**Faculty Caucus Executive Committee Agenda**

**Monday, April 14, 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.

***Approval of the minutes of*** [***3-17-2025***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/mch-Minutes%20-%20FC%20EXEC%202025.03.17.docx?d=wd6ec17cedf19471fb93334ea6417cf0e&csf=1&web=1&e=BIP1n7)

Motion by Senator McHale.

Second by Senator Cline.

Senator Edwards: In the linked version I made some clarifications. I had that long statement, so I put some clarifications in there. Just editorial comments.

Unanimous approval.

***Oral Communication:***

***Faculty Associate senator attendance during ASPT discussions.***

***NTT faculty senator attendance during ASPT discussions.***

Chairperson Horst: We have for next year a Faculty Associate senator, which is great news. It has been 6 or 7 years. That is very exciting that they elected somebody. When I met with the Faculty Associate group, their shared governance group a year ago, one concern they conveyed to me was that the senator who did it 6 or 7 years ago went to all of the ASPT changes, and they found it really laborious because it had nothing to do with what they did. I said I would try to make it so that it could be optional for the Faculty Associate senator. The Faculty Associate senator has nothing to do with the ASPT and there might be quite a lot of discussions on it. Could we make it optional for the Faculty Associate senator to be at Faculty Caucus when discussing ASPT?

Senator McHale: You are suggesting it be optional?

Chairperson Horst: For the Faculty Associate senator. That is the concern they raised and it is one of the reasons they haven’t had a senator in quite some time. They found the work of the Senate was unconnected to their concerns. They pointed to the Faculty Caucus discussions, especially the business that we did with the dismissal and the disciplinary actions with Susan about 8 years ago.

Senator Cline: The Faculty Associate senator attends the Faculty Caucus?

Chairperson Horst: The Faculty Associate senator is part of the Faculty Caucus.

Senator Cline: And we want them to be a part of the Faculty Caucus for other reasons outside of the ASPT?

Chairperson Horst: Symbolically, they have always been part of the Faculty Caucus.

Senator Cline: And they are a voting member?

Chairperson Horst: They are, and so is the NTT senator who also has nothing to do with ASPT.

Senator Cline: Could someone like the chair of the senate say at the beginning of Faculty Caucus, “does anybody object to us dismissing the NTT and the Faculty Associate for the duration of this conversation without penalty to their attendance record?” Given that nothing is relevant to them, if nobody objects.

Chairperson Horst: That sounds good.

Senator Cline: That way everybody is acknowledging that we are letting them go because they don’t have to sit through us talking about all that stuff.

***URC work discussion***

Chairperson Horst: I had a very productive meeting with Keith Pluymers for an hour and half. I also had a meeting with the University Review Committee now that we have potential contract language from the union.

Senator Cline: It has been ratified.

Chairperson Horst: It has been ratified? Good. When I met with the URC, one concern that I had that they shared is that you have multiple bodies now. You have the URC, the Academic Senate, and the union. It could take quite a long time if those entities are not working together to get something passed. By the time you know it, you have a bargaining session again in 3 or 4 years. One thing that somebody in the University Review Committee proposed is that we have a University Review Committee Plus, which would be expanded to include union representation. Think of it like a liaison. I talked about the structure that the University Review Committee proposed with Keith Pluymers today. He was very positive about creating a group that could merge the standing ASPT document with the contract language, which will not be easy. There is quite a lot of change that will have to be done. Then you won’t have just the University Review Committee working on it. You can have representation right there so that it can facilitate conversation and get things done in a more efficient manner. It would be like our liaison idea. I am just proposing this, I don’t know what you want to do with it. Something like the University Review Committee plus Craig Gatto’s position, plus 3 members or designees from the union contract enforcement team, plus potentially I am throwing in the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. You might also want the chair of the Senate or one of the two. Some sort of group that could work together as opposed to all of these three separate, Faculty Affairs, Faculty Caucus, URC, and the union all trying to do it separately so that we can do this a little bit more efficiently.

President Tarhule: Great idea.

