****

**WEB MINUTES of AAUP Executive Board meeting**

**3 April 2024, 9 to 10:30**

We work to advance the power of faculty at UW to protect the public goods of higher education and academic freedom;

Our mantra is “refuse austerity.”

#### https://washington.zoom.us/j/93610086550 or One tap mobile +12063379723,,93610086550# (Seattle)

#### Board member attendance (all zoom): Eva Cherniavsky (president), Abie Flaxman (VP), Diane Morrison (treasurer), Amy Hagopian (Secretary), Rachel Chapman, Jay Johnson, Ann Mescher

#### Guests: JF, Leslie Gascon (prospective board member); Note Malori Musselman, national AAUP, has been assigned to another campaign in another state for the time being. She says, “Please leave me on the listserv and exec email lists.”

#### Absent: Nora Kenworthy (on leave for rest of year from our board), Louisa Mackenzie (on leave), Charlie Collins, Jim Gregory, Rob Wood, Duane Storti

Our next meetings are = May 1, June 5 (9 am, usual zoom link)

UW-AAUP Executive Board Meeting

April 3, 2024

9:00—10:30 AM

<https://washington.zoom.us/j/93610086550>

I.       Announcements and Updates

a.       Update on Jennifer Llewellyn event:  are we a go for 4/17?

b.       Update on outreach to Rania Hussein/FC on Race, Equity, and Justice regarding the Class C resolution

 [aaup class c draft - LM - major modifications RC.docx](https://uwnetid-my.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/g/personal/rrc4_uw_edu/EZl4_dze4HNAjSXJzOe9t48BsrkpvWdep_u8DjzlbYMNhw?e=ohPSzQ" \t "_blank)

c.       Debrief on meeting with Provost Serio

II.      Discussion of nominating committee report (attached) and updates on candidate outreach to date.  \*We need a finalized slate of vetted candidates by no later than the end of April\*

III.     Anticipating President’s “departmental guidelines;” discussion of response outline (attached).

IV.      Report on meeting with Channing Cooper, AFT Legal Department for guidance on FOIAs (attached).  Discussion of messaging to faculty on this topic.

***MINUTES***

1. Announcements

1. Faculty senate meets Thursday. Three Class A measures are up for discussion; note this commentary from Nora on these:

Class A Legislation – Transparency in Retention Raises - this is a pretty straightforward measure to try to get more faculty transparency on retention raises at the unit level.

Class A Legislation – Voting Timelines – this allows a bit more flexibility to senate, particularly during the last weeks of the spring quarter, to get business done and votes out to faculty.

The messy one is Class A Legislation – Expanding Candidates’ Rights in the Promotion Process. This started out in FCFA as a fairly straightforward measure to ensure candidates could have a right to be informed, review decisions, and provide responses at all stages of the P&T process. since then it's gotten a lot more complicated and messy, and there have been many different versions going back and forth between FCFA and SEC. Jake has championed a messier and more detailed version, whereas other faculty (I would guess most of FCFA and myself included) have preferred a more streamlined version. The provost has gotten her hands on this at least once, if not more times. Most recently with a very late-breaking amendment (brought forward by Gautham but definitely from her) ahead of last week's SEC meeting. I attach the amendment suggested changes as they were presented to SEC.

I'm also highly concerned about the language in here that further codifies the Provost's review power, and now introduces the power to solicit additional letters, extend the process, and generally leaves room for a lot of shenanigans between deans and the Provost.

I feel like I have exhausted a lot of political capital going head to head with the Provost on this one in SEC, with very little back-up from others on SEC (who then of course message me afterwards to tell me they are silently supportive - but nonetheless did not vote against. sigh.) So I would definitely welcome vocal contributions from other AAUP exec members in the faculty senate meeting this week

Rachel wondered whether this is a mechanism for smuggling in injustices.

1. February 17 is the national day of action for higher ed. https://www.aaup.org/event/national-day-action. National is scheduling a 5 pm Eastern event (2 pm our time). Rachel is trying to schedule Jennifer Llewellyn for 3:30 to 5 pm on 4/17; looking for a registration link from Amy.

Jack Johnson at Whitman is hoping to call attention to misrepresentation of anti-semitism, writing an AAUP letter of protest.

