday, September 5. She stated that, if the numbers continue to hold, the university will be in good stead on enrollment.
- **Krendl** stated that undergraduate preregistration has been running slightly ahead of last year and is on target with budgeted enrollment numbers. She said that first-year retention looks like it will be up 1 to 2%. She thanked all members of the university who participated in retention efforts.
- **Krendl** reported that the number of freshmen applications were the highest ever received in the history of the institution and that transfer applications grew by 87. She estimated that there will be an increase of between 20 to 30 transfer students.
- **Krendl** reminded senators that 2008-2009 marks the first year in a predicted decade-long demographic decline in projected Ohio high school graduates. As a result, recruitment is likely to become markedly more competitive as universities compete for these students. She stated that OU will need to maintain focus and develop strategies to compete in this climate.
- **Krendl** announced that the Quarters to Semesters Transition Team will have its first meeting on Tuesday, September 9, at 5 pm. She noted that the Board of Trustees must give final approval to the change to semesters and is expected to do so in October. She stated that three other institutions—Wright State, OSU, and Cincinnati—are also in the process of acting on the recommendation of the Ohio Board of Regents for a universal academic calendar.
- **Krendl** reported that she had met with Bill Decatur, Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and the leadership of the Classified and Administrative Senates in July to discuss the distribution of the existing health care surplus derived from employee premiums. She announced an agreement to use the employee premium portion of the surplus to create a health care credit and that President McDavis has decided to offer a health care credit to the bargaining units. Details of the health care credit are still to be discussed. The portion of the health care benefits surplus contributed by the university will be used in funding Objective 20 of the Five Year Vision Ohio Implementation Plan, which is to “Improve the overall health of our faculty and staff by creating a culture of wellness and by encouraging healthy lifestyles.” Krendl stated that the rest of the surplus “will be used to strengthen the financial position of the university and thereby support its academic priorities.”
- **Krendl** reported that Graduate Student Services’ policy of having new graduate students register on the first day of classes has to do with adding them to SIS.

Questions for Krendl

- **Ken Brown** asked for clarification whether all of the health care surplus will stay in healthcare. **Krendl** replied that the employee portion will go toward premium

- holiday; managerial portion will go to strengthen financial situation of the university.
- **Peter Jung** asked whether there has been any statement from the university system on what calendar the administration would prefer. Krendl suggested that just looking at our current calendar of 30 weeks would equal two 15-week semesters. She noted that the University System of Ohio Strategic Plan says nothing about a common calendar or common dates.
 - **Geoff Buckley** asked about the diminishing number of students and the resulting competition for students and whether this contradicts the chancellor's statement about universities not competing with one another. He asked whether the centers of excellence will lead to streamlining of programs and the elimination of some programs. **Krendl** replied that the chancellor has always said that, although people have thought we have too many educational options, in fact we want to take advantage of the options we have. She noted that Ohio lags behind other states in Bachelors and Associates degrees. She stated that the centers of excellence will bring more students in from out of state and international students. **Krendl** believes that they will help us sell our programs to people outside the state.
 - **Krendl** returned to her report to acknowledge improvements in multicultural enrollments, which increased by 337 this year. She also noted that international applications also grew with 136 more applications than last year. She suggested that these international students are good targets for OU and for the system. She explained that the chancellor says he wants to know where the lights of excellence are, but he also insists that everyone is going to have a good basic education, general education, etc. She maintained that the chancellor's statements are not cutting other programs but that he has also said that we want to not compete with each other. She suggested that achieving this will be the challenge OU faces.

IV. Roll Call and Approval of the June 9 2008 Minutes.

The June 9, 2008 minutes were approved.

V. Chair's Report – Sergio López-Permouth

- **López** reported that it was a busy summer for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (EC). He indicated that the EC worked on an evaluation vehicle for members of the administration and stated that a draft of the survey will be distributed within the next few weeks.
- **López** stated that the move from quarters to semesters was another issue the senate was concerned with late last year. He stated that there is significant faculty representation on the transition team, which will be co-chaired by Tom Carpenter. Members of the EC will also be serving on the committee.
- **López** reported that the first call for volunteers for members of the standing committees was not quite sufficient. A second call helped fill the gaps, and hopefully the committees will be fully staffed soon.