Senator Cline: This is just the ad hoc committee to deal with the contract language and merge that into current ASPT, not an ongoing thing? Wasn’t there also a suggestion that URC should have an ongoing liaison from the union?

Chairperson Horst: I think they should. That would be a bylaws change.

Senator Cline: That would be in addition to what you are suggesting?

Chairperson Horst: Another idea, yes. The other idea is we start establishing some official cross-references. The union would have somebody on the Faculty Caucus potentially, or the URC, or however you want to do that. There are so many changes, I was just going over whether something is an appeal or a review with Keith, and the wording changes are crucial. The amount of edits that are going to have to be done, I think it is important that the union is involved in these because they are the ones that necessitate the changes.

Senator Cline: Are you suggesting that this “University Review Committee Plus” begins immediately? The contract, once ratified, is immediately in effect. It is now currently, as we sit here, in effect.

Chairperson Horst: The University Review Committee will not work over the summer.

Senator Cline: That was my other question. We would also not have a chair of Faculty Affairs over the summer.

Chairperson Horst: That is correct. This would be some sort of ad hoc committee. I put the entire University Review Committee on so then they can just stop the “Plus” meeting and say, “University Review Committee, do you pass this language?” You would have the entire committee there. We can pass this as an ad hoc committee on May 7, April 23rd?

Senator Cline: Would we be setting up an ad hoc committee that would then not meet until August?

Senator Bonnell: What happens in between then? What is in the summer? What happens with the periwinkle book since some of it will be out of date?

Chairperson Horst: You have the contract language and you have the book.

Senator Bonnell: So, people have to figure it out for themselves?

Senator Cline: That is what the contract enforcement team will assist with if there are questions.

Senator Bonnell: I know what you mean. I am speaking as someone who is 12-month contract. It is just messy.

Chairperson Horst: The University Review Committee is charged in the ASPT with working on the ASPT. The union, in their contract, has accepted the ASPT. It would still be URC’s business, but the union can engage in impact bargaining based on amended policy language passed. It is still the University Review Committee’s prerogative to control the ASPT. What would happen with any ASPT changes? You would wait until the URC convenes. You wouldn’t do it over the summer.

Senator Cline: The URC can still make changes to the ASPT, but they would just have a right to challenge any change that they find averse.

Chairperson Horst: That is not the way Keith explained it to me. He explained to me that they could do impact bargaining based on the amended policy language passed. Not contesting the language anymore, and I am quickly getting out of my expertise, but because now there is a contract it becomes bargaining on the impact of the new language, but not the new language itself. I am just trying to facilitate the dialog with the group.

Senator Cline: I don’t have any problem with this, I think this is a good idea. I do worry about what happens over the summer. I don’t know if that is really within the realm of shared governance. There aren’t going to be faculty around to be doing it. I guess there is no solution that includes faculty governance in the summer.

Chairperson Horst: Craig Gatto could try to convene the URC and see how it goes.

Senator McHale: Is there a possibility that the faculty that would be available could have informal conversations with them about their concerns?

Senator Cline: I would object to that. In the event that my representative isn’t available over the summer, you can have whole colleges that won’t have any representation because they happen to not be able to come in during the summer when they are off-contract.

Senator McHale: My suggestion would be that no decisions could be made but at least we would get a sense of the temperature of what might be looming.

Chairperson Horst: It belongs to the URC.

Senator Cline: They are also subject to the Open Meetings Act, are they not?

Chairperson Horst: Yes.

Senator Cline: So, they couldn’t have conversations without quorum present.

Chairperson Horst: Yes. Do you think it would be the chair of the Academic Senate or designee? I don’t know.

Senator Cline: I think that wouldn’t be bad. It might be that the chair wants to be there, but if the chair doesn’t want to be there then they could designate Faculty Affairs.

Senator Bonnell: I would think that the chair would want to be there. You never know.

Senator Cline: Instead of the chair of Faculty Affairs, make it the chair of the Academic Senate or designee.

