

We, the undersigned in the **Department of Mathematics and Computer Science**, are not experts in the theology, morality, or history of unionization.

All we know is numbers.

Here are some numbers.

Let's say there are 300 non-tenure track faculty who are eligible to vote for or against unionization. Both AFLOC and the administration/Littler Mendelson agree that 90 of them (30% of 300) must go through the act of signing a union card for there to be a vote. That's standard NLRB procedure.

Standard NLRB procedure also says that such a vote is then decided by "the majority of votes cast." This NLRB standard, which is supported by AFLOC, but not the administration/Littler Mendelson, would mean that...

1. ...if the vote was **101 for unionization** and **100 against unionization**, then unionization would **pass**.
2. ...if the vote was **198 for unionization** and **1 against unionization**, then unionization would **pass**.

On the other hand, the administration/Littler Mendelson wants, in addition to 90 signed union cards, a new non-NLRB requirement that two-thirds of the 300 eligible voters must vote for unionization to pass. This would mean that...

1. ...if the vote was **101 for unionization** and **100 against unionization**, then unionization would **pass**.
2. ...if the vote was **198 for unionization** and **1 against unionization**, then unionization would **not pass**.

As we said, we're not experts in the theology, morality, or history of unionization, but we do know numbers, and we know that this odd proposal by the administration/Littler Mendelson just doesn't add up.

Dan Ostrov
Ed Schaefer
Mary Long
Natalie Linnell
Katelyn Byington
Linda Burks
Reza Shariatmadari
Shiva Houshmand
Mike Hartglass
Frank A. Farris
Luvreet Sangha
Mehdi Ahmadi
Nicolette Meshkat
Norman Paris
Tamsen McGinley