- **López** announced that some progress has been made in the effort to include a faculty trustee on the Board of Trustees. He stated that he has received more positive feedback on this issue than in previous tries. He stated that he had consulted with several people over the summer to see what they thought should be done. The EC suggests that the senate not present just one proposal; rather, we should provide two or three options based on models we have found at other institutions across the country.
- **López** announced that **Pete Coschigano** will serve as chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee this year.
- **López** then yielded the floor to **David Thomas**, who announced that he had obtained approval and funding to automate and digitize University Curriculum Council paperwork. He reported that the design of the new system will be completed by the end of the fall, that the system will be tested in winter, and will go live in spring quarter.

VI. Resolution on Collective Bargaining – Ken Brown

- **Brown** reported that he had spent the summer revising this resolution along the lines discussed during the June meeting. The original resolution focused on a single item—the health care surplus. **Brown** broadened the resolution substantially. He therefore suggested that revisions had been large enough that this should be considered a new resolution and that the senate should not vote on it during the current meeting and should instead vote on it at the next meeting. **Brown** withdrew the resolution from last June.
- **Brown** read the resolution aloud.
- **Brown** maintained that the resolution is about shared governance and stated that faculty have none and need to get some. He noted that the list of whereas clauses was by no means all inclusive or necessarily even entirely correct and would there like input from faculty to improve it before the vote next month.

Questions for Brown

- **Peter Jung** asked what the relationship between collective bargaining and evaluating the president would be. **Brown** replied that the contract could state how we participate in the president’s evaluation and that it would be an issue of law if the administration or Board of Trustees don’t follow it.
- **Another senator** stated that the administration has chipped away at our health care benefits. **Joseph Slade** added that the workload policy will also get worse. He noted that contempt of the administration for the faculty is so palpable. He stated that he was previously involved in a unionization effort in NY. He recalled thinking that, if the administration already treating me as a blue collar worker, he should join a union. He stated that what it did was give the faculty its dignity back. He concluded that, unless you have collective bargaining, the status of the faculty is continually reduced and that you just have to do whatever the administration says.

- **Rudy Pasic** stated that he agreed 100% and that this resolution is a very good start. He maintained that we have to start doing something final. He said, “I talked to someone the other day about what faculty think of the senate and they said, ‘We don’t think you do anything.’ We have tried everything so far. We did whatever was possible to convince the authorities that something needs to be done, but nothing has been done.” He concludes that collective bargaining is a good step, a good beginning regardless of the outcome. He suggested that some of the statements (ex. Athletic director, constant meddling, non-essential areas) need to be a little more precise and have more details.) he also suggested that the “Be it resolved” clause be changed to solicit the opinion to start organizing, since he believes that we first need to see what other faculty think about the initiative. **Brown** replied that the administration is constantly meddling in academic and curricular affairs, as seen in lifelong learning going around UCC on online courses.
- **Geoff Buckley** asked if **Brown** could explain the process a little more. He wanted to know how representative we are of the faculty and whether there are lots of people out there who don’t know what’s happening. **Brown** replied that we will find out how representative we are. He stated that it’s the faculty senators who spend years at the interface with administrators and that other faculty can avoid all that stuff. Consequently, we’ll have to find out where they fall on this issue. He noted that AAUP is in the process of arranging a mechanism to gauge support for collective bargaining. If that looks reasonable and this resolution passes, a card drive will start with ASUP. All faculty members would receive a card in the mail. Once signed cards have been collected by 30% of the faculty, they will be verified and then an election will be scheduled within a time period of 60-90 days. If that passes, we would negotiate a contract with the administration.
- **Beth Quitslund** noted that it would be good to have as many details as possible in the resolution. She also stated that faculty support may shift or be different after the consequences of semesters begin to be felt. She is therefore concerned about prematurity. **Brown** replied that he’s asked the timing question several times. He said, “My answer every time has been that the point when the administration is prepared to abrogate our agreement about health care, there’s no place else for us to go—we have only three choices: we can shut up and teach our students, we can send our resumes out and get another job, or we can unionize.”
- **Tom Flynn** stated that he does not know anything about the advantages and disadvantages of a union. He worries that if we do this we’ll be locked in. As he said, “I don’t know enough to say that this would be better or worse than where we are now. I’d rather see the education process first. I’d like to hear from other campuses that have unionized.” He asked, “What will we lose in a union? What will we be giving up?” **Brown** replied that he can arrange for AAUP as well as Ohio unionized representatives to come to the October meeting. He stated that AAUP is very interested in supporting the effort and that they would have multiple presentations if asked. He said that, if the senate wants to hear from such representatives, then we need to arrange a meeting or have them attend the next senate meeting, if Sergio is willing to give them the time. **Brown** noted that representatives from other unionized campuses have been to OU in the past two

years. He pointed out that people always worry about how it will affect the faculty-administration relationship. He states that we already have an adversarial relationship. People he's talked to say the relationship improves because the contract gives structure.