Senator Edwards: I am going to play devil’s advocate and say that I don’t think we need this. I think the URC is able to read the contract. I just thought of the provost appeal which is basically 5 lines followed by a little bit of implementation. I think the URC is capable of reading that and taking it into account and rewriting. Doing the steps that you talked about before, about going through the other articles that may be impacted by that. I think URC is the best to do that. The contract language is plain, it is there, sitting in a separate place. It is legally binding. URC can look at that and say, “Ok. If we want to be in alignment with that, we can do this and this and this.” URC can then invite any representative that they want. Almost every meeting we would have somebody invited to clarify things. That was very helpful. I don’ t think the URC should feel that their decisions are being influenced by an outside force. I don’t think you want to view the union as an outside force. It is going to be a large number of faculty, there will likely be union members just by chance on URC. I think they have both interests in mind. I am not quite sure that having everybody in the same room is actually good in this case. It sounds like too many chefs in the kitchen there. Whatever URC comes up with, that will go from Russ Morgan over to whoever. There is no elected leadership structure in the union yet. It will go from Russ to that person, they will look at it and say if it looks good or not. That doesn’t prevent the URC from changing ASPT. I feel like URC should be solely in charge of ASPT as they have been.

Chairperson Horst: But they’re not. The language was changed by the union.

Senator Edwards: The URC controls ASPT. That language stands, it hasn’t been changed. The contract is the contract.

Senator Cline: The contract explicitly alters the ASPT.

Senator Edwards: It supersedes aspects of it. For example, the provost’s new appeal. I did want to bring that in line and clearly it ran into problems that needed to be discussed. I think the URC can handle that aspect of it better.

Chairperson Horst: This is just one example of the wording choices that went on to be made.

Senator Edwards: I’m ok. I just wanted to lay it out there that it is not all upside, I think. Trying to get all those people together, and being on URC, just in doing the rewrite that we did we had to break into small groups and handle issues as groups of 2 or 3. Now having 20 people in a room, I don’t see it facilitating…

Chairperson Horst: I would say also that not all these people show. What Keith explained to me about how it is going to be like an optional AFEGC process, if somebody doesn’t want to do the union process then they do the AFEGC process. That is going to take a lot of language. He also explained to me that there is the contract language, but there is the intent behind the contract language and that carried some legal weight. I don’t think many people in the URC were in the room to understand the underlying implications for the contract language and what was conveyed orally, or whatever legal precedent needs to happen to say that has some kind of contractual weight. The people who were on the contract enforcement team will have that knowledge because they were in the room.

Senator Edwards: I think that is where it makes the most sense. It is going to be different people as well for the salary side of it than on the grievance side and the appeal side.

Senator Cline: The reason I started with the question that I started with was, is this an ad hoc committee just meant to be at this unique moment of merging the ASPT with the very first contract by the UFISU or is this ongoing? You said it is sort of a crack team for dealing with this unusual circumstance where language has been altered externally to help get all of those nuances that you are talking about together. At that ongoing URC, the regular URC would have a liaison from the union who could be present.

Chairperson Horst: Potentially, that is an idea.

Senator Cline: From my understanding, the liaison’s role is not usually to be an active participant, but to be called upon. They can be in the room listening to the conversation and if someone says, “What do you think of X Y and Z with the union or the contract?” Then they could respond and give their opinion, but they are not a new member of the committee, they are just a person. This is only short term, not ongoing. I agree having all of these people might be problematic long-term, but in the immediate sense of getting the difficult work done that resulted from this first contract, I think this looks like a good idea. But, ongoing, just to have some less intense UFISU present in the room would also seemingly be easier.

Senator Edwards: I think laying out all the issues that need to be tackled, but not necessarily they are going to tackle all the issues of that particular group makes more sense to me.

Senator Bonnell: Can you go through the flowchart of that again? You mentioned Russ Morgan- how do we imagine this going through? You introduced Russ Morgan which makes sense, but then at what point would this be going back through Faculty Caucus?

