



CSU AAUP NEWSLETTER

May 2017

IN THIS ISSUE

- NTTF Reform: An AAUP Responded to CoFG's concerns, p. 1
- CoNTTF's response to CoFG's concerns, p. 4
- What Has Been Happening to the CSU Faculty, p. 8
- Attachment: CoNTTF Action Plan, p. 11
- Attachment: CoFG's Concerns, p. 21

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REFORM: AN AAUP RESPONSE TO THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE'S CONCERNS

AAUP-CSU Executive Committee

As most readers of this newsletter are aware, the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (CoNTTF) recommendations for NTTF reform were received by the Council's Committee on Faculty Governance (CoFG) which recently circulated a list of 11 concerns with CoNTTF's suggested revisions to the Manual's Section C (see attached documents). CoFG is to be thanked for reviewing CoNTTF's proposals, if for no other reason than the obvious fact that one size doesn't usually fit all. Adopting a set of far reaching proposals for faculty reform such as these invariably requires fine tuning to satisfy and support standards and practices currently in force at the university level and meet the needs of departmental units that vary by degrees in task allocation and the professional expectations associated with a research oriented university.

That said, CoFG's stated concerns with CoNTTF's proposed changes to Section C, most of which should be on the table, do carry an unfortunate tone of skepticism and more than a hint of suggesting the perfect should vanquish the good. The AAUP, of course, has supported the CoNTTF's faculty reform initiative and unequivocally

believes that improvements in NTTF status should issue from it. In this spirit we offer our response to several of the CoFG's leading concerns which are (in no particular order of precedence): 1) contractual security vs. tenure ; 2) NTTF representation in Faculty Council; 3) NTTF voting rights in Department Councils; 4) evaluation of NTTF in the probationary period; and 5) NTTF and other special pedagogical functions. It should be said that our responses are informed by an appreciation that our current faculty situation sustains a system of academic dualism in which upwards of 40% of CSU faculty are NTTF's with no meaningful academic freedom and little voice in shared governance across the university landscape, CoNTTF being a recent but limited exception to that rule.

Contractual Security v. Tenure. CoFG worries that Professors of Practice (PoPs) as proposed will not enjoy tenure and therefore will not have the tenure protection that affords real academic freedom and undergirds faculty participation in shared governance. POP vulnerability may render them susceptible to undue administrative influence and manipulation to the detriment of tenured faculty.

The AAUP agrees these are reasonable concerns. The Colorado Conference has since 2006 favored a system of instructor tenure that would address this problem. However, several things should be borne in mind. First, it is doubtful that current administration and the Board of Governors would support the grant of instructor tenure. So that is off the table. Second, the current situation is such that not only NTTF's lack protection, so too do all probationary tenure-track faculty who are equally prone to administrative manipulation but enjoy representation in Faculty Council and Department Councils. One only need notice the number of assistant professors representing their departments in Faculty Council meetings to appreciate this point. Third, while tenure provides valuable protection from dismissal short of sustained non-performance and charges of professional misconduct, some of its force in practice emanates from access to Section K's grievance procedures. NTTF's, with very few exceptions, currently lack access to Section K. In this aspect CoNTTF's proposal is a step forward as it also would give PoPs access to Section K. Is this a perfect solution? No, it is not. But Section K access moves NTTFs (as PoPs) into a zone where greater academic freedom and shared governance protection is afforded. As PoPs, the 80% of current NTTF's gaining this faculty status would have contractual security in three year increments, with access to Section K, moving beyond strictly at-will conditions of employment. All faculty are presently covered by the Manual's stated embrace of academic freedom (Manual E.8.2) and academic freedom as it applies to shared governance (Manual, Preface, Paragraph 2) so Section K access helps PoP faculty claim this protection. When CoNTTF's Section C reforms are married to the Section K reforms that is an advance over current circumstances, if falling short of instructor tenure.

We note that CoFG has also raised the question of whether Faculty Council should pursue tenure for NTT faculty. Under present circumstances we believe the CoNTTF proposal is the more practical avenue.

NTTF Representation in Faculty Council. The CoFG raises a cluster of concerns related to the CoNTTF's recommendation that PoP's be represented in Faculty Council. Lacking tenure should PoPs be fully represented on Faculty Council? Do and should PoPs represent all NTTF's in Faculty Council, or just themselves as a group? Should a separate representative body be established for NTTF's and PoPs apart from Faculty Council? Is longstanding commitment to the university sufficient justification for including PoPs in shared governance? If PoP's are granted representation in Faculty Council should the present CoNTTF be abolished?

