

UA Quantification of UNAC Proposals

Summary of Methodology

From table discussion: 12/7/21

UA Management team said that they counted changes according to the following criteria: :

- changes that require management to make a change
- changes that could go to grievance
- “multipart” proposals were counted as separate changes

They did not count changes to punctuation and formatting or repetitions. The UA management team came up with this scheme because one of their members stated that he needed a way of keeping track because it seemed like there were a lot more changes than proposed at the 2016 negotiation. They also stated that counting the number of changes was a way of justifying the long delays from the UA management team in responding to UNAC proposals.

Examples of how the UA management team counts changes:

UNAC Proposal Article	Proposed Change	Changes to CBA as counted by UA Administrative team
11.1.1 (11/29/21)	“The Seven Tenets of Just Cause” (included in 6070 CBA)	7
1 (10/4/21)	Land Acknowledgement	3

Using this quantification scheme the UA management team concluded that:

- UNAC proposed 200+ substantive changes
- UA management team proposed 19 substantive changes.

UNAC maintains that the UA management team’s quantification scheme grossly overcounts the number of changes proposed. Both examples represent one proposed change each, not a combined total of 10.

Many proposed changes are necessitated by the fact that this is the first negotiations since the UAFT/UNAC merger, the gap between negotiations is almost double (5 years rather than 3), numerous relevant and exceptional events happened in that period—exigency, the compact, expedited program review, COVID, and so on—that affect faculty working conditions. Our substantive proposals seek to solve problems and improve the CBA overall.