1. Update on outreach to Rania Hussein/FC on Race, Equity, and Justice regarding the Class C resolution; there was a troubling event on the trouble with DEI by a Black conservative legal scholar. Rachel will follow up with her on getting the Class C. Probably a “both sides” response to the Berkeley scholar event.

 [aaup class c draft - LM - major modifications RC.docx](https://uwnetid-my.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/g/personal/rrc4_uw_edu/EZl4_dze4HNAjSXJzOe9t48BsrkpvWdep_u8DjzlbYMNhw?e=ohPSzQ" \t "_blank)

1. Debrief on meeting with Provost Serio, see notes in Appendix 1 below. It’s all very affable, until you push on an issue, then the boundaries are declared. But she’s on notice we are a force. She’s very metrics-driven.

Jess had a report she heard from a faculty member at Tacoma in the Nursing dept that deans are being asked to review faculty workload. Implications? Unclear. Rachel noted the convo with Serio wasn’t satisfying with regard to classroom support, pitting faculty against grad students, other issues. She waived aside our salary compensation report. Tone shifted with her rapidly when we got down to brass tacks. Serio called Rachel’s views “extreme,” and (ahem) as allies we should have pounced on that in the moment. Shared governance is clearly (and collectively among administrators) viewed simply as “willingness to have conversations.”

1. National election for governing council of [AFT Local 6741](https://www.aaup.org/chapters/aaup-local-6741-aft), which represents the AAUP advocacy chapters in the AFT hierarchy.  The Higher Education Labor United (HELU- A national coalition from all ranks of higher education workers across the country organizing to guarantee higher education for all) / Faculty for the Common Good) slate includes

**Slate for AAUP Advocacy Local 6741 of AFT**

President: [Jorge Coronado](https://spanish-portuguese.northwestern.edu/people/faculty/teaching-research-faculty/coronado-jorge.html) (Northwestern University)

Vice President: [Bethany Letiecq](https://cehd.gmu.edu/people/faculty/bletiecq/) (George Mason University)

Secretary-Treasurer: [Bill Mullen](https://www.cla.purdue.edu/directory/profiles/bill-mullen.html) (Purdue University)

Executive Committee Member #1: [Gabriel Winant](https://history.uchicago.edu/directory/Gabriel-Winant) (University of Chicago)

Executive Committee Member #2: [Heather Ferguson](https://www.cmc.edu/academic/faculty/profile/heather-ferguson) (Claremont McKenna College)

Delegate #1: [Amy Offner](https://live-sas-www-history.pantheon.sas.upenn.edu/people/faculty/amy-c-offner) (University of Pennsylvania)

Delegate #2: [Marcus Johnson](https://gvpt.umd.edu/facultyprofile/johnson/marcus) (University of Maryland)

Delegate #3: [Laura Bray](https://lbraysociology.com/) (University of Oklahoma)

Delegate #4: [Amy Hagopian](https://sph.washington.edu/sph-profiles/faculty-profiles/amy-hagopian) (University of Washington)

Delegate #5: [Matthew Thomas Miller](https://english.umd.edu/directory/matthew-miller) (University of Maryland)

1. ELECTIONS
2. Nominating committee reported in, see appendix 3 below.

More suggestions:

Rachel suggested Sudhir Mahadevan sudhirmahadevan@gmail.com, Eva will follow up.

Josie Walwema jwalwema@gmail.com, Rachel will follow up

Leslie offered to ask UW librarian at Bothell, Je Salvador https://guides.lib.uw.edu/jsalv

And Marisa Petrich at Tacoma Library would be great! <https://directory.tacoma.uw.edu/index.php/employee/marisp2>

Hoping for a final slate at end of April, conduct election in May.

(Charlie reported later that Becca Price declined; Amy learned that Jochen Scholl and Nathalie Williams declined; Nora reported Menaka Abraham declined.

1. Anticipating President’s “departmental guidelines;” discussion of response outline (attached).

We anticipated the Senate would be asked to approve administration drafted guidelines, and Eva prepared a response, but it seems to have stalled. Faculty Senate hasn’t played ball, it seems, so it will probably emerge as an executive order.

Jay Johnson has looked into the FIRE organization, financed by right-wing groups. It’s sort of odd that they align with us on some academic freedom issues, but they mostly seem to be fueled by concern about conservative students not finding faculty who reflect their views in the classroom (as if that was a right or something).

