Members Present: Fran Squires, President, Michael Abernethy, Virginia Anderson, Bryan Hall, Brian Jones, Diane Russell, Brian Atwater, Michael Harris, Paul Pittman, Alan Wong, Mary Bradley, Joanna Durham-Barnes, Bradford Griggs, Jim Hollenbeck, Melanie Hughes, John Doyle, Clint Franklin, Elaine Haub, Glenn Mason, Donna Bowles, Jodi Henderson, Debbie Finkel, Todd Manson, Yu Shen, Rhonda Wrzenski, Stephen Bowman, Ron Endris
Absent with Alternate: Elizabeth Rueschhoff (David Taylor), Aaron Setterdahl (Kent Edmonds)
Absent without Alternate: Vijay Reddy, John Finnegan, Terrence O’Connor
Present: Administration, Ex Officio Faculty, Professional Staff Council: Chancellor Patterson-Randles, Curt Peters, Anne Skuce, Samantha Earley, Jay White, Kathleen Bailey, Greg Roberts, Rebecca Turner
Guests: Victor Waingeh

President Squires called the meeting to order. The roll was passed with instructions to sign for yourself or initial if you were attending for someone else. The minutes were approved as written.

The meeting moved directly to item J on the Agenda. Dr. John Applegate joined the Senate meeting by telecast regarding a recent ICHE proposal, and after a few remarks by David Taylor, Dr. Applegate spoke at length about his concern regarding the proposal for ICHE and the reciprocity agreement that the proposal addresses. Several of the points that he brought forward are as follows – the I.U. Southeast campus is incredibly reliant on the reciprocity agreement with Kentucky given the large percentage of Kentucky students that it attracts; the agreement itself is quite complex, given the breadth of territory it covers and the multiplicity of parties involved, so it is generally better to maintain a broad position within the agreement, rather than try to be too specific; despite the longstanding nature of this agreement, it is still delicate and ought to be treated as such.

One of the main goals to consider when working on the agreement is that maintaining the status quo is a good thing, considering how beneficial the agreement has been to the campus. We want to encourage minor improvements and avoid set-backs, but we must always be looking to the future and what actions will lead to the best results.

Despite any disagreements that exist about certain language in the agreement regarding what might benefit the University should this language be implemented, ICHE is resolute against implementing certain changes at the moment, and it is ultimately better for the campus to leave that language alone for the time being, leaving open the door to address the topic again down the road.

Dr. Applegate pointed out two final items. The first is that the Commission itself does not control the money in the state. Rather, it creates and implements formulas and makes recommendations to the legislature, who ultimately control state appropriations of funds. The final item of import is that the University, insofar as it is possible, speak with a unified voice. It has proven incredibly
helpful in moving the I.U. forward addressing both the Commission and the legislature as a unified body.

David Taylor brought up to points of concern. The first was his impression that the regional campuses have not been adequately represented by the central administration. He noted that IUB, although having a broader picture and interest that IUS, seems to be overlooking concerns specific to the campus. The required 0% increase from a previous year and 25% summer tuition discount were both brought up as mandates from Bloomington that strongly affect IUS but were not arrived at in consultation with the campus. He also noted that, while investigating the current metrics regarding the reciprocity agreement with V.C. Wavle, the current situation results in $1 million left out of the IUS budget. This is approximately 1% of our budget, and is a very significant number given that we are currently making cuts in order to balance the budget.

In response, Dr. Applegate strongly disagreed with Dr. Taylor. He noted that the central administration aggressively supports each campus, and the differential effects (e.g. benefits to one campus with simultaneous drawbacks for another) are part of being a single University spread out so broadly. But Bloomington does not choose to favor any one campus over another. One ought