These concerns strike AAUP as red herrings. First, we would argue that it will be valuable to have PoP voice in Faculty Council. The proposed changes to Section C.2.1.3.1. require no change to the current systems of electing departmental and Libraries representatives. The change envisioned is simply a function of including PoP's in the calculation of each College's At-Large delegation to Faculty Council. Colleges with greater numbers of PoPs in their faculty would presumably see more of a PoP effect in voting for College At-Large representatives. In essence, PoP representation would be highly diluted. PoP's, of course, could stand for election or be nominated for election in their colleges. It is certainly reasonable to suppose that a few more of the Council's members would, in fact, come from PoP ranks. This, at best, is a minor change in Faculty Council representation. The potential gains from PoP voice, in our view, clearly outweigh any possible PoP advantage in the composition of Faculty Council.

Second, inasmuch as close to 80% of NTTF's are expected to apply for and gain PoP faculty status, it is likely that most NTTF concerns will be represented to the Council. That some NTTF faculty (and we would add graduate student instructors) are not represented requires some additional mechanism of representation but AAUP believes this may be accomplished by preserving the CoNTTF advisory mechanism to Faculty Council. CoNTTF has proven itself effective in reaching out to NTTF's across the campus and providing an avenue for expressing their concerns. It should not be abolished.

Third, the question of length of service as a sufficient condition for consideration for inclusion in Faculty Council simply misses the mark. PoP status is not granted strictly on the basis of length of service but also on established evident of professional competency in delivering that service. The only element that is missing

from this evaluation is research and discovery, but that's precisely what is not required for PoPs and what distinguishes this new class of faculty from tenure track faculty (TTFs). From the time an NTTF arrives on campus till the time they would be eligible to apply for PoP status is a term of two years, a period of probation that is ample time to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of a faculty member's pedagogy. Let us remember that it is possible for probationary TTFs to serve on Faculty Council in year one at CSU. This, thankfully, does not happen frequently. But quite a few TTF's in probation have found themselves on Faculty Council in year two, or three. So making this distinction strikes AAUP as being more than a little hypocritical.

Fourth, creating an entirely separate representative body for PoPs and other NTTFs obviates the academic freedom and shared governance gains to be had by creating and including PoPs in faculty decision-making. NTTF's are faculty after all. The point here is to de-marginalize this group of faculty and creating a separate body would only marginalize them further.

NTTF Voting Rights in Department Councils. The matter of voting rights in Department Councils strikes us as the more revolutionary of these proposals and is sure to generate considerable discussion. The main problem here, of course, is the fact that PoPs may lack the professional knowledge, experience, and incentives needed to evaluate research achievement and the recruitment of faculty tasked with research and discovery as well as pedagogy. They may also lack knowledge and experience that is requisite for the performance of certain types of professional and university service. Such conditions are not likely to be true of PoPs across the board, indeed there are plenty of cases of NTTF's engaged as active researchers in addition to their pedagogical duties but this strikes us as a meaningful concern at the departmental level. TTF's in departments with larger numbers of PoP's may also worry about PoP voting on departmental codes and governance arrangements.

This problem can be solved, however, with stipulations in departmental codes that restrict PoP voting to matters directly related to their contractual duties (e.g. curriculum and pedagogy) and the recruitment of NTTFs for pedagogical functions, allowing, perhaps, for some variation in decision-making with respect to service and the internal governance of departmental units. The solution, or so it seems to us, is to allow departments to approach the problem selectively with the proviso that PoP's should always be included in departmental governance and decision making bearing on their assignments. PoPs should also always be invited to Department Councils and enjoy observer status in matters before the Department Council. By definition this would include participation and voting in curriculum matters commensurate with the level of their pedagogy (undergraduate or graduate). This would involve a modest change in CoNTTF's recommendation for changes to C.2.4.2.1.m.

Evaluation of NTTFs in their Probationary Period. The CoNTTF recommends that E.13.1 be altered to create a PoP Evaluation Committee in each department consisting of PoP faculty charged with evaluating applications for PoP status and PoP promotion. CoFG is concerned that TTF are not involved in the evaluation. AAUP agrees with CoNTTF that NTTF's with PoP status are professionally qualified to evaluate PoP performance but regards this as an area where compromise is possible. It seems reasonable to include as departments may desire at least one TTF on PoP evaluation committees, perhaps as an ex-officio non-voting member.

