aaup-ud

Bargaining Update

October 31, 2026

Dear Bargaining Unit Colleagues,

To send a message to the administration that they should bargain in good faith, respect shared governance, and treat CT faculty fairly, we are asking all full-time faculty to **attend the Faculty Senate meeting on Monday, November 2, at 4:00 p.m. in Purnell 115.**

What has prompted our sudden request? On Friday evening, October 30, at 7:39 p.m., Senate President Meghan McInnis-Domínguez forwarded to senators a Friday evening surprise from Interim Provost Bill Farquhar about the recent resolution on 5-year rolling contracts for CT faculty, which passed 63 to 0 at the October 5 senate meeting. This surprise message was that he recently realized that the Board needed to weigh in on this resolution (see his full message below). His rationale: he read Section 3.2.1 of the University's Bylaws, which says that the Board must approve a resolution if it involves "any **changes** in academic and educational policies having a **material** financial impact upon the University" (emphases added). Interim Provost Farquhar further said that after reading this portion of the bylaws, he contacted the Board, and the Board indicated on October 29 that they believe circumstances warrant their involvement in the process. He did not indicate why he or the Board thinks that this resolution makes any changes to policy or would have material financial consequences when, in fact, the resolution seeks only to codify the long-standing interpretation of 5-year rolling contracts as ones that are honored for four more years after a nonrenewal. Codifying a current practice does not change policy; therefore, it does not have the potential to change the university's finances. In addition, honoring the contract for four years means that the nonrenewed faculty member would continue to perform their duties for four years, so nonrenewals should actually have little to no financial impact on the university. Furthermore, we believe that Section 3.2.1 pertains to "academic and educational policies," such as the creation of new academic programs, and not to policies involving working conditions, such as faculty contracts.

Here are other reasons why we are mystified by the administration's actions:

*The administration's bargaining team said that the administration agreed with our definition of rolling contracts at a bargaining meeting on August 12 and again at a later bargaining session. In the 2+ months since August, neither their bargaining team, which has one dean and two associate deans from three colleges, nor any other administrator has indicated to us that they believe the resolution has material financial implications.

*The administration's bargaining team has two lawyers on it, and their steering committee has one, Associate Vice President & Deputy General Counsel Wendy Buckingham. One would think that one of them would have referred the resolution to the Board for consideration months ago if they truly thought it was necessary.

*President Carlson voted in favor of the resolution (which is in red text below). If she believed the resolution had material financial impact, she did not convey this before, during, or after the October 5 senate meeting.

*On Monday, October 26, Interim Provost Farquhar told Chief Negotiator/Faculty Senator Deni Galileo that he was planning to propose a resolution for the November senate meeting that included two added sentences to the language that was approved on October 5, which would then allow him to approve that language for inclusion in the handbook. (See the interim provost's 10/26 resolution below.) The interim provost mentioned nothing about being concerned with the resolution's financial implications; nor was he aware that the University's Bylaws (3.2.3.2) require him to explain the rationale of any vetoes in writing should he choose to reject the resolution.

*Besides passing unanimously in the senate, 659 full-time faculty signed the July petition supporting our definition of five-year rolling contracts. For the administration to continue to delay and equivocate on placing this resolution's language in the Faculty Handbook is an affront not only to senators, but also to more than half the faculty. (The petition is still open if you have not yet signed it. Copy and paste the following url into your browser if the document will not open via the link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSc9oSZwRS2G0cTSk4iHO6G5WAE7zdr7kuYJIn85rJNwihPPLg/viewform?usp=header.)

*The nonrenewal of CT faculty members on 5-year rolling contracts is extremely rare. (Despite this, we want to codify the definition of the contracts to ensure that it is maintained into the future.) If the administration is concerned about the financial impact of this resolution rising to the level of materiality–i.e., to the level that it would make a

significant impact on a university with expenses of almost $1.3 billion–does that mean that the administration is planning to drastically decrease the number of CT faculty who will be renewed? Or, does it mean that the administration has mistaken honoring the remaining four years of a contract with paying out the four years as “severance” (as they wrongly asserted in the interim provost’s July 17 bargaining update)?

As you can see, we faculty need to send a message to the administration that it needs to bargain in good faith, respect the will of the Faculty Senate, and keep its long-standing commitments to faculty. If we do not send this message, the administration may be emboldened to continue down a similar path as they carry out their stated plans to re-shape UD’s future.

The mere presence of a large contingent of faculty at Monday’s senate meeting will constitute a powerful statement in and of itself. If you would like to identify your specific concerns, we will provide you with stickers displaying phrases such as “Honor the Four,” “Respect the Vote,” “Bargain in Good Faith, or “Share Governance.” Also, please consider reaching out to your Faculty Senator to encourage them to question Interim Provost Farquhar and President Carlson about these matters after they give their customary remarks to the senate during Monday’s meeting.

In solidarity,

The AAUP-UD Bargaining Team

Join Now

Interim Provost Farquhar’s Proposed Revisions to the Resolution on 10/26/26

(On October 5, the text in red was unanimously approved by the senate 63-0. On October 26, Interim Provost Farquhar pitched the addition of the highlighted sentences to Chief Negotiator/Faculty Senator Deni Galileo as a way to secure the Interim Provost’s approval for the resolution to go into the Faculty Handbook. Interim Provost Farquhar mentioned nothing about the resolution’s financial implications at this point.)

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. This contract will be renewed automatically

each year, following an annual review, such that the faculty member remains in the first year of the 5-year contract. In the event of a non-renewal, the remaining four years of the existing contract will be honored. This provision applies only to non-renewal. It does not change any other provision of this section or elsewhere in the Faculty Handbook governing how or when a continuing track appointment may end.

Message from Interim Provost Farquhar to Senators, 10/30/26

I understand that questions have been raised about the status of the Senate's proposed changes to the continuing track rolling contract provisions.

After the Senate approved its proposed Handbook language, the Provost's Office reviewed it. As I mentioned in the October Senate meeting, I had concerns that the language could be inconsistent with other handbook language. I inspected the board of trustees bylaws, particularly section 3.2.3.2 which details the process for additions to the handbook and 3.2.1 which states that Board approval is required for changes to academic policy that may have a material financial impact. I then worked with the University Secretary's Office to share with the board. The board discussed this topic yesterday (Thursday) and determined that additional time is needed to consider appropriate next steps.

I recognize the Senate wants a prompt answer. The Bylaws set no deadline for the Provost to approve the proposed language, and I cannot approve on my own a change that requires Board approval. The Board must also have the time it needs to meet its fiduciary responsibilities to the University. I share the Senate's interest in getting this settled, and I will keep Senate leadership updated as the process moves forward.