

Information over speculation

We encourage all eligible faculty to make an informed decision and participate in this vote. The administration has sent a series of emails raising speculative concerns about unionization clearly intended to convince us to vote no. But they have yet to provide examples that justify these concerns. We believe these questions are best addressed by reference to *empirical evidence*, rather than speculation, when possible. A truly informed decision requires information over speculation.

Fortunately, we have a substantial number of examples that help us understand how collective bargaining has actually worked. See below for several links that provide useful information as you consider how to vote; and further below we provide a chart with information addressing some recent speculations.

- [Why we're voting yes](#)
- [How bargaining really works](#)
- [What other faculty have won through collective bargaining](#)
- [Examples of flexibility in the NYU union contract](#)
- [Why USC Academic Senate veterans are voting yes](#)

<i>Speculation</i>	<i>Useful Information</i>
A union contract must be “one-size-fits-all” and could eliminate things we like about our school/program	The administration has claimed that union contracts must be “one-size-fits-all” and cannot accommodate unique situations in particular schools, such as higher salaries or other specific conditions. Yet, the actual experience shows that equally diverse groups of faculty have negotiated contracts that did not have this result. We have found no examples of unionized faculty negotiating a contract that sacrificed the benefits, salaries, or interests of one school in favor of others. For example, NYU faculty negotiated major improvements to pay, benefits and working conditions for all faculty, while protecting an array of local/departamental practices where that was important. They also ensured that even the highest earners before the contract will receive significant pay increases.
Unionization could cost us flexibility in negotiating the terms of our individual employment.	As a dynamic and democratic process, collective bargaining can accommodate flexibility for special circumstances. For example, at USC the Graduate Student Workers won pay increases for all graduate workers, but also have a provision in their contract that states “nothing should preclude the University from providing compensation at rates above those required in this Article in its sole discretion.” In the NYU contract, faculty negotiated the following on the question of teaching loads: “<i>The parties acknowledge that the Department Chair or equivalent may engage directly with individual Contract Faculty Members on their teaching schedules, including course assignment, meeting days, times, and semester, consistent with this Agreement.</i>” On the question of leaves, NYU faculty strengthened baseline leave protections while ensuring that nothing “<i>restricts a school, college, or department from offering a leave of absence or workload relief to a Contract Faculty Member in excess</i>” of the minimums set in the contract, providing faculty continued flexibility on this topic.
There is no guarantee that all faculty interests (i.e. in smaller schools, full-time vs part-time, etc) will be represented in the bargaining process.	Faculty and other academic workers in the UAW have a strong track record of high participation in the bargaining process. This includes voting to elect a faculty bargaining team, filling out bargaining surveys, voting to approve initial bargaining demands, attending bargaining sessions, town halls, and department-level meetings, and voting on whether to ratify the final agreement. For a recent concrete example, read “How bargaining really works: notes from our NYU colleagues” where an overwhelming 81% of all represented contract faculty, from more than 100 schools and programs, voted ‘yes’ to approve the final contract.