

aaup-ud

Bargaining Update

[BECOME A MEMBER](#)

September 12, 2026

Dear Bargaining Unit Members,

This is a special update to inform you about a particular bargaining issue that is unfolding at a rapid pace. (We will send a more comprehensive update next week when we have more information about the status of other bargaining issues.)

On Monday (9/7), the agenda for the first Faculty Senate meeting on 9/14 was released. On that agenda was a proposal (see [here](#)) from Interim Provost Farquhar that purported to define CT faculty's 5-year rolling contracts in alignment with longstanding practices and interpretations. However, that item has been removed from the agenda by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. We would like to provide you with some explanation of the events that led up to this removal because it relates directly to bargaining. To begin, after 600+ faculty members signed the AAUP-UD petition (within a week's time) supporting fair compensation and job security for CT faculty, the administration's bargaining team told the AAUP-UD's team at the table that they agreed with us in principle on the definition of 5-year rolling contracts. (We had defined these contracts both in our proposals and in our petition as ones that would be honored for the remaining 4 years in case of nonrenewal.) The administration's team also noted that they thought this information belonged in the Faculty Handbook and indicated that at the September Faculty Senate meeting, Interim Provost Farquhar would propose a resolution, with language close to ours, that reflected the AAUP-UD's definition of 5-year rolling contracts. The AAUP-UD team did not object to the administration's suggestion that this information go into the Faculty Handbook as long as it aligned with the definition proposed by the AAUP-UD.

However, the resolution* from Interim Provost Farquhar that appeared on the agenda, and which was not approved by the AAUP-UD bargaining team, did not align with our definition. Here is what he proposed to add to the Faculty Handbook: "In this case [after the first five-year rolling contract is issued], the five-year rolling contract is automatically renewed each year following a

satisfactory annual review, such that the faculty member remains in the first year of the five-year contract, with four additional contract years remaining beyond the year in which the annual review occurs.” Note that the existence of “four additional contract years” is mentioned, but it does not say that these four years extend to those who are not renewed. Thus, the provost’s proposal leaves open the possibility that a non-renewed CT faculty member on a 5-year rolling contract could be dismissed with one year’s notice rather than being able to serve out their remaining four years. Such a dismissal would, in effect, reduce job protections from five years to one, thus negating the entire meaning of a 5-year contract.** In sum, **the administration has reneged on its agreement at the bargaining table** to introduce language aligned with the wishes of the AAUP-UD’s Steering Committee and Bargaining Team and the more than 600 faculty who signed the petition. The faculty spoke, but the administration has not listened.

Provost Farquhar’s proposal also leaves open the possibility that CT faculty members on five-year rolling contracts, whether or not they are up for five-year peer review, could be **dismissed even more easily** than now. Currently, a mid-contract CT faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory annual review may be subject to a peer review, the negative outcome of which is a precondition for termination, after which appeals may be filed. Note that the provost’s proposal says that the annual renewal of a 5-year rolling contract would follow upon the faculty member receiving a “satisfactory” annual review. This suggests that the faculty member would not be offered another contract at all after receiving an unsatisfactory peer review, perhaps without receiving the same due process currently afforded to faculty.

So, at best, the provost’s proposal fails to afford the protections of “four more years” to non-renewed faculty members on 5-year rolling contracts, which the administration’s team agreed to at the bargaining table. At worst, it makes these faculty members even more vulnerable to termination.

In response to the provost’s proposal, Faculty Senator and AAUP-UD Chief Negotiator Deni Galileo wrote to Interim Provost Farquhar, President Carlson, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to explain the issues with the proposal and to ask that the administration change the language to the following: *“Continuing Track faculty who are on a five-year rolling contract shall receive a new five-year contract annually and be duly notified by the university, subject to any review process or other limitations stipulated in this section. In the event of a nonrenewal, the remaining four years of the existing contract will be honored.”* This language would protect the rights, as they have long been understood, of non-renewed CT faculty members to remain employed for the four remaining years of a five-year contract. In addition, Senator/Chief Negotiator Galileo’s proposal does not introduce new language that would put CT faculty at greater risk of termination for one unsatisfactory peer review. Unfortunately, the administration did not accept this simple solution, opting instead to pull their resolution from September’s

agenda and introduce it (the same one? a revised version? we don't know) at Monday's senate meeting as new business.

Regardless of what the provost presents at Monday's senate meeting, the AAUP-UD, senators, and faculty will have time to respond—new business may not be debated or voted upon until the following senate meeting, which in this case is scheduled for October 5. We will update you again next week, after Monday's senate meeting and Wednesday's bargaining session. If you have not yet had the chance to sign the petition supporting CT faculty, you still have time to do so—just copy the following url into your browser and complete the Google form:

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSc9oSZwRS2G0cTSk4iHO6G5WAE7zdr7kuYJIn85rJNwihPPLg/viewform?usp=header>.

In solidarity,

The AAUP-UD Bargaining Team

**The resolution was incorrectly redlined in several ways. First, only the last sentence of the proposed new language was redlined instead of the last two sentences, which could be misleading to the reader. Second, the three ending sentences of the original paragraph, to which the administration added their text, are missing. So, the status of these sentences remains unknown.*

***Any faculty member, regardless of track, can be dismissed “for cause”—i.e., incompetence, gross irresponsibility, or moral turpitude—or as the result of “extraordinary financial circumstances.” After the faculty member is afforded due process, such as a hearing before the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, this dismissal could occur with no or one-year's notice, depending on the cause. See Faculty Handbook 4.1.15 for details.*