

Greetings Colleagues,

On behalf of the IUB chapter of the AAUP, I write with an urgent request that all IU faculty participate in the [10-Day public review and comment period](#) for University Policy: **ACA-17 Faculty Boards of Review Uniform Standards**. All responses must be sent to [policies@iu.edu](mailto:policies@iu.edu) by May 6, 2026.

As a current member of the FBR, I can personally attest to the importance for strengthening and clarifying the scope and mandate of the FBR. This new policy revision raises several concerns about its implications for due process, shared governance, and faculty rights. Below I provide a summary of these concerns for your review. At this critical stage it is essential that faculty take part in this brief 10-day review and comment period. This will be the only opportunity for faculty to document their concerns and participate in the policy revision process.

These points are provided only for your review and consideration. Feel free to copy/paste, modify, or ignore any of these points as you feel appropriate. But, please, submit a response by May 6.

Respectfully submitted,

*David McDonald, President*  
*IUB AAUP*

---

### **ACA-17 Faculty Board of Review Uniform Standards**

- The policy defines the FBR as purely an advisory body, raising concerns about whether it can provide meaningful peer review or serve as an effective check on administrative decisions.
- Limitations on evidence procedures—such as prohibiting objections and allowing consideration of unverified information—may undermine fairness and objectivity. This policy should allow for objections to evidence, prohibit anonymous evidence, and guarantee full access to all evidence without request.
- Ambiguities in scope and eligibility could restrict who may access the FBR process and what types of cases may be reviewed. There is inconsistency regarding the status of visiting, adjunct, and temporary faculty. And the policy may exclude actions tied to extramural speech (e.g. protests, social media posts).
- The exclusion of cases that are also subject to legal proceedings may delay or prevent timely internal resolution.

- PTR and annual review outcomes should be explicitly included in the scope of the FBR.
- The policy does not clearly require administrators to pursue informal resolution prior to imposing sanctions, nor does it protect informal discussions from later use in disciplinary actions. There needs to be reciprocal obligations for faculty and administrators.
- The role of faculty governance bodies in overseeing or participating in the appeal process is limited or unclear.
- Administrative authority to reject FBR recommendations, even with explanation, raises concerns about accountability.
- Confidentiality provisions may unintentionally limit transparency and prevent reporting on broader trends affecting faculty.

A strong FBR policy should:

- Ensure fair, transparent, and timely review processes
- Protect the rights of all academic appointees
- Provide clear standards for evidence and procedure
- Maintain meaningful faculty participation and oversight
- Function as a credible mechanism of peer review within shared governance