NTTF and Other Special Pedagogical Functions. Here the CoFG is concerned that faculty tasked only with pedagogy should be involved in certain Honors Program oversight and assessment functions, particularly as these involve research and discovery. AAUP recognizes that there is a long record of effective NTTF services on these specialized committees in various units across the university. This concerns strikes AAUP as overdrawn as it applies to most cases and certainly something that can be negotiated at the departmental level.

In sum, the AAUP supports the CoNTTF proposal as a valuable step forward, as a transition to a fairer and more just and more workable system of faculty employment that moves in the direction of the decasualization of

academic work. It advances academic freedom and shared governance for the vast majority of NTT faculty on campus. And Colorado State University will be well served by that.

COIMMITTEE ON NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY RESPONSE TO THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE'S CONCERNS

- Claim in Issue #1 (see attached document): “The proposed changes will include a class of NTTF, namely the Professor of Practice (PoP), in the calculations for representation of the Colleges in Faculty Council. Colleges with a large number of PoP would gain a significant increase in representation in Faculty Council. . . .”

**Please note that Professor of Practice is the proposed term for longstanding non tenure-track faculty of 50% FTE or more – this was part of a set of proposals sent to CoRSAF. (We await that committee’s recommendations as well.)*

CoNTTF Response: Our proposal was based on current wording in the *Manual* (C.2.1.3.1 Elected Members) that we have since come to understand has been carried out differently from its intent. Our aim was to open up representation so that NTT faculty could be eligible to serve as representatives - **not to overwhelm Faculty Council** with representation of NTTF outnumbering TTF. We never intended to have NTTF in proportion to their numbers in individual departments. We would like to propose wording that simply allows representatives to be chosen from among “regular faculty” *and* NTT faculty. Please consider the current version in the *Manual* and our proposal. (Had we had the chance to talk this out with CoFG, we could have improved the wording and proposed inclusion of PoP to an appropriate degree. Such a revision would have occurred under ordinary circumstances for a proposal moving from one FC standing or advisory committee to CoFG, but CoNTTF was not afforded the courtesy of this standard practice.)

Current:

Each academic department and the Libraries shall elect one (1) representative. An additional number of representatives, equal approximately to one-third (1/3) of the number of representatives elected from the departments and the Libraries, shall be elected at large by and from the colleges and the Libraries as required to achieve, as nearly as practical, membership proportional to the number of regular, regular part-time, and transitional faculty members in the colleges and Libraries.

We would consider submitting a **reasonable proposal to revise:**

C.2.1.3.1 Elected Members (last revised May 2, 2007)

Each academic department and the Libraries shall elect one (1) representative from among their regular, professor of practice, and transitional faculty. An additional number of representatives, equal approximately to one-third (1/3) of the number of representatives elected in each college from the departments and the Libraries, shall be elected at large by and from the colleges and the Libraries as required to achieve, as nearly as practical, membership proportional to the number of ~~regular, regular part-time, and transitional~~ faculty members in each of the colleges and Libraries.

- Claim in Issue 2: The proposed changes will restrict the participation of NTTF in Faculty Council Committees and as Faculty Council Representatives to PoP and give PoP full voting rights in Departments while other NTTF may have no voting rights.

CoNTTF Response: This is out of context. The current accompanying proposals to CoRSAF regarding new appointment types define professor of practice as the only NTTF appointment with 50% FTE or more. Under the new appointment types, the other NTTF are less than 50% FTE, therefore, are not qualified to be representatives. We ask that the reader keep this in mind for all of the arguments given by CoFG against PoP below! We are trying to be reasonable and suggest inclusion of NTT faculty in representation and voting in departments based on degree of involvement in the university community. This approach is consistent with feedback we have received that governance participation should generally be associated with full-time faculty having a long-term commitment to the university, We recognize that temporary appointments and NTTF appointments less than 50% may have limited commitment to university policy and issues by nature of their appointments and have therefore not included them in departmental voting or university-level representation.

- Claim in Issue 3: The proposed changes will allow PoP voting rights on a wide range of issues occurring in Departments and in Faculty Council. However, NTTF typically have focused responsibilities in their assignments.

CoNTTF Response: Survey information about NTTF at CSU have demonstrated that NTTF carry responsibilities in all areas of faculty workload, including teaching, research, service, and the administration of programs. To argue that the focused responsibilities of NTTF disqualifies them from governance in departments and FC neglects the fact that TTF are often as singularly focused or majority focused as NTTF. We did not arrive at a place where NTTF are shouldering most of the teaching accidentally; as NTTF take on more teaching, TTF are “liberated” to do other kinds of work such as research, publication and artistry. Additionally, the proposal will allow PoP to have voting rights, but department codes will still indicate the domain(s) of those voting rights.

