

28 April 2010

TO: Tenure related faculty, non-tenure track instructional faculty, non tenure track research faculty, and officers of administration

FROM: The Senate Executive Committee

RE: UNIONIZATION SURVEY RESULTS: DATA FROM NON-TENURE TRACK RESEARCH FACULTY ONLY

Dear Colleagues:

Here are the results of the recent survey on unionization conducted by the Senate Executive Committee. Four UO employee groups were surveyed: tenure related faculty, non-tenure track instructional faculty, non-tenure track research faculty, and officers of administration excluding senior administrators. UO employee lists were supplied by the UO General Counsel's office and paid for from private funds.

We heard back from 46% (1053/2307) of those who received the email to participate in the survey. We received responses from 56% of the tenure related faculty (380/677), 30% of the non-tenure track instructional faculty (100/336), 33% of the non-tenure track research faculty (110/335) and 48% of the officers of administration (458/959). Of those that started the survey, 96% (1009/1053) completed it.

Several caveats about the survey:

1) The survey was sent out to all members of each of the 4 groups. It was thus not a scientific, random sample survey, but an electronic "straw poll".

2) Although all members of each group were asked to participate, we do not know the reasons why some chose to respond and some didn't. It is possible that the data are skewed by those who had strong feelings either in favor of or against a union.

3) Although the survey limited responses to one per IP address, it was possible to game the survey by submitting multiple responses from different computers. However, we trust the honesty and good will of our colleagues.

4) ~10% of the emails sent out requesting participation in the survey were returned as "undeliverable". These are not included in the total number for each group. We also know that some emails were delivered but filtered out as spam. It is unclear whether these were read.

We have chosen not to analyze the survey data. Instead, we present only the raw data including anonymous comments and a breakdown of the data by groups. These data are provided solely for informational purposes to facilitate the discussion regarding unionization.

If you have any questions about the survey, please feel free to contact Nathan Tublitz at <u>tublitz@uoneuro.uoregon.edu</u>

Office of the President of the University Senate

207 Johnson Hall, 1258 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-121258

T (541) 346-3081 F (541) 346-2023 www.uoregon.edu

An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act

UNIVERSITY SENATE UNIONIZATION SURVEY

My primary position at the Universi	ity is as a:		
		Response Percent	Response Count
Tenure Related Faculty (TRF: i.e., Full Professor, Associate Professor; Assistant Professor; tenured Senior Instructor)		0.0%	0
Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty (NTTIF; i.e., Senior Instructor; Instructor; Adjunct)		0.0%	0
Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty (NTTRF; i.e., Senior Research Associate; Research Associate; Senior Research Assistant; Research Assistant)		100.0%	110
Officer of Administration (OA; i.e., librarian; administrator)		0.0%	0
	Please feel free	to comment	6
	answere	d question	110
	skippe	d question	0

Please feel free to comment		
1	I am also an OA - did not allow multiple responses	Apr 15, 2010 5:57 PM
2	I don't really fit in any of these categories, but I'm non-tenure faculty. I don't teach.	Apr 17, 2010 12:19 AM
3	also OA	Apr 20, 2010 7:10 PM
4	I think	Apr 22, 2010 2:20 AM
5	University designationactually work for Early Childhood CARES	Apr 24, 2010 12:04 AM
6	research assistant, about 20 years	Apr 26, 2010 3:29 PM

1			
		Response Percent	Response Count
wish to be represented by a union.		17.9%	19
do not wish to be represented by a union.		42.5%	45
have no opinion.		4.7%	5
don't have sufficient information to answer this question.		34.9%	37
	Please feel free	to comment	11
	answere	ed question	106
	skippe	ed question	4

	Please feel free to comment		
1	The status of the on-going development of NTTF status and promotion documents and policies will impact my opinion on this question.	Apr 15, 2010 5:58 PM	
2	I support unions, but I am not terribly concerned about my current situation.	Apr 15, 2010 5:59 PM	
3	I am essentially a retired individual and my "union days" are behind me	Apr 15, 2010 6:00 PM	
4	I use to be classified and supported the union, I would like to know more about how the two unions would work together	Apr 15, 2010 6:07 PM	
5	In principal, I am in favor of unions, for the protection they offer to employees and the clarity of discussion they help to provide employers and administrators. In the UO case, I know barely anything about the options, and so am hesitant to endorse a union blindly.	Apr 15, 2010 8:56 PM	
6	Been in a union before. I'm on an annual contract subject to the success of a grant. A union won't help the stigmatization of being 'non-tenure track' Faculty (to the 'tenured' faculty).	Apr 17, 2010 12:22 AM	
7	In my experience, unionization brings down the quality of research as well as the quality of work environment.	Apr 19, 2010 4:53 PM	
8	The amount of money it will cost me personally to give someone else the ablility to 'bargain' for me is just ridiculous. As far as I can tell, for others that are members of other unions here at the university, the union has not been helpful to them.	Apr 19, 2010 5:19 PM	
9	sympathetic to union but not 100% convinced it's a good idea	Apr 20, 2010 7:13 PM	
10	Our program directors have been very attentive to our needs	Apr 26, 2010 3:24 PM	
11	I find that unions tend to lead to a less productive place, with added regulations and loopholes, as well as fostering the retention of sub-productive employees, due to over-protection and the hassle it takes to let them go.	Apr 26, 2010 3:34 PM	