Abie noted FIRE has the resources to help faculty in trouble, so they worm their way to faculty sympathy that way. Their goal is to destroy public universities, but they use this approach to curry favor.

Diane said we could highlight this problem by focusing on the weaknesses in shared government. Separately or together, we could weave these into a forum. A survey was distributed by the Society for Open inquiry in behavioral sciences, <https://www.soibs.com/>, James Pfeiffer looked into it, very suspect.

We hope Jennifer’s presentation can help amplify this concern.

We once talked about inviting Monica McLemore, UW nursing, to do a presentation. Perhaps this could be a centerpiece of a bigger conversation about this topic?

Should we post the hate mail that’s circulating to pro-Palestinian students? Jay—needs context. Trauma porn? Can we express support for our students, while alerting faculty this is happening (without necessarily posting the photo of the letter). Eva and Amy will draft a message from the BOARD, not just individuals. It’s worrisome that when we post terrible messages to our list server these are sometimes seen as “from the AAUP.”

IV.      Report on meeting with Channing Cooper, AFT Legal Department for guidance on FOIAs (attached).

Meeting UW-AAUP Board and Provost Tricia Serio

March 15, 2024, 9-10AM

<https://washington.zoom.us/j/93610086550>

In attendance (expected): Eva Cherniavsky (President), Amy Hagopian (Secretary), Abraham Flaxman (Listserv Moderator), Rachel Chapman; Jay Johnson, Charlie Collins, Jim Gregory.

Missing: Diane Morrison (Treasurer), Ann Mescher

We did introductions

Eva reviewed our topics (below)

Jim underscored how glad we are that Serio has replaced her predecessor, who didn’t value much the importance of shared governance. Also noted the flatlining of the size of the faculty, other than medical school clinical folks. Administrative ranks, meanwhile, have grown. The temptation is to grow programs, each requiring administration and staff, rather than to expand faculty ranks.

Rachel and Charlie made additional comments.

Serio has the same list as we do, she says, and they’re all important. She doesn’t shy away from challenging topics. She’s noticed the unfortunate tendency here to reduce to simple framing. Change happens over time, we can keep at it pragmatically. Always asking, what’s the best we can do right now?

She acknowledged her first generation status, it’s personal for her to center people and nurture success. She’s worked several universities—Arizona, Massachusetts, Rhode Island. She met the DEI committee of the Board of Regents, noting the importance of access.

Worried about workload, and equity issues. Faculty workload and reward project with Joy. She knows the problem of adding things without ever taking anything away. Sludge. As a newbie, she can ask why, and often there’s no good reason we are doing things.

Example? Top 3 categories of expenditures are instruction, research, and administration. The ratio of administration to instruction, we are 29th, one of the lower ratios, flat over time. Reporting requirements are up. Preparing hiring plans is a tremendous amount of work, so we streamlined that. It’s not my call if the hiring happens in a subfield, that’s a local decision.

Academic freedom. I co-sponsored the Pen America talk to the Senate. Very concerned about the tenor of conversations. First year programs can do better at promoting constructive dialogue. Faculty being harassed from the outside, targeted for their scholarship. (Charlie asked if she/anyone tracks these things; Safe Campus and Bias Reporting Tool.) When people are targeted, we don’t have a way of tracking. Adding that function adds an administrator!

Shared governance seems like “being told” here. It would be helpful for her to know what consultation would look like. (Jim said the best provost in his experience, Ana Mari, showed proposals to SCPB (Senate Committee on Planning and Budget) in advance, including spending, and then explained what decisions she was going to make). The data need to be supplied with sufficient time for analysis, not just in a ppt quickly before an announcement.

Info: we need data on faculty discipline, have been told it’s not available. Tricia says even she has trouble getting data. Ana Mari likes to share her concerns as the legislation is being shaped.

Little dispute about “being nice,” which she means as being in dialogue. Tricia thought maybe Rachel was being extreme. Overlegislating discipline is in the wrong direction. Too many rules can take us in the wrong direction.

Post-discussion: Jim noted we accomplished our goal of letting her see us—reasonable, articulate, team, working on important issues and willing to hold the line and be serious. We want her to respect us and fear us. No administrator will concede things and give us what we want in response to niceness. By contrast, Ana Mari in the room would have used up all the air time. Serio was listening, and she knows know we are a force.