- Claim in Issue 4: The protections provided by tenure form the foundation of shared governance in a university. Tenured faculty may disagree with administration and may express that disagreement by voting in Departments and in Faculty Council without fear of being dismissed. Regardless of what their appointment is called, NTTF will not have those protections. What will be the effect of including a large number of NTTF who are vulnerable to pressure from the administration in faculty governance processes?

CoNTTF Response: This claim beautifully states the problem non-tenure-track faculty face in expressing their opinions. The CoFG opinion states, “Tenured faculty may disagree with administration and may express that disagreement by voting in Departments and in Faculty Council without fear of being dismissed. Regardless of what their appointment is called, NTTF will not have those protections. What will be the effect of including a large number of NTTF who are vulnerable to pressure from the administration in faculty governance processes?” Amazingly, having identified the problem, the solution suggested is *NOT* to stand up for the voting, academic freedom, job stability, or due process rights of this unprotected class, but to continue to deny voting rights. CoFG indicates that there is no interest in solving the problem of vulnerability of a growing faction responsible for an increasing portion of the university teaching mission but only an interest in protecting, at the expense of others, that which tenure-line faculty already possess. Shared governance should be shared, and long-term faculty off the tenure track should be included in that process. It is not in the best interest of

individual employees or the institution as a whole for such a large body of faculty to fall outside important protections associated with the roles of teaching and research.

- **Claim in Issue 5:** One suggestion that has been raised several times is to create a Faculty Council for NTTF, which would be separate from Faculty Council. This would be similar to the situation of the Administrative Professional Council and the State Classified Employee Council. That would eliminate several difficulties that arise in trying to include NTTF in Faculty Council.

CoNTTF Response: Bifurcating the faculty is advantageous to no one portion of the faculty. All faculty should have input on issues relating to curriculum and university policies that directly affect faculty concerns. A larger unified faculty is more effective than two smaller groups of faculty.

- **Claim in Issue 6:** The basis for requesting special status for PoP in voting is “long standing commitment to the University, a high level of knowledge in his or her field, and years of teaching, clinical, or research experience” at a 50% appointment or higher. CoFG discussions have raised several concerns about these criteria:

a. Faculty on tenure track invest 6 years working in research, teaching and service through a wide range of responsibilities. Nonetheless, they can be dismissed if they do not meet the criteria for tenure, despite their 6 years of commitment to the university. In general, working for a length of period for an organization does not imply commitment to the organization. This is the basis of “post-tenure review” for TTF. How can these observations be balanced against the rationale that NTTF who have been working for the university for a given length of time (which appears to be less than 6 years) deserve elevated status because length of service implies commitment?

CoNTTF Response: While faculty on the tenure track invest 6 years prior to tenure, those same faculty are eligible to serve on Faculty Council in their first semester of their probationary period – a time in which they generally know little about University issues and policies and faculty governance, and are not yet protected by tenure. Yet governance processes are learned habits and abilities, not attributes belonging to a particular class of people. All faculty need and deserve the opportunity to learn the processes, habits, conventions, and structures of participation in faculty governance and to become active, contributing members of the whole. This point also belittles the work of non-tenure-track faculty and implies that their continuing in their jobs is because they are allowed to do so rather than because they genuinely want to.

b. Is it feasible to quantify achievements in qualities like “long standing commitment” and “high level of knowledge”? Such vague criteria cannot be used for tenure.

CoNTTF Response: Neither can they be used for promotion of NTT faculty; these simply are among the considerations for what might qualify someone to be a representative – although they are currently not required for tenure-track faculty representatives.

c. Is it problematic to equate the Faculty Council participation of NTTF on a 50% appointment with TTF who have 100% appointments, TTF who have a 100% appointment split between faculty and administration duties, and NTTF who have 100% appointments?

CoNTTF Response: This is a gross misunderstanding of the proposal and of current policy. As it stands now in Faculty Council, regular faculty with 50% FTE can serve as representatives. With the proposed change, representation would be by both PoP and TT/TF of 50% or more FTE.

d. If the University establishes criteria for promoting NTTF to PoP, is this creating a tenure-like system without the protection of tenure?

