
aaup-ud

Bargaining Update

[BECOME A MEMBER](#)

July 9, 2026

Dear Bargaining Unit Members,

The AAUP-UD contract with the University expired on June 30, 2026. Despite President Carlson agreeing with the AAUP-UD's Chief Negotiator last fall that having a new contract in place prior to expiration was a priority, the administration's bargaining team subsequently has pushed across the bargaining table proposal after proposal that would **limit faculty rights and provide them with only small increases in compensation.** Thus, the AAUP's and the administration's bargaining teams remain far apart on most significant issues despite having passed the 2023-2026 contract's expiration.

Rest assured that while we continue to negotiate with the administration, your current compensation, benefits, and other contract provisions remain in place. Though we do not yet believe that we are deadlocked, we are prepared to call for mediation if or when that should occur. We will keep you apprised as events unfold.

Turning to the status of specific proposals, we have a few important updates. To begin with compensation, the administration's team has moved only marginally upward in its proposed raises for faculty and has continued to propose a 5-year contract; moreover, **all the raises proposed by administration would favor the highest paid faculty** because they all are structured as percentages of individual faculty salaries. The AAUP, on the other hand, has proposed raises for a 3-year contract that are structured to benefit faculty across the salary spectrum, and these raises would be based on multiple mechanisms, including structural raises based both on percentage of individual salary (1st year) and

percentage of rank mean salaries (2nd and 3rd year), along with merit raises based on a dollar amount tied to merit scores (2nd and 3rd year).

In addition to salary increases, another significant issue at the bargaining table has been **job protection and compensation for CT faculty**. At the June 10 bargaining session, the AAUP-UD team delivered to the administration's team a letter from the CT Caucus Executive Board supporting our proposals for CT faculty members (five-year rolling contracts that may not be terminated with one-year's notice and incremental pay increases that are earned at either years 6 and 13 of service or at the time of promotion, if sooner). Despite the fact that the CT Caucus Executive Board represents 356 CT faculty across the university, the administration merely thanked us for the letter, made no further mention of it, and, at the next bargaining meeting, re-proposed their language 1) to provide only one-year's notice if a CT faculty member on a five-year rolling contract is not to be renewed, and 2) to provide CT faculty members with the possibility of incremental raises only at the time of promotion and not at years 6 and 13, despite the fact that some CT faculty members do not have a clear path to promotion. **Our arguments that CT faculty members deserve more job security and compensation than that afforded by the administration's proposals apparently have fallen on deaf ears.** So has our insistence that some CT faculty members never would have accepted positions at UD, and others may have left UD, had it not been for the administration's prior assurances that at year 13, CT faculty on five-year rolling contracts would have significant job security.

Also sobering has been the administration's third submission of their proposal on **academic freedom**. **More specifically, their team resubmitted the language of their previous proposal, despite the serious limitations that it would impose, with a change of only two words.** The proposal still retains its egregious elimination of protections to criticize the institution outside of the context of "institutional governance," and it retains its narrow description of academic freedom in the classroom as being "the freedom held by the faculty to teach and discuss their subject expertise in academic instructional settings." As we noted in our [detailed response to their second proposal](#), if the administration were truly dedicated to academic freedom, which is best protected by tenure/job security, it would not be insisting on having unfettered license to hire adjunct faculty and to eliminate the level of job security traditionally afforded to CT faculty on five-year rolling contracts. The AAUP Steering Committee rejected the administration's third proposal on academic freedom and voted to resubmit our own. In response, the administration indicated that it is "holding" on the language in their third proposal. The AAUP is considering a response.

In another potential blow to academic freedom, the administration's team **rejected our proposal to allow faculty to choose whether or not to use AI in their teaching, service, or research**. We were not surprised at their rejection, given the staunch opposition of the deans and the interim provost to a recent Faculty Senate resolution that would have afforded faculty the right to opt in or out of AI usage and would have guaranteed the Senate an advisory vote on new AI-related technology. However, even though the administration's rejection of our proposal is unsurprising, it is no less unsettling, especially given the controversial and ever-expanding presence of AI on college campuses, including on our own.