Chairperson Horst: It will still go through Faculty Caucus. My understanding is that once the language is passed, then the union can come back and say they want to renegotiate. They can renegotiate parts of the contract potentially. I’m not sure. They can do impact bargaining, and they can say, “This language change is going to affect us in a certain way, so we want to put some new language in the contract to deal with the impact of this new language.” What I am saying is, there is a lot of changes that happened to this, and to view the URC as solely the body that is going to deal with the work of another faculty group doesn’t seem fair to me to the URC. There was so much background in the changes that they did for this first contract, I think it is really important to have a cohesive group that can work on this together. The Senate will still pass it, but just for this one moment where we have to merge their significant contract language with the ASPT and gut out a lot of the middle part, it’s the idea I came up with. It is just an idea.

Senator Nikolaou: They can always invite them as liaisons instead of creating an ad hoc committee. There is one month when faculty are going to be under contract. The majority over here is faculty members. How are you going to have an ad hoc committee during the summer? It doesn’t make sense to create one.

Chairperson Horst: We wouldn’t have an ad hoc committee in the summer, it would start in August.

Senator Nikolaou: If they are going to start in August, why do we need to create an ad hoc committee? We can have the URC and then the URC can, whenever they deem appropriate, they can invite team members up from the hearing. Instead of saying we are going to create an ad hoc committee which is only for a certain period of time, then we are going to go back to the URC. If the union can go and do this impact bargaining and they are, from the beginning as members of the ad hoc committee, discussing about how to change the ASPT, the way that I am thinking is they should just focus on how the ASPT should look to be consistent with the contract. If they have any questions, they can contact the union. It is independent of the union. As Kevin said, members of the URC, some of them most likely are going to be members of the union. Then we have the clear process from the URC, then we have the Faculty Caucus, and then if the union has big concerns that we need to address, that is where they come. It seems that if they are from the beginning of the process, they might steer in a certain way that might not necessarily be focused just on ASPT issues. It seems that it is muddling the process much more. Especially because if the contract still says that Faculty Caucus is responsible for ASPT, it doesn’t say that URC is not responsible for the ASPT. They still recognize that this is our process and whenever there is need, then they can be invited as liaisons. I don’t think there is a need to create an ad hoc. If we were thinking that we want things to have been discussed and have been clarified before the URC starts their review in August, if it is truly an ad hoc committee then we should make calls for people who are interested in participating in that ad hoc committee for aligning the two groups, and that is going to go to the URC and the URC sees if any of them are relevant.

Chairperson Horst: Another concern I have is just the URC that functions as an editor. It is going to be a significant editing job and there is this background to the contract language that probably nobody in the URC would know.

Senator Nikolaou: It might be that the first meeting of the URC is literally with the union contract enforcement team members, just to discuss the specific portions of the contract that talk about the ASPT and discuss what was the intention behind them so that the URC members are clear, then the URC goes to do their work on revising the ASPT.

Chairperson Horst: This was an idea from the URC.

Senator Cline: That is what I was going to say. You began this conversation by saying that this was something that someone from the URC was asking for.

Chairperson Horst: The URC asked for it.

Senator Cline: URC asked to have someone from the union?

Senator Edwards: Not in the summer.

Chairperson Horst: Correct.

Senator Cline: If members of the URC are asking for there to be some sort of formalized process to include the union…

Chairperson Horst: So that you don’t have this back-and-forth.

Senator Cline: I don’t have a problem if that is what URC wants.

Senator Nikolaou: But they can do it right now.

Chairperson Horst: They can?

Senator Nikolaou: The URC can invite any person during their meetings to help them with what they are working on.

Senator Cline: Did you also discuss this today with Keith?

Chairperson Horst: Yes.

Senator Cline: And he was in support of this structure?

Chairperson Horst: Yes.

Senator Cline: If the URC was asking for it, and the union is in favor of this structure, I don’t have any reason. If you are asking for a vote, I will vote for it.

Senator Bonnell: Going back in time, it seemed like in the fall we were always hearing that they couldn’t make quorum because they didn’t have enough members. Does it look like they will have membership?

Chairperson Horst: I don’t know. An ad hoc committee would stand apart from the URC. The URC would have to pass the language.

Senator Bonnell: If they have a hard time making quorum, this would help. That is my point. I would support this knowing that in the past there weren’t enough members.