Abie noted that we could encourage our list to be kinder to each other. He doesn’t want to be the civility gatekeeper on our list, but our colleagues are sometimes downright cruel to each other. Rachel noted these are political performances, not cruelty. Perhaps the small group of super ideologue right wingers are coordinating and controlling. They represent a powerful set of actors. We are aiming for intelligent conversations on important issues in the world, and on our campus.

<https://heterodoxacademy.org/campuses/university-of-washington-tacoma/>

<https://heterodoxacademy.org/files/annual-report-2023-Mar-13Final.pdf>

Charlie: those voices come to represent us in an unfortunate way. People are reluctant to joint the board when they associate those voices to the board.

<https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>

Eva: what is the problem they are trying to fix, the anti-DEI/pro-Israel, white supremacists? Time for a board statement that differentiates us from the creeps on our list server. Our job is educating, noting those in bad faith.

**Appendix 2, Day of Action for Higher Ed**

**The Future We Stand For**
***A Call for a National Day of Action for Higher Education for the Public Good: April 17, 2024***

**We Stand for Democracy — and the System of Higher Education that Sustains It**

Today both education and democracy are under attack. Institutions of higher education serve to educate the public and to help generate the reliable information, broad-ranging knowledge, and reasoned analysis that a democratic society requires. Colleges and universities are spaces where research and ideas—including challenging ones—are subject to rigorous study and critical evaluation. In the interest of democracy, our educational institutions must be allowed to function free from interference by politicians, CEOs, and lobbyists seeking to repress inquiry.

**We Stand for the Freedom to Teach and Learn**Education and research require free inquiry, the freedom to teach, students’ freedom to learn, freedom to publish, freedom of assembly and association, and the freedom to speak as members of the public. Academic freedom differs from freedom of speech; it does not protect every opinion within a university because it relies on the collective judgment of scholarship. For example, scholars and teachers have found such ideas as scientific racism, Holocaust denial, and intelligent design to be intellectually and thus academically indefensible. To ensure the continued social value of higher education, decisions about teaching and learning must be made by qualified faculty—not by those seeking to impose private and partisan interests.

**We Stand for the Democratic Value of Dissent**

Democracy, like education, requires both consent and dissent. We affirm the right of every student, teacher, worker, and community member to assemble and to speak out on issues of public concern. Protest is a form of learning and community-building; it should be respected by colleges and universities as an essential component of education.

**We Stand for Higher Education for All**

Higher education is a public good, not only because it trains students for careers but also because learning and thinking are valuable in themselves for all members of the public. Protecting civil rights and advancing racial equality are essential to the public mission of colleges and universities, just as they are essential to a thriving democracy. High quality education at every level should be the right of all. Yet federal and state divestment has made the cost of college prohibitive, and recent attacks on diversity and equity threaten to make educational access more unequal. The burden of lifelong debt jeopardizes futures, while predatory interest on loans unfairly forces poorer students to shoulder higher costs than wealthier students. To ensure equality of access, we must make public higher education freely available to all by reversing decades of budget cuts and reinvesting in our globally leading university systems.

**We Stand for Job Security**

Federal and state defunding of public institutions not only harms the futures and livelihoods of students and employees; it also undermines the quality of education. Teaching has been converted into exploitative gig work through management practices shaped by manufactured austerity. Over 70% of the nation’s faculty are now overworked and underpaid contingent instructors with inadequate benefits and no job security. Educators’ working conditions are students’ learning conditions: job security is necessary to the freedom to teach and learn, and a living wage and reasonable workload are necessary to quality education. Colleges and universities need to be stable places to work as well as exciting places to learn, and all workers on our campuses deserve fair pay and better working conditions.

**We Stand for Democracy within Higher Education**

Educators, researchers, staff, students, and community members must have a meaningful collective voice in the governance of colleges and universities. Attacks on entire areas of study, attempts to roll back policies supporting diversity, the defunding of research and teaching, the suppression of protest, the transformation of universities into tools of financial speculation and  into real estate developers displacing local communities, and the imposition of crushing debt on students undermine and render meaningless existing structures of shared governance. State legislatures from Florida to Indiana have taken aim at public universities as part of a broader assault on U.S. democracy. At private universities, unelected trustees, billionaires, and administrators increasingly exercise unilateral power to dictate policies and academic priorities. We stand against these antidemocratic pressures in all their guises.