CoNTTF Response: Yes. CoNTTF was informed that tenure was “off the table,” a non-starter in terms of improvement possibilities. But, as mentioned in Issue 4, the lack of protections for NTTF is damaging to tenure and academic freedom; the lack of protections for this body of faculty hurts everyone at the university. Advocating to move NTTF out of the at-will category via open-ended appointments and multi-year contracts without threatening the tenure structure of the university—a structure that central administration and the Board of Governors are not interested in changing/enlarging/extending - is essential for the stability and protection of all faculty at CSU. CoNTTF is seasoned and practical enough to realize that insisting on the gold standard of tenure, a standard we would prefer, is likely to have the effect of stalling out reasonable and necessary improvements to the conditions and status of NTTF that can be made now.

- Claim in Issue 7: In view of the history of academic freedom issues in universities in the United States, it can be stated without reservation that teaching in universities demands the protection of tenure. Whether or not this is practical for a part time instructor hired to teach an isolated course, faculty that teach over a long period of time at a university should be protected by tenure. Members of the CoNTTF have stated several times that acquiring some kind of tenure protection is a long term goal, but they have also encountered resistance on several levels. Should Faculty Council investigate the possibility of creating a tenure system for faculty who primarily teach or perform service? Note: Tenure is different from promotion, and establishing tenure does not necessarily require all faculty to be evaluated and rewarded under the same uniform work load assignment. Several departments have recently hired TTF with the great majority of workload assignment given to teaching.

CoNTTF Response: This question is beyond the scope of CoFG’s charge and the section C proposals that are currently under its review and brings up other questions which CoNTTF, congruent with its charge, has already investigated and addressed.

- Claim in Issue 8: If the motions to have PoP participate fully in Faculty Council is enacted, what is the justification for having a Committee on Nontenure Track Faculty? In that case, should Faculty Council establish a Committee on Tenure Track Faculty?

CoNTTF Response: This was a necessary developmental stage to bring the issues of NTTF to the forefront. NTT faculty continue to experience lack of representation, lack of protections like free speech and academic freedom, due process/grievance. Let’s be clear and honest - even though the *Manual* gives a nod in writing to protections and inclusion in the grievance process (Section K), NTT faculty not under contract remain at-will; and termination of at-will employees is clearly *NOT* grievable under Section K. A non-tenure-track faculty member who speaks out against policy or supervisor, or votes her or his conscience in public, or teaches current viewpoints even though controversial can be terminated because of it, without justification, because she or he is employed at-will. So yes, CoNTTF remains an important committee. The notion that tenure-track and tenured faculty need a similar committee is absurd as Faculty Council and all of its standing committees currently only allow “regular faculty” with the exception of the CoNTTF as a specialized standing committee and the Chair of CoNTTF as the only voting member in Faculty Council who represents the NTTF! CoNTTF looks forward to the day when NTTF are fully integrated and CoNTTF can disband itself, just as previous structures such as the Provost’s Task force of 2006-09 was able to write itself out of existence when better structures were possible and the work of that committee had been achieved.

- Claim in Issue 10: The rationale for allowing NTTF to serve as advisors for students in the University Honors Program does not address some potential consequences. A traditional argument made for

supporting research in a Carnegie Research I university as a core mission is that research contributes synergistically to improve education provided to students. . . .

CoNTTF Response: NTTF faculty have historically served with distinction as advisors for students in the University Honors Program and on graduate committees as well. The claim here begs the question, assuming that NTTF do not have the research background and capability to support student research objectives, and any survey of NTTF will demonstrate otherwise. Increasingly, given shifts in faculty employment trends and shrinking opportunities, it is often only the tiniest of opportunities and accidents of opportunity that allow one person to become tenure-track and another NTT. Furthermore, NTTF are eligible by the Graduate School to sit on graduate committees and advise students. The only requirement is a “Special” appointment, which is applied to various NTTF in many positions across the university. Clarifying the role of NTTF would in fact identify more certainly and appropriately who is eligible to participate in these ways.

- **Claim in Issue 11:** It is proposed that only PoP will provide evaluations of NTTF during a probationary period. Should not the TTF play the key role in such evaluations, since they are involved in all aspect of the broader mission of their departments?

CoNTTF Response: This is a misunderstanding. The purpose of C.2.5.g is to list responsibilities of department heads in evaluating faculty; it does not specify the composition of the committee. An E.11 proposal sent simultaneously to CoRSAF specifies the membership of the evaluation committee and reads: The ~~appointment~~ Professor of Practice Evaluation committee ~~must~~ shall include the chair of the T&P committee or another representative of tenured faculty and a representative body of no less than two (2) peer faculty. The majority of the committee should be faculty off of the tenure track and may come from multiple departments and/or colleges around the university if there are not enough departmental faculty off of the tenure track to form a majority on the committee. The department head shall draw the additional members of the appointment committee by lot from the pool of eligible faculty members. Therefore, there is no cause for alarm. It is proposed that a committee with a majority of NTTF would evaluate NTTF, not a committee solely of NTTF. CoNTTF would be happy to consider a revision in which both NTT and TT faculty sit on the same committee to evaluate all faculty, both NTT and TT.

