**Faculty Caucus Executive Committee Minutes**

**Monday, March 17, 2025**

**Immediately following the Executive Committee Meeting**

***Call to Order***

Chairperson Horst called the meeting to order and declared quorum.

***Public Comment: All speakers must sign in with the Senate Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.***

None.

***Oral Communication:***

None.

***Distributed Communication:***

***From Kevin Edwards: Faculty Affairs Committee (Information item 3-26-25)***

***ASPT Changes***

[***Link to Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.03.17/12.20.2024.02%20-%20ASPT%20Changes/URC%20ASPT%20Revisions%202025_February_Negative%20Provost%20Recommendation%20Appeal1%20-%20Markup%20%28Exec%20Comments%29.docx?d=w9e9c30ccd61045efb9868fb0949b3068&csf=1&web=1&e=JN9zAh)

Senator Edwards: The URC sent us their final version of the appeals change and we thought they might make some bigger changes than they did. You had explained the issue with this, which is that the FRC is going to review something that has already been to the provost and coming back to the FRC. They are a little bit hamstrung if they can’t ask the provost why the decision was made. However, the provost should not really be forced to give that type of information, the provost not being a body that has had a vote. The provost just has their decision, so the compromise there was to say that this could go to the FRC, this could be called an appeal, but the FRC can still issue a decision. The provost is not required to provide anything back. The FRC can see all the lower decisions, anything that tenured candidate wants to provide, they can see. They can’t call the provost and say, “explain why you had this decision.” That seems to get around the legal issue.

That is basically what the revision said. They didn’t change much. They said that you can have a review by the FRC, and the provost does not have to provide anything there. We thought it they were ok with that it seemed fine. We did not have any changes to their final version. If they add this optional FRC review, that changes timelines. They said if they were happy with it fitting in with everything that we would keep it. There is also this graphic chart that would have to go with it. They said they would get it to me, and they did not yet. We don’t have the graphic chart. That would be an edit of the timelines for the appeals process. Assuming all of that fits together and it is in that graphic, that should be fine. That was the main substantive issue. How do you do this so that the provost is not forced to explain themselves since they were and have been the last step in the academic ladder before the president and the board.

Chairperson Horst: Do we want to bring this up to the full Faculty Caucus?

Senator Edwards: We can talk through the whole thing. We would have to start from the beginning.

Chairperson Horst: You have been on the other side. Traditionally we invite the URC chair. We will start sometime after 8:30 and we will have questions from the full Faculty Caucus. This is the first time we have done an ASPT change with this standing committee. I am still trying to get used to this process. There are some advantages to it, but at some point, it is helpful to get the full Faculty Caucus input.

Senator Nikolaou: The ASPT says that the FRC is going to resolve differences from DFSC and the CFSC. If we are now saying that there is going to be potential involvement with the provost’s recommendation, in article 3D, they would need to make some adjustment in that article as well.

Chairperson Horst: That is why I am thinking it might be useful to bring in the entire caucus at this point.

Senator Nikolaou: On article 3D it just refers to DFSC and CFSC.

Chairperson Horst: All changes go through the URC.

Senator Edwards: I will have to tell Chad.

Senator Cline: I have concerns about changing ASPT in the middle of the union contracts and how that all works. I don’t know if Weedman is fed in. This is explicitly off the table, I thought. Anything that would change the status quo is explicitly off the table.

Chairperson Horst: Craig Gatto is part of the union negotiation team, and he is on the URC. We could ask him that question.

Senator Cline: I think that question will come up on the floor from somebody. We should have an answer for it.

Senator Nikolaou: That was my other question. In the Academic Leadership Council, we were told that all bylaw revisions and ASPT revisions are on hold until the contract is finalized.

Senator Cline: This changes an actual procedure about grievance, there is an entire article of agreement between the university and the union about grievance. We would want Mr. Weedman’s opinion.

Chairperson Horst: Could Craig Gatto represent that opinion?

Provost Yazedjian: I don’t think he should if that is a legal opinion. He can follow up and maybe we would want to have some representation from General Counsel ready. I can ask him to look into it. If he comes back and says they should be there, we will let you all arrange it, so everyone is getting the same notifications and stuff from Kevin. I will have Craig let Kevin know.

Senator Bonnell: The trigger for this is only when it has been a positive DFSC and positive CFSC, is that correct? It is only under that specific circumstance. I am trying to figure out how this would happen under “3” where it says, “If a faculty member wishes to request an additional review of a negative recommendation by the provost with respect to promotion or tenure and they have not yet previously appealed to the FRC.” I am trying to imagine when that previous appeal would have happened, because it would have been two positives.

Senator Edwards: I think that is the issue, is that the person who had positive, positive and then a negative would have less rights than somebody that had gotten negative, negative then they went to the FRC and got the provost. The person who got positive, positive is in a worse position than somebody who got negative, negative in terms of overall number of steps that they got.

Senator Bonnell: If they want that review only under the specific circumstance of both of those being positive, it just says, “and they have not previously appealed to the FRC.” I am not imagining why there would have been a review if they were both positive.

Senator Edwards: If they got a minority letter that they disagree with from their DFSC or CFSC, they could have decided that it would be problem down the road, and they could have. Nobody would probably do that, but it is not off the table. That is my understanding. It is just allowing the possibility that they might have appealed anyway. That is something that Chad can answer.

Provost Yazedjian: Earlier it was, people in this situation wouldn’t have the opportunity to appeal, but this is saying that they would, and they just didn’t do it.

Senator Cline: “They have not previously appealed” is not the same as “they have not had the opportunity to appeal.” You can have the opportunity to appeal and choose not to. Those are two different things.

Senator Edwards: In light of the provost’s negative.

Senator Cline: I understand. You keep using this term, “have not had the opportunity,” that is not what the language says.

Senator Edwards: That is just shorthand for the fact that nobody would appeal a positive. I don’t think anybody would do that.

Chairperson Horst: I think it is time for this to get a bunch of Faculty Caucus questions and then the way it traditionally used to work is that would come back to the Faculty Caucus Exec, and we would have to hash out whether or not these were addressed in the next draft. That will go to your committee. It used to work that this exact body was the one who would say, “did they address this question and this question in the next draft that comes from the URC?” Instead of us, it is going to be your committee.

Senator Edwards: If Faculty Caucus doesn’t like it, it goes back to URC and it will come back.

Chairperson Horst: Faculty Caucus will inevitably have questions. And the URC can say, “we discussed this, and we ignored it.” Or they can say, “we discussed it and here is our revised language.” Instead of this group of people trying to figure out if the response was adequate, that will be your committee, either this year or next year.

***\*\*Approval of proposed Faculty Caucus Agendas- See below\*\****

Motion by Senator Bonnell.

Second by Senator Nikolaou.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Cline.

Second by Senator Bonnell.

Unanimous approval.

**Faculty Caucus Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, March 26, 2025**

**Immediately Following the Academic Senate Meeting**

***Call to Order***

***Roll call***

***Public Comment: All speakers must sign in with the Senate Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.***

***Information Item:***

***From Kevin Edwards: Faculty Affairs Committee (Information item 3-26-25)***

***ASPT Changes***

[***Link to Markup***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.03.17/12.20.2024.02%20-%20ASPT%20Changes/URC%20ASPT%20Revisions%202025_February_Negative%20Provost%20Recommendation%20Appeal%20-%20Markup.docx?d=w4386527d0fc94f8ea8c366efdda60b5e&csf=1&web=1&e=uOzwXk)

***Adjournment***