A final update involves two proposals that the AAUP pushed across the bargaining table on June 24. The first would provide the AAUP with **15 minutes of time at any live new faculty orientation** to provide

an in-person overview of the union’s operation, activities, and benefits. This resolution was **rejected** by the administration on July 1. Similarly **rejected** was the AAUP’s 6/24 proposal for **the administration to guarantee the rights of faculty who are transgender to use their preferred names and pronouns, to provide a website indicating how to change names and pronouns in University systems, and to provide trans-inclusive resources to employees and managers**. One reason that the administration gave for their rejection of this latter proposal is that faculty who are transgender, like all other faculty, already have the ability to change their names and pronouns to match their identities. True, faculty can choose a preferred name in the UD directory and can change their legal name by presenting official documentation to HR, but there appears to be no centralized place for faculty to declare, let alone change, their pronouns. (Canvas and Zoom do allow individuals to establish/change their pronouns and choose preferred names within their particular systems.) Nor did the administration address the fact that nowhere (that we could find) is it explicitly stated that faculty members have the right to use preferred pronouns; in fact, in UD’s Administrative Policies Manual, there are no references to the word “pronoun” at all. (Contrast UD’s seeming lack of a policy with Penn State’s detailed [Chosen Identity Policy](#).) The AAUP team firmly believes that **faculty who are transgender need and deserve codified protections that are clearly explained on one readily accessible webpage**. Due to the importance of both our 6/24 proposals, we are considering responses to the administration’s rejection of them.

If you would like more details on the most substantial proposals made during the bargaining process thus far, please see the table below. Also, if you would like to help us fight back against the administration’s proposals to limit faculty rights, protections, and compensation, please [become a member now](#). The more members we have, the more power we have at the bargaining table. If you are already a member, thank you, and please reach out to your colleagues to make sure that they’ve joined the AAUP-UD, too.

In solidarity,

The AAUP-UD Bargaining Team

Proposals by AAUP-UD	Date First Delivered to Administration	Status
SALARY & COMPENSATION		
Salary increases totaling 18% over 3 years* <i>*For the sake of brevity, we are not including compounding in any of our percentages.</i>	4/1/26	Admin countered with 11% over 5 years on 5/27/26; AAUP-UD countered with 15% over 3 years 6/10/26; admin countered with 12.25% over 5 years 6/24/26; AAUP-UD is considering response*
Timing of CT faculty salary increase for “early” promotion (i.e., not having to wait until years 6 or 13 to receive	12/8/25	Admin countered 3/11/26; AAUP resubmitted 4/1/26; admin countered 4/15/26; AAUP resubmitted 4/29/26;

incremental salary increase); 5-year rolling CT contracts defined		admin resubmitted 5/27/26; AAUP-UD resubmitted 6/10/26; admin resubmitted 6/16/26; AAUP resubmitted 6/24/26; admin resubmitted 7/1/26; AAUP-UD is considering response
Increases in overload (S-contract) compensation	1/9/26	Proposal tabled 1/29/26; AAUP presented revision 3/11/26; Admin countered 4/1/26; AAUP countered 4/15/26; admin countered 5/27/26; AAUP countered 6/24/26; admin countered 7/1/26; AAUP is considering response
Annual letter detailing all components of salary, including special adjustments and administrative supplements	12/8/25	Admin countered 1/9/26; AAUP will respond after merit pay mechanisms are finalized
Administrators who return to the faculty do not keep their administrative salary increase in perpetuity	12/8/25	Admin rejected 1/9/26; AAUP countered 2/19/26; admin rejected 3/11/26
FACULTY RIGHTS & PROTECTIONS		
Distribution of CBA in electronic and printed formats within a certain time frame	12/8/25	Admin countered 1/9/26; AAUP countered 1/29/26; admin countered 2/19/26; tentative agreement 3/11/26
Enhanced privacy protections for faculty, esp. related to surveillance	1/9/26	Admin countered 5/13/26; AAUP countered 5/27/26; admin countered 6/16/26; AAUP resubmitted 6/24/26 and is awaiting response
Faculty's ability to opt out of AI usage and hold primary responsibility for policies related to AI in teaching, research, and service	2/19/26	Admin rejected 3/11/26; AAUP countered with just faculty's ability to control their AI usage 6/10/26; admin rejected 6/16/26; AAUP resubmitted 6/24/26; admin rejected and AAUP is considering a response.
Clarification of language and the role of the Faculty Handbook in reductions in faculty positions	12/8/25	Admin partially accepted 1/9/26; AAUP is considering response
Names/pronouns		
Guarantee that AAUP-UD be given 15 minutes to provide an overview of the union at all live New Faculty Orientations	6/24/26	Admin rejected 7/1/26; AAUP is considering response
WORKLOAD		

