

Resolution on Collective Bargaining

Brought to the Faculty Senate of Ohio University on October 13, 2008

for Second Reading

Whereas continued functioning of the university requires real shared governance and a substantial degree of cooperation between the faculty and the central administration and the Board of Trustees, and

Whereas such cooperation depends upon a relationship built on mutual trust and respect between the university administration and the faculty and between the Board of Trustees and the faculty, and

Whereas the administration and the Board of Trustees have steadfastly resisted the implementation of any real shared governance and jeopardized the respect and trust of the faculty as a result of the following:

- While no semblance of real shared governance exists at Ohio University, faculty continue to be asked to waste time on committees that have no real participation in the actual governance of the institution;
- Surprise announcements establishing new initiatives, administrative offices, and administrative positions without prior consultation with the faculty have become routine;
- A history of faculty grievances with findings by the President and Provost that tend to favor the administration with no option for legally-binding arbitration;
- An explosion of highly paid administrative positions which were not needed to run the institution just a few years ago;
- The lack of staff and resources in the academic units needed by faculty in order to do their jobs effectively due to repeated budget cuts to academic units used to confront the university's continuing budget problems;
- The inability of the administration to accept the fact that in order to be more effective and productive (as required by the university's "vision") we need more faculty;
- The willingness of the administration to accept fraudulent budgets from the Athletic Director while he searched for another job,
- An attempt by Lifelong and Distance Learning to circumvent the University Curriculum Council by offering a number of Ohio University courses on-line, despite the fact that these courses had not been approved as on-line offerings as required by UCC, a clear violation of the faculty's "primary jurisdiction over curriculum,"¹

- Constant assessment and evaluation of faculty to determine if they are meeting the institutions needs while the administration continues to pump money into non-essential areas with no accountability whatsoever,
- The departure of several deans and senior administrators which led to the hiring of new administrators at salaries far above those of the former office holders, and subsequently to large increases in the salaries of continuing deans based on "market considerations," despite the fact that faculty salaries continued to lag far behind those of a group of administratively selected peer institutions;
- A five year plan to improve faculty salaries which was consequently adopted and began in fiscal year 2008 with the conversion of ca. \$1M of health care benefit compensation into salary compensation, contrary to an explicit recommendation by the Budget Planning Council, giving the appearance of improving OU's faculty salary status while there was little if any improvement in faculty total compensation and no additional investment in compensation by the institution;
- The proposed postponement of the implementation of the second year of the faculty salary improvement plan, and indeed any faculty raise at all, due to the possibility of subsequent budget rescissions, which adequately demonstrated the low priority given by the administration to fair faculty compensation;
- Continued shockingly low estimates by the Provost of the cost of changing the academic calendar from quarters to semesters which take no account of the thousands of man-hours of faculty time required to revise the entire curriculum and demonstrate an administrative view that faculty time is both limitless and worthless;
- A request by this Senate for a non-voting position on the OU Board of Trustees, originally made over 27 months ago, which has yet to receive even the courtesy of a response from the Board of Trustees;
- A policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in "response" to overwhelming complaints from faculty and student governance regarding the evident lack of any consideration given by the Trustees to the input provided by faculty and student representatives to the annual evaluation of the President, which provides that such "comprehensive" evaluations, which include faculty and student input, would occur only every five years, instead of every year;
- A subsequent offer by the Board of Trustees of a new five year contract for the President without the benefit of a comprehensive review of the President as required by their own newly adopted policy, and despite two consecutive overwhelmingly negative annual votes of confidence in the President;
- A subsequent announcement by the Board of Trustees that it will conduct an ex post facto, and consequently completely useless, comprehensive review of the president, with

the aid of as yet unnamed outside consultant(s) at an unknown cost, despite the university's fiscal problems;

- A recommendation by the Board of Trustees, and the subsequent acceptance by the President, of an outrageous increase in salary compensation for the President despite the university's continued and entrenched fiscal problems, and despite the two consecutive votes of no confidence by the faculty;

- The stonewalling of the Faculty Senate by the Provost who approved only one of the last nine Senate resolutions requiring her signature dating from April 16, 2007 through May 12, 2008;

- The recent abrogation by the administration of a prior written agreement with the Faculty Senate regarding the disposition of health care benefit surplus funds, which demonstrates the administration's disregard for even those Senate initiatives which they approve in writing;

- A growing fear that faculty control of the curriculum will be lost to administrative mandates regarding how the curriculum will be converted during the quarter-to-semester calendar transition; and

Whereas the instances enumerated above have destroyed any trust and respect that the faculty may have had in the administration and the Board of Trustees;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Ohio University calls upon the faculty to begin the process of organizing themselves into a collective bargaining unit for the purpose of negotiating a contractual agreement with the university, instituting meaningful shared governance,² to which the university administration would be bound by law.

¹Preamble to the Ohio University Faculty Handbook, June, 2008.

²See the AAUP "Statement on Academic Government for Institutions in Collective Bargaining," AAUP Policy, 10th Ed., October 26, 2006.