- **Norma Pecora** stated that she would like to see something added to the resolution about grievances. Her personal experience is that unions gave great support on grievances. She noted that the Professional Relations Committee receives grievances that result in bad decisions by the president.
- **Allyn Reilly** pointed to the issue of trust and stated that he agreed with the second whereas. He thinks whatever bargaining unit we end up choosing will have a hard sell on how a union will enhance trust, since he comes from a different experience, which was highly charged and adversarial. He therefore wanted to know more about how collective bargaining improves relations with administrators. He further suggested that the "Be it resolved" section be rewritten to call on our colleagues to begin the process of unionizing rather than simply call on them to unionize. **Brown** replied to the question about faculty-administrator relationships by pointing to the idea of a loyal opposition. As he said, "People can be mad as hell and bitter all the time or they can be gentlemen."
- **Joe Bernt** stated that he thought that it is important that this resolution come from the Faculty Senate because of the issue of shared governance. He stated that most of us believe that we don't have much of it. He noted that choosing a bargaining agent – like AAUP – is the faculty choosing themselves. He suggested that the resolution emphasize that the reason that the Faculty Senate is interested in this resolution is that it will make the Faculty Senate stronger. He stated that a union would not dissolve the senate; it will reinforce the senate. **Brown** asked that he send him some wording on this and where it would go in the resolution.
- **Joe McLaughlin** stated that he could understand people's anxieties. He acknowledged that he has no idea if collective bargaining will make things better. He stated that there is not one thing on this list that is inaccurate or that Faculty Senate or Budget Planning Council hasn't kicked and screamed about. He stated that what we have now isn't working.
- **Glenn Matlock** suggested that senators educate themselves, but that the senate does not have to wait for this education before it vote on the resolution. He noted that the discussion on this issue has already begun among the faculty as a whole.
- In response to a question from Tom Flynn about the goal of this resolution, **Brown** replied that if we pass this resolution, there won't be a union. He noted that we're just recommending that there be a union. He asked, "Does the senate want to be educated by the AAUP before it votes or do we want to recommend this and then have the faculty educate themselves about it?" He acknowledged that he doesn't know if we'll get the 50%, but he thinks we'll get the 30%.
- **Pecora** stated that if the resolution says "begin the process" of organizing it will reflect more of what we're asking. **Joseph Slade** agreed. He opined that this resolution will come as a surprise to most faculty. He stated that the education process would be helpful. He stated that he's been in unions. He said, "What happens is that once you have a collective bargaining agreement in place there's still some tension, and it takes about a year for everything to settle down. You

then negotiate. It improves working conditions. Individual people might complain, but the contracts have to be ratified by the faculty. We decide if this is a deal we can live with or not. I would therefore discount the perpetual warfare idea. There's almost always progress, and conditions are almost always better. People don't get screwed in all of these myriad ways." He concluded that there's a lot of education that still needs to take place. **Brown** replied that **Slade** had raised many important points, but one is that the union we have will be our union. No one tells us what to say in the contract. We write our contract with the administration. He noted that if one department complains about across the board raises, we can have the contract include whatever kind of raises we want. He posed the possibility of an option that determines the raise pool but individual units would determine the way that its distributed.