Chairperson Horst: We don’t have to vote on it. If you don’t want to bring it forward, I guess that is what this body has to decide. Do you want to bring this idea forward on May 7? Do you want to table it?

Senator Nikolaou: I am not opposing having someone from the union, it is just that, you said that they are going to be operating separately.

Provost Yazedjian: I was going to ask about that too. Are they going to be different people?

Chairperson Horst: No. The URC is not this ad hoc committee.

Senator Cline: URC is like the nucleus of this committee, so the same people. They could adjourn a meeting and then gavel in URC just to vote on the stuff from the ad hoc committee that all of these people were present for 5 minutes ago.

Senator Nikolaou: That is why I think it is kind of muddled. In essence it could be they invite team members from the union, they talk, and when it is time to vote, they vote. The team members, because they are guests, they don’t vote. Because we call in an ad hoc committee for the URC, but then we also have the URC. What is the distinction between the two?

Senator Cline: Some are members of the URC, and some are not. This would mean that this ad hoc committee couldn’t meet if it didn’t meet quorum and included in that quorum would be the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the provost or their designee, three members from the team, and the chair of the Academic Senate. It enshrines their participation in this process.

Chairperson Horst: We might want to say “seated” members of URC.

Senator Nikolaou: In the beginning we used the term, “liaisons.”

Senator Cline: That would be ongoing, not for this.

Senator McHale: I think that this consultation with non-voting by the union and then the union offering suggestions, that is the issue, right? It seems to me that it comes down to: does the URC commence and these union members are consulted? Then they later on can add to the process for consideration, but they are not officially members of the URC.

Chairperson Horst: They would never be official members of the URC. The idea is that instead of saying to the URC, “please do all of these major edits to the document by yourself” you could bring in liaisons for efficiency. You have multiple stakeholders now. This is the implementation task force. If it is too weird, I will withdraw it. This is just an idea that the URC came up with. They called it URC+. I can’t remember who came up with it. It is so they don’t have this back-and-forth that potentially could drag out. It is more efficient at this stage where we have a major revision to the ASPT. This was the idea, so I talked with Keith this morning to try to implement the idea and he really liked it.

Senator McHale: If URC supports it, if they endorsed it, then they are willing to listen and agree when it is reasonable.

Chairperson Horst: They could just do it. It doesn’t have to go through the Senate, I was just trying to facilitate the idea.

Senator Edwards: Can you remind me the URC election schedule?

Chairperson Horst: It is happening right now.

Senator Edwards: I don’t remember seeing an email.

Senator Cline: It is college by college.

Chairperson Horst: In my college we received an email.

Senator Nikolaou: We did ours.

Senator Edwards: Nominations are not complete?

Chairperson Horst: I have no idea. Each college is different.

Chairperson Horst: The College of Engineering has nobody seated. The College of Business has nobody seated. I didn’t see anybody from Mennonite, I don’t think they are showing up. There is a lot less people, that is why I would put, “seated” members of the URC. There was 5 people there.

Senator Edwards: If there is a table team or bargaining group member on the URC, I think that would obviate the need for this whole thing.

Senator McHale: When I read the new contract, it struck me that there are now going to be more multi-layers to tenure and promotion. I think this is a way to at least head off some of the major issues at the pass.

Chairperson Horst: The “two appeals” line, that sounds very tricky. Let’s all think about it and then we can consider it for the May 7 Faculty Caucus agenda?

Senator Cline: I feel we do need to vote on it. If we are going to add a liaison, we have to actually adjust their bylaws. That does require a vote.

Chairperson Horst: This idea was just for next year to try to expedite the work of the URC in consultation with the union. The whole structure of the URC is another matter.

Senator Edwards: If this can be delayed past this Wednesday when the bargaining group will meet, we have not discussed anything like this at all.

Chairperson Horst: I am in support of that. Let’s delay our discussion of this. We can consider this for the Faculty Caucus agenda for May 7.

Senator McHale: Is there a way to ask the union?

Chairperson Horst: I asked Keith Pluymers, he was in full support of it.

