

## DU AAUP Chapter Meeting

5 November 2010

Sturm Hall 154

### Agenda

*The primary goal of this meeting is to reach consensus on a set of issues and/or recommendations to bring before the Faculty Senate at its 12 November 2010 meeting.*

#### I. Introductions.

II. **State Conference Meeting:** December 4, 2010, in the Aspen Rooms of the University Memorial Center on the CU-Boulder campus. **Special Guest:** National AAUP President Cary Nelson.

III. **AAUP Membership Drive Materials...PLEASE JOIN!**

IV. **Grievance Policy Update and Highlights:** I will email you the latest draft at your request.

#### V. Big Issues and Recommendations

##### A. APT Document

1. Eliminate inconsistencies in the language used to describe criteria for promotion and tenure (e.g., varying references to “excellence”, “competence”, “promise”, “distinction”)

2. Make a more explicit definition of “academic freedom” to parallel the definition of “adequate consideration” (page 42); i.e., one that does more than simply link academic freedom to the “free pursuit of learning” (page 4) and “teaching and research” (page 24),

a. recommend that this broader definition of academic freedom covers the faculty obligation to participate in “institutional governance” (page 4), e.g. “*Academic freedom includes the freedom to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the university.*”

b. recommend inclusion of examples of what violations of academic freedom would look like.

3. Clarify the timing of submission of Department Committee and Department Chair recommendations in “Procedures for Tenure Decisions” section 5.4.7 and 5.4.8.

4. Clarify procedures governing Department Review of a negative Department Committee recommendation if requested by candidate (i.e., what happens between sections 7.3.3 and 7.3.4)

5. Include more explicit discussion of “conflict of interest” in promotion and tenure proceedings.

6. Note that “collegiality” (page 4) is not an appropriate criterion in promotion, tenure, and annual review.

7. Emphasize that alternative means of department level review are available to candidates who do not believe that they can receive a fair and conscientious review within their home unit either because of #5 and #6 (above) or something else).

8. Recommend, in section 5.4.11, that deliberations of College, School, and Divisional Committees be conducted without secrecy or exclusion, in the interest of ensuring “equitable and fair treatment of the faculty as a whole.”

9. Stipulate, at the end of Section 5.4, that Departmental Review Committees and Faculty P&T Committees at the Divisional level are entitled to know the recommendations of higher level administrators (Deans and the Provost) after their reports have been sent up the line. Recommend reporting of these decisions back to the committees.

10. Note, in section 7.4 (Appeal of Negative Provost Recommendation) that the Faculty Review Committee—as warranted by the Faculty Senate Constitution—may, with respect to any individual complaint or appeal—*recommend remedies either for procedural inadequacies or for inequities or injustices.*” [In other words, the FRC may deliver both procedural and substantive justice].

11. Other things to tidy up: Include “professional service” in definition of Service (p. 24); address the missing “Appendix A” (p. 34), and reference to “Equal Opportunity Board” (p. 34), etc.

**B. Faculty Review Committee processes and procedures.**

1. Selection of Chair.
2. Decisions about what cases get taken.
3. Procedures for collecting and evaluating evidence in grievance proceedings.
4. Recusal for conflict of interest.
5. Rights of appellants, grievants, and respondents to appear.
6. Role of internal legal counsel.
7. Finding facts vs. Making recommendations.

**C. Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity.**

**D. Contingent and Adjunct Faculty Issues?**

1. compensation?
2. re-appointment?

**E. Faculty/Administrator Search Issues?**

**F. Other??**

**VI. Adjourn**