Statement by Theatre and Dance Faculty Supporting Fairness in the Voting Process for Unionization
The undersigned faculty of the Theatre and Dance Department would like to offer our support for a fair
election process regarding the lecturer unionization vote currently under negotiation. In crafting this

election process regarding the lecturer unionization vote currently under negotiation. In crafting t statement of support we draw upon a key element in our department's mission which reads:

Study in the Department of Theatre and Dance fosters an ethical and intellectual community, cultivates in our students the ability to think critically and creatively and communicate with clarity and conviction, promotes understanding and values diversity, and develops a vision of a better world together with the means to contribute to the common good.

In a department where we embody our values by sharing them through language and action we feel a fair process as articulated below reflects our intentions to develop a better world together while contributing to the common good. We recognize that the matter of unionization is controversial. The department as a whole does not take a stand on how the SCU lecturers should vote, rather we respect their own deliberative process concerning their choice.

The undersigned agree with the following:

- 1) the University administration's decision to employ an anti-union law firm, Littler Mendelson, to lead their negotiations on the unionization election is controversial and inconsistent with our department mission to promote an "ethical community;"
- 2) We are grateful to the Philosophy Dept.s comments regarding the administration's proposed quorum requirement:
 - The high quorum requirement additionally divides lecturers into voters and non-voters in a way that assists the anti-union side by design. Lecturers may choose not to vote for a plethora of reasons—sickness, ignorance of the issues, confusion, fear, being overwhelmed with family matters, etc. With a high quorum threshold, however, all those reasons are in essence converted into a "no." The person who does not vote becomes a person who did vote, with that vote interpreted as "no" for quorum purposes. To be clear: each non-vote will count against the high quorum threshold requirement and thereby make the union drive that much more difficult.

Therefore we support the clear guidelines offered by the National Labor Relations Board, such that only ballots cast should be counted as votes either for or against unionization – those who decide not to cast ballots should not be counted as "votes" against unionization;

3) continued negotiations in good faith is paramount to promoting the "common good," at SCU.

Signatures
Aldo Billingslea
Brian Thorstenson
Derek Duarte
Jerald Enos, Assoc. Professor. Member
United Scenic Artist Local 829

Karina Gutiérrez, Assistant Professor Barbara Murray, Professor David Popalisky, Associate Professor David Sword Jeff Bracco Patt Ness, Lecturer