Senator Bonnell: I saw Adam in the library, and he was supporting of this too. There are other people who support this idea as well.

***Distributed Communication:***

***From Kevin Edwards: Faculty Affairs Committee***

[***External Committee Slate***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/CommSlates4-9-25.docx?d=w380565e55e33444aa8cce46e51eed17b&csf=1&web=1&e=hIrDlp)

Chairperson Horst: From Senator Edwards we received the External Committee Slate. I am going to note a couple of things in there. For the election of the UCC you have a choice of two. Kevin and I looked at the language of the UCC and we believe it has to be somebody from the Social Sciences division based on the language that is in the bylaws. By that logic, it has to be a person from the School of Social Work, Nicole Anderson. There has to be at least one representative from each of the divisions of CAS.

Senator Edwards: There were no other choices, everybody requested not to be picked.

Chairperson Horst: Is Nicole Anderson a faculty?

Senator Edwards: I am seeing a split appointment of Social Work and Student Counseling services. As far as I could tell, she is eligible.

Chairperson Horst: It can’t be Ionescu; it is either Nicole Anderson or it is vacant.

Senator Edwards: We can strike him.

Chairperson Horst: The other one is that you offered a choice for Team Excellence Award Committee. I would advise that we pull this from the slate and have the Faculty Affairs Committee who is now going to be charged with shared governance decisions. They can decide between these two next year and then they can be elected in the fall. There is no urgency for this committee.

Senator Edwards: I just tried to generate some elections because you suggested that would be a good thing.

Chairperson Horst: We always do the slate, or do you just want to have an election between the two for the Team Excellence Award Committee? I would rather the Faculty Affairs Committee just decide and pick one.

Senator Edwards: Fine with me.

Chairperson Horst: We will pull that from the slate, otherwise I think it was pretty good.

Provost Yazedjian: A few quick things. College of Engineering is just “CEG.” I also noticed on some we have just the college and on others it is the college and the unit, whichever we want to choose. If we know of somebody who is retiring, is there an opportunity to add somebody? I believe Ellis Chefor is either retiring or resigning. I think I just signed a letter from the College of Business.

Chairperson Horst: We can’t address that now, so we will have it be vacant. We will address that vacancy in the fall.

Provost Yazedjian: We can confirm that with Christie.

Chairperson Horst: We are just going to work on the slate, and we always go through the pool of volunteers first. I would suggest the vacancy on the Textbook Affordability Committee be filled by the new Senate. It is a vacancy that has to be a senator. I propose we strike that so that the new Senate can decide who is representing the Senate. For the Associate Vice President for Academic Administration search committee, we have Sarah Smelser who also volunteered, so we have 4 volunteers. There can be volunteers from the floor.

Senator Cline: Is that the same with the Panel of 10?

Chairperson Horst: That is correct. The AFEGC is pretty healthy with 6, we can go up to 8. The Panel of 10 at least has 10, that is exciting.

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

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator McHale.

Second by Senator Cline.

Unanimous approval.

**Faculty Caucus Meeting Agenda**

**Wednesday, April 23, 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.***

***Approval of the minutes 3-26-25***

***Elections:***

* ***Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee (up to 8)***

1. Ellis Hurd, Professor – Teaching and Learning, CoE - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/AFEGC%20CV%27s/AbbrevVitae_2025_ELLIS_HURD.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=XskdHA)
2. Ben Wellenreiter, Associate Professor – Teaching and Learning, CoE - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/AFEGC%20CV%27s/Wellenreiter_2025_CV%201%20page.docx?d=wede5a7031abb4111b80e60a73216deb9&csf=1&web=1&e=V2qe4Z)
3. Kyle Miller, Associate Professor – Teaching and Learning, CoE - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/AFEGC%20CV%27s/Kyle%20Miller%20CV_One%20Page.docx?d=w12c501dc0d6b4f689560412e96d32ab9&csf=1&web=1&e=KEXzVG)
4. Barbara Meyer, Associate Professor – Teaching and Learning, CoE - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/AFEGC%20CV%27s/bbmeyer%20one%20page%20vita%20040225.docx?d=wb110d2a8ace1405c9b826434a233337d&csf=1&web=1&e=6WBDvT)
5. Christy Borders, Professor – D/deaf and Hard of Hearing, CoE - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/AFEGC%20CV%27s/Borders%201-page%20CV%20-%202025-April.docx?d=wd71c0e4d0606466ba11f4cbc750631a0&csf=1&web=1&e=q8K4j8)
6. Sumesh Philip, Associate Professor – Information Technology, CAST - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/AFEGC%20CV%27s/Philip%20cv-2025%20(1%20Page).doc?d=wec1d96f4c2864c4392c1d4fed68cab82&csf=1&web=1&e=2fUigo)