- **Buckley** asked what would happen if we do a card drive but the vote fails. He wanted to know if everything just starts over again later. **Brown** replied that if it fails it would be difficult to get AAUP to come back soon.
- **Jim Lein** asked whether it would be possible to add a timeframe in the last paragraph. He suggested adding a date so that we can move forward rather than leave it vague. **Brown** replied that this isn't really a problem, since AAUP will not sit around. He explained that the local chapter is in the process of finding representatives in every unit. He stated that, if we pass this, a card drive will happen; the process will begin. He explained the process again and emphasized that there would be a legal limit on time.
- **Bernt** noted that, as we transition to semesters and the implications of that for workload, being involved in a card drive has some advantages. He suggested that this is another reason why now is important. **Brown** replied that compensation for faculty time can also be in the contract.
- **Flynn** stated that the list of whereas clauses in the resolution needs more substance. He noted that we're asking our colleagues who are less familiar with the issues raised in these clauses to buy into something that they know nothing about. He asked, "How do we know where the rest of the faculty stand?" He stated that, if we go out ahead of the faculty, we don't have any substance to back up our arguments. We need to know what the level of discontent is and what the advantages of a union are. He stated that he would vote against the resolution as it stands now.
- **Pecora** stated that in the 10 years she has been at OU she has never seen the people in her department with such discontent. She stated that they know what's happening in terms of wages and raises. She also stated that AAUP is already doing the work of educating. She suggested that, if we "wait until the faculty catches up to us," they might pass us by.
- **Doug Bolon** asked how passing this resolution would change things. **Brown** replied that it's possible nothing will change. He noted that this resolution is the senate saying what we think and the rest of the faculty doesn't have to buy that. He acknowledged that we'll find out what they think, but insisted that he thinks a lot of us may be surprised what they think.
- **Bolon** noted that there are two parts to the process. He asked what the cards authorize and stated that the card drive is not the vote. **Brown** pointed out that it

is important that everyone understand what signing a card means: it means there should be vote, not there should be a union. **Bolon** stated that in some unions, if only 30 or 31% of the cards are signed, the union wouldn't go ahead. **Brown** replied that this is right and that the union would want to get closer to 50%. **Bolon** stated that the education process for the broader faculty is very important for this reason.

- **Brown** was asked why he is delaying the vote and whether this sends the wrong message. **Brown** replied that it is a tactical move designed to allow for more education before a card drive begins.
- **Toby Stock** agreed with Flynn's previous comments and asked whether there are any studies that talk about faculty satisfaction pre- vs. post-unionization and measure salary pre- and post-unionization. He stated that we don't know what we're talking about and that we just have opinions. He noted that before I can send an informed signal about unionization by voting for this resolution, he needs to know what he's talking about. He also asked what good having AAUP representatives speak would do, since we already know what they'll say. **Brown** asked who else we could bring in? **Stock** replied that this is why he asked about studies. He also asked what percentage of universities are unionized. **Brown** replied that he did not know. **Stock** asked, "If is such a wonderful thing, why is it that relatively few institutions are unionized?" **Brown** replied that this is not the case in Ohio and stated that anyone worried about the union should remember that it will be our union—we decide what the relationship with the administration and what the contract will be. He reminded senators that we're talking about making a legal contract with the administration.
- **Scott Titsworth** asked about the power of Faculty Senate under a union and noted that the University of Akron is not a good model for us. **Brown** replied that he believes that we're already at a point where we have zero influence.
- **Tracy Leinbaugh** responded to **Stock's** previous comments by noting that any AAUP representatives would not be employees of the organization. She also noted that the senate is supposed to deal with the academics of the institution and that we only make suggestions about benefits, etc., which are not our charge. She pointed out that the senate has spent the last several years dealing with non-academic matters that are not within our power to deal with. She said that she wants the senate to go back to what we're supposed to deal with.
- **Joseph Shields** asked what fraction of the grievances listed in the whereas clauses would be fixed by a union. **Brown** replied that this was a good question and stated that a union won't change some of these things but that there are all kinds of things you could write into contracts. He suggested, for example, writing in an impeachment proceeding for administrators. He pointed out that, while it might not exist in any contract now, anything you can get both sides to agree to could be in the contract. **Bernt** also stated that this is an important question. He noted that having a collective bargaining unit will protect us and the power of the senate as **Tracy Leinbaugh** suggested. He suggested that you don't start a union to make the university a better place; you start a union to allow the faculty to do their jobs.
- **Quitslund** stated that one effect would be that funds would have to come from somewhere other than faculty salaries. **Ken Collins** agreed, stating that you can't

make the management do certain things, but you can make it more expensive for them to do certain things.

- **Brown** concluded his presentation of the resolution by saying that a university isn't a bunch of buildings or an administration or a board of trustees; a university is a faculty and its students. He said, "All the rest of it should be only to support the university, which is us. But somehow things have gotten turned upside down. We need to do something about this. It's time for us to take out university back."

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.