UNIVERSITY SENATE UNIONIZATION SURVEY

Should a union be established,			
		Response Percent	Response Count
I support the organization of a single, "wall-to-wall" collective bargaining unit that includes all the following employee groups: tenured related faculty, non-tenure-track instructional faculty, non-tenure- track research faculty, and officers of administration.		22.1%	23
I do not support the organization of a single, "wall-to-wall" collective bargaining unit that includes all the following employee groups: tenured related faculty, non-tenure-track instructional faculty, non-tenure- track research faculty, and officers of administration.		28.8%	30
I have no opinion on this issue.		6.7%	7
I don't have sufficient information to answer this question.		42.3%	44
	Please feel free	to comment	9
	answere	ed question	104
	skippe	ed question	6

	Please feel free to comment		
1	The requirements of Tenured and NTTF faculty are sufficiently different that I don't think they have enough interests in common to justify a wall to wall unit.	Apr 15, 2010 5:58 PM	
2	Same as above, how will the single organizations work together to fit the group	Apr 15, 2010 6:07 PM	
3	A single organization would mean that all of my supervisors and bosses would be in the same union as I am; this seems like an obvious conflict of interest. If I have a dispute which requires union representation, would the union represent me or my boss?	Apr 15, 2010 6:25 PM	
4	A "wall to wall" system seems most efficient for all concerned, however, would all groups and their concerns be equally well represented? What happens if an issue before the union is a concern for one group but not the other, or if different groups within the union hold strong opposing viewpoints? These are some of my concerns.	Apr 15, 2010 8:56 PM	

	Please feel free to comment		
5	is this something that would be a permanent decision? Could it be changed after trying it out?	Apr 15, 2010 11:36 PM	
6	This questin is N/A since I do not support unionization.	Apr 19, 2010 4:53 PM	
7	If there is a union, having a wall to wall bargaining unit does not seem benificial to the whole group. Some issues with contracts are not the same across the boards and it doesn't seem right to do so.	Apr 19, 2010 5:19 PM	
8	I feel these employee groups need to be represented individually to better represent their needs. A single wall to wall unit would throw everything in one pot- as is the umfortunate situation with the current classified/unclassified system. We can do better and represent employee groups more according to their individual needs (i.e. individually).	Apr 22, 2010 8:49 PM	
9	The smaller the 'groups' get, the less bargaining power they have	Apr 26, 2010 3:34 PM	

UNIVERSITY SENATE UNIONIZATION SURVEY

Should a union be established,			
		Response Percent	Response Count
I support the establishment of a separate bargaining unit for my particular group.		20.2%	21
I do not support the establishment of a separate bargaining unit for my particular group.		19.2%	20
I have no opinion on this issue.		12.5%	13
I don't have sufficient information to answer this question.		48.1%	50
	Please feel free	to comment	8
	answere	ed question	104
	skippe	ed question	6

	Please feel free to comment		
1	I could perhaps be swayed on this option depending on the details	Apr 15, 2010 5:57 PM	
2	I support a union for general University faculty, but do not need it for my organization.	Apr 15, 2010 7:15 PM	
3	As above in number 3, the same concerns apply to this question.	Apr 15, 2010 8:56 PM	
4	It's unclear to me how grant funded NTTRF would be represented in a collective bargaining unit dominated by a different class of faculty with different concerns and demands on their time and resources.	Apr 16, 2010 4:07 PM	
5	I support whichever option limits the union's power over my position.	Apr 16, 2010 4:35 PM	
6	I do not think that tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty should have the same bargining unit, since non-tenured faculty are amorphous.	Apr 17, 2010 12:22 AM	
7	This questin is N/A since I do not support unionization.	Apr 19, 2010 4:53 PM	
8	Our agency is quite different than the rest of the U of O, so it is imperative if there is a union, we remain a separate entity	Apr 22, 2010 2:21 AM	