* ***Panel of Ten (up to 10)***

1. Jing Wang, Professor – Electrical Engineering, CoEng - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/cv_jing1page.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=vAa3RK)
2. Yun-Ching Chung, Professor – Special Education, CoE - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/Curriculum%20Vitae%20Yun-Ching%20Chung%20One%20Page%20013125.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=0jRe9O)
3. Ben Sadd, Professor – Biological Sciences, CAS - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/Sadd_CV02222025_1pg.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=FE86Hv)
4. Justin Stanek, Associate Professor - Kinesiology and Recreation, CAST - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/Stanek_CV-1%20page%20Panel%20of%2010.docx?d=w25098542554b4c97a0594fa027143b38&csf=1&web=1&e=akXe4F)
5. Karen Stipp, Associate Professor – Social Work, CAS - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/Karen%20Stipp%201-page%20CV.docx?d=w1a5d1581c2024e49af86a68aafdcb1b7&csf=1&web=1&e=FG9eRe)
6. Michael Wille, Professor – School of Art, WKCFA - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/MichaelWille.CV.2025ART.1page.docx?d=w680addbf9a7c43e9924e180bb6fde9b0&csf=1&web=1&e=Dvt7Ka)
7. Ellis Hurd, Professor – Teaching and Learning, CoE - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/AbbrevVitae_2025_ELLIS_HURD.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=tKLUb6)
8. Kristin Carlson, Associate Professor – CTK, WKCFA - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/Carlson%201%20pg%20vita%20(1).pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=tLwlaW)
9. Eric Willey, Associate Professor – Head of Technical Services, Milner- [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/willey_cv_brief.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=F7EtLs)
10. Abdelmounaam Rezgui, Associate Professor – Computer Networking, CAST - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Panel%20of%2010%20CV%27s/Rezgui_CV_1p.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=RgA19U)

* ***External Committee Slate – From Faculty Affairs Committee***

[***Link to Slate***](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/CommSlates4-9-25.docx?d=w380565e55e33444aa8cce46e51eed17b&csf=1&web=1&e=hIrDlp)

* ***Textbook Affordability Committee***

1. One (1) faculty senator or designee 2025-2027 (replacing Carl Palmer)

* **Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Search Committee (up to 6)**

1. Michael Torry, Professor – Kinesiology & Recreation, CAST - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Search%20Committee%20CV%27s/CV4MRTorry%201pg.docx?d=wbeabffd208a54e73836b059dadf37de2&csf=1&web=1&e=kJMZSw)
2. Jing Wang, Professor – Electrical Engineering, CoEng - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Search%20Committee%20CV%27s/cv_jing1page.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=Fvjuzd)
3. Mary Henninger, Professor – Kinesiology & Recreation, CAST - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Search%20Committee%20CV%27s/Henninger%20CV.docx?d=w2361ce56961f426e8fb79eebba4208cd&csf=1&web=1&e=tJOd0a)
4. Sarah Smelser, Professor – Printmaking, WKCFA - [CV](https://illinoisstateuniversity.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/AcademicSenate/Academic%20Senate%20Sharepoint/SUB%20-%20Faculty%20Caucus%20Executive%20Committee/2025.04.14/Linked%20Documents/Search%20Committee%20CV%27s/Smelser_1p_CV.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=PH7owO)

***Adjournment***