**We Stand Together**

We call on all members of the higher education community across the country to engage in collective action for higher education in the public interest. We stand in solidarity with all who are organizing unions, AAUP chapters, and student organizations to win the conditions that make teaching, learning, and research possible.

**On April 17, we will mobilize for these goals on campuses nationwide. Our struggles are linked, and so are our futures. On this national day of action and beyond, we commit to working together to build the universities and the democracy that our society needs and deserves.**

**Appendix 3, Nominating committee report**

IV.      Report on meeting with Channing Cooper, AFT Legal Department for guidance on FOIAs (attached).  Discussion of messaging to faculty on this topic.

Faculty are getting messages about the public nature of communications that are “work product related.” Channing’s investigation needs to be amplified to the faculty generally. He could come to our May meeting, perhaps.

1. Alexes Harris

Let’s have a report on how Alexes is representing us on the Board of Regents. Eva will invite her to June meeting?

****

**Appendix 4, Departmental statement guidelines**

“President Cauce affirmed her personal and institutional commitment to academic freedom. She invited senators to offer their thoughts on collective /departmental statements on university websites. She does not want to ban such statements as other university leaders have done, but wants to strike a balance with the right to dissent and institutional neutrality. As such, she discussed potential guidelines – not a ruling – for collective academic statements on topics of public interest. Guidelines are likely forthcoming in a non-binding form.”

Outline of our response to what this appears to bode:

* We appreciate the respect for the principles of academic freedom evident in the decision to forward these guidelines in the form of “non-binding” recommendations.
* Certainly, any attempt to ban departmental statements of values that are informed by faculty expertise in matters of history, culture, politics, policy, and science would represent a wholesale violation of academic freedom. (Subtext: let’s not be too self-congratulatory about not flat-out trampling faculty rights!)
* At the same time, in the current political context, where academic freedom is under assault by private interests and powerful public office-holders alike, we can and should be concerned about how “recommendations” contribute to a pervasive climate of fear and self-censorship.
* It seems important in this context to distinguish between freedom of speech and academic freedom – which are importantly *not the same.* Free speech is the right of individuals to express their views; it implies no judgment of quality. Thus, on the principle of free speech, one can express views that are unsubstantiated, biased, or offensive to others. Academic freedom is the principle that teaching and research in universities should not be subject to extramural, political control. Historically, then, it described the right of university faculty and students to teach and learn without fear of repression from the Church or the monarch. Today, it means our freedom to teach and learn without fear of repression from the state or from private organizations that are the self-appointed reformers of higher education. (It is no small irony that those who wish to bring supposedly politicized faculty to heal are precisely the actors attempting to subject the university to this most overt and egregious form of political control.) ***Academic freedom means that faculty – and faculty alone – collectively set the standards by which teaching and research will be assessed.***
* Thus, with respect to academic freedom, the *quality* of the argument matters. Within the precincts of the university, not all viewpoints have equal legitimacy. It matters whether the position presented is persuasively grounded in relevant evidence. It matters whether the analysis offered is cogent and informed.
* ***In a situation of crisis – whether that crisis is the systemic devaluation of Black lives, spiraling climate change, or a genocide in Gaza – it is not our role as academics to remain neutral.*** It is our ***responsibility*** to bring our expertise to bear on the crisis and to offer our best assessment of what is needed. Obviously, there is and will be and *should* always be debate within and among faculty bodies. But if a department (or a school or the faculty members of a disciplinary professional organization) reach consensus on a matter of public interest, then the principal of academic upholds their right to publicly state this position. Full stop. No checks, no “soft” deterrents.
* We are not sure what is meant by “institutional neutrality”—on what vision of the university is this idea based? But this cannot and must not be understood as any obligation of the part of faculty to uphold “neutrality” – or notions of “viewpoint diversity” detached from determinations of quality.

**Retreat to do list, keeping track**

Amy & Eva are tracking it. See here: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1g2ePJJFNDF9nJ7yJJyoLCT3qsKPon6AE/edit>

Outstanding items from our Retreat to do list:

1. Invite Alexes Harris to work with us in her capacity as faculty Regent rep
2. AAUP swag production
3. Get new faculty lists to invite to join AAUP
4. Submit the Schedule C resolution on faculty discipline/disputes
5. Assemble names of prospective new AAUP board members for spring elections