**Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, January 22, 2025**, **6:00 p.m.**

**Dobski Conference Room, Bone Student Center**

*Call to Order, 6:00 pm*

*Roll Call*: Nathan Kapoor (chair), Kevin Edwards, Sheryl Henry, Steven Peters, Benjamin Stiers, Craig McLauchlan (nonvoting)

URC Chair Chad Buckley was present as an invited guest to discuss a URC proposal. Senate Chair Martha Horst was present in advisory role.

--Minutes of December 11, 2024 were approved unanimously.

Agenda items discussed:

**1. Previous edits to policies 7.4.1 and 7.4.2.** We clarified the list of RSP duties with McLauchlan. For 7.4.2 it was considered whether the role of Principal Investigator should be defined here, in other policy, or on a case by case basis at RSP. A new clarification was added with the line “PIs should make their supervisor and RSP aware of their intent to submit a grant proposal”. The final versions were forwarded to the Senate for passage.

**2. Discuss and Review URC ASPT Revisions.** Buckley from URC explained the rationale for adding a tenure/promotion appeal of a negative decision from the provost. The ASPT Appendix 4 flow chart would need to be redrawn. The General Counsel is being consulted by Chair Horst as to whether a provost is allowed to provide detailed rationales for their tenure/promotion decisions to another party (FRC, the final review body, in this case). If they cannot, it may impact the FRC decision, but FRC can still review the existing material, acting as a third (after dept and college) advisory review of the tenure/promotion package. Would the FRC be allowed request additional voluntary information from the provost? McLauchlan pointed out the Provost is chief academic officer, and so it is not clear they can be set up to be overturned. Is it appropriate to call this an "appeal", if FRC cannot overturn the Provost? Is it appropriate for the President, who may not be experienced in the particular academic field in question, to overrule the provost after an FRC review in favor of the applicant? These questions raised sufficient doubt for us to ask URC to reconsider and clarify the proposal.

**3. Review Revisions to Policy 3.3.4**. Do "emeriti" mean those who “Retire from ISU" or “Retire from any institution of higher education”? We support the interpretation that emeriti referred to in this policy must be retired from ISU, although they may also have retired from other institutions.

Adjourned 6:55 pm