Clarification of credit-contact hour conversions, esp. those not listed in CBA or dept documents	12/8/25	Admin countered 2/19/26; AAUP countered 3/11/26; admin countered 4/15/26; AAUP countered 4/29/26; subcommittee of reps from both sides meeting to facilitate mutual agreement
Clarification of the use of adjunct, part-time, and full-time temp faculty	1/29/26	Admin countered 2/19/26; AAUP countered 3/11/26; admin countered 4/1/26; AAUP countered 4/15/26; tentative agreement 5/27/26
BENEFITS		
Application of phased retirement years to the post-sabbatical requirement	12/8/25	Admin rejected 1/9/26; AAUP countered 2/19; admin rejected 3/11/26; AAUP resubmitted 6/24/26; AAUP seeking clarification of admin's position
Maintenance of the employee fitness center at the current location and condition	5/13/26	Admin countered 5/27/26; AAUP countered 6/24/26; Admin countered 6/24/26; AAUP countered 7/1/26 and is awaiting response
Faculty who retire under contract have the option to receive a Medicare supplement plan, not just a Medicare Advantage plan	4/29/26	Admin rejected 5/27/26; AAUP resubmitted 6/24/26; admin countered 7/1/26 saying retirees under this contract would get "access" to a supplemental plan-AAUP is confirming what this means.
All sabbatical-eligible faculty, including CT faculty, shall will be given equal consideration for sabbatical leave; sabbatical proposals for research/scholarly activity shall not be prioritized over proposals for service or pedagogy	6/24/26	Admin countered 6/24/26; AAUP-UD countered 7/1/26 and is awaiting response.

Proposals by UD Administration	Date First Delivered to AAUP-UD	Status
SALARY & COMPENSATION		
Pro-rating of overload compensation up or down based on below-minimum or above-cap enrollments	2/19/26	AAUP countered 3/11/26; admin countered 4/1/26; AAUP countered 4/15/26; admin countered 5/27/26; AAUP countered 6/24/26; admin

		countered 7/1/26 and AAUP is awaiting response
FACULTY RIGHTS & PROTECTIONS		
Revision of academic freedom language (would significantly limit protections)	1/9/26	AAUP rejected 2/19/26; admin resubmitted on 5/13/26; AAUP rejected 5/27/26; admin countered on 6/16; AAUP resubmitted 6/24; admin resubmitted 7/1.
Revision of privacy rights language (would limit protections only to those provided by University policy or Delaware law)	1/9/26	AAUP rejected 2/19/26; admin resubmitted 5/13/26; AAUP countered 5/27/26; admin countered 6/16; AAUP countered 6/24 and is awaiting response
WORKLOAD		
Increased discretion of chairs in assigning workload (including in the winter session)	12/8/25	AAUP rejected 1/9/26
Increased discretion of chairs in assigning S-contracts (FT faculty would no longer get precedence)	12/8/25	AAUP rejected 1/9/26; admin countered 2/19; AAUP rejected 3/11; admin countered 5/27/26; AAUP countered 6/24/26; admin countered 7/1/26 and AAUP is awaiting response
LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING		
To establish a committee of 9 (6 selected by Admin and 3 selected by AAUP) to examine effects of merit allocation and potential alternatives and make recommendations within a year to President and Provost. Then, President and Provost could unilaterally implement what they wanted outside of CBA.	5/27/26	AAUP rejected 6/10/26