



**Faculty Council
Collective Bargaining Committee
Tuesday, September 22nd, 2026
Zoom**

MINUTES

Attending:

Deb Palmer (UCB), Joanne Addison (UCD), Diana White (UCD), Wendy Bolyard (UCD), Dylan Harris (UCCS), Brittany Orton (UCCS), Christy Thrash (Anschutz), Kelly Holmes (Anschutz), James Byrne (UCB), Thomas Pshak (Anschutz)

1. Business Items

- The September 8 draft meeting minutes were approved 8-0.
- The committee charge was approved by the Faculty Council Executive Committee.
- Members reaffirmed the plan to review research on shared governance and collective bargaining to identify recurring issues before narrowing the committee's policy review priorities.

2. Readings, Policies and Implications

- Members discussed the Bucklew reading, including its four models for the relationship between shared governance and collective bargaining and the value of comparing those models with actual collective bargaining agreements.
- Members questioned how well the older research reflects current higher education, noting that administrative structures, leadership backgrounds, and institutional conditions have changed significantly since the study period.
- Discussion highlighted tensions between individual/self-efficacy and collective efficacy, as well as the possibility that unionization can create additional faculty/administration tension. Members also discussed perceptions that unions can become politicized or protect poor performance, while noting comparable criticisms are sometimes made of tenure.
- A recurring concern was how to determine what faculty actually want without assuming support for collective bargaining. Members emphasized the need for meaningful campus-level feedback and acknowledged that faculty time and engagement are limited.
- Salary and budget implications were also raised, including concern that bargaining gains for one group could create pressure elsewhere, particularly for contingent faculty during periods of budget constraint.
- Members emphasized that obtaining the right to bargain would be only an initial step; campuses and employee groups would still need to determine interest, bargaining-unit structure, scope, and the model that best fits their circumstances.



3. Campus Updates

- **Denver:** Faculty leaders plan to seek feedback from eight Faculty Assembly standing committees, potentially reaching 80-100 faculty. Members described ongoing efforts to strengthen shared governance, uneven administrative support, and difficulty recruiting faculty for additional service. Denver participants indicated that a permissive collective bargaining model may be the most viable starting point.
- **Boulder:** Members noted a continued need to gauge faculty interest. The campus group is finalizing its report, appendices, and rollout plans, and is recruiting additional committee representation, including a non-union perspective. Discussion leaned toward a model somewhat stronger than permissive, with greater enforceability for existing Regent Law/shared governance decision making expectations.
- **Anschutz:** Members described significant complexity created by overlapping School of Medicine, UCHHealth, CU Medicine, and the Children's Hospital relationships, including separate employment, privileging, contracting, and billing arrangements. These structures may complicate who could bargain, with whom, and in what units. Members suggested broader campus representation from clinical faculty, residents/fellows, and administrative/non-clinical groups. Anschutz participation was also identified as a practical concern because clinical responsibilities make committee service difficult; some faculty must use professional leave to attend. Diana White indicated she would contact Mike Lightner about possible support for participation.
- **UCCS:** Collective bargaining is being discussed within shared governance and Faculty Assembly, but members have not yet seen significant faculty interest or momentum around the issue. Ongoing budget pressures also complicate the discussion, including concern that salary gains could come at the expense of contingent faculty. Members noted that many questions remain about what collective bargaining would look like at UCCS.

4. Next Steps

- Continue discussing ways Faculty Council might help assess faculty interest in and understanding of collective bargaining across campuses.
- Continue examining various scenarios rather than assuming a single model will fit the entire CU system.
- Boulder will continue recruiting additional committee representation; Anschutz members will consider expanding participation to better reflect its varied roles and employment structures.
- Diana White will follow up with Mike Lightner regarding possible support for faculty who must use leave or otherwise face barriers to participating in committee work.
- Continue research and development of the campus reports/related materials.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 13, 2026, 10:00–11:00 a.m. via Zoom