WHAT HAS BEEN HAPPENING TO THE CSU FACULTY

By Steven Shulman

Department of Economics
Center for the Study of Academic Labor

What has been happening to the CSU faculty?

As CSU has admitted more students, a common perception is that it has not hired more full-time tenure line faculty members to teach them. Instead it has hired more non-tenure track faculty members to drive down instructional costs.

To find out if this perception is accurate, I pulled faculty employment statistics from IPEDS, the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System that is the primary source for federal data on higher education.

CSU provides data to IPEDS and uses the same data to produce its Fact Books. However, the Fact Books do not distinguish between full-time and part-time faculty or between tenured and tenure track faculty members. Furthermore, their figures on special and temporary faculty understate the number of non-tenure track faculty members, who may have other types of appointments.

I compared 2009, when Tony Frank was first appointed President, to 2015, the most recent year that the IPEDS data are available. Over this six year period, total student enrollments grew from 28,547 to 32,236, an increase of 13%.

The good news is that the number of full-time tenured faculty members grew from 662 to 797, an increase of 20%.

The bad news is that the number of tenure track faculty members fell from 320 to 248, a drop of 22%. This is worrisome since it portends a future drop in tenured faculty members.

Putting these two sets of numbers together, the number of full-time tenure lines rose from 982 to 1045, an increase of just 6% over six years. Full-time tenure lines have been growing at half the pace of student enrollments.

Over the same period, the number of full-time non-tenure track faculty members rose from 193 to 308, an increase of 60%. Part-time faculty members, almost all of whom are non-tenure track, rose from 476 to 615, an increase of 29%. The perception that increasing numbers of students are being taught by increasing numbers of non-tenure track faculty members is certainly borne out by the IPEDS data.

In 2009, there were 29 students for each full-time tenure line. By 2015, there were almost 31 students for each full-time tenure line.

We are headed in the wrong direction. CSU has been spending an extraordinary amount of money on new buildings and on frivolities like football. At the same time, instructional spending is kept as low as possible. The first response to a revenue shortfall is always to cut academics, as shown by the Provost's recent announcement of budget cuts.

The problem is not money. Although the administration constantly complains about state budget cuts, tuition revenues have risen far more than state appropriations have fallen.

The problem is priorities. The administration follows the lead of the President. His priority is the excitement and ego-gratification of new buildings and a big (albeit money losing) football program, even at the expense of educational quality.

This is why we need genuine shared governance. We cannot rely upon the administration to protect our academic mission. The recent election of an independent leadership to Faculty Council is a step in the right direction.

STATE CONFERENCE NEWS

Summer Institute Scholarships

The Assembly of State Conferences has a limited number of scholarships available to support first-time attendees of the Summer Institute, to take place July 27-30 at the University of Cincinnati. The scholarships will cover registration and up to \$400 in travel. We encourage state conference leaders to nominate up to two people

for these scholarships. Nominations should be sent to Steve Mumme, Stephen.Mumme@colostate.edu, by **May 15**.

CSU CHAPTER OF THE AAUP

Tim Gallagher, President, Tim.Gallagher@colostate.edu, 491-5637

Ross McConnell, Co-President, rmm@cs.colostate.edu, 491-7524

Natalie Barnes, Vice-President for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Affairs, Natalie.Barnes@colostate.edu, 491-6774

Dimitris Stevis, Secretary and Treasurer, Dimitris.Stevis@colostate.edu, 491-6082

Steve Mumme, Colorado Conference Co-President, Stephen.Mumme@ColoState.EDU 491-7428

Bill Timpson, member, Chapter Executive Committee member, William.Timpson@colostate.edu, 491-7630

Ray Hogler, member, Chapter Executive Committee member, Raymond.hogler@colostate.edu, 491-5221

Visit our Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/CSUAAUP?fref=ts>

AAUP State Conference News: <http://aaupcolorado.org>

HOW TO JOIN THE AAUP

To join the AAUP and our CSU chapter, sign up at the national AAUP site: <http://aaup.org>. They will notify our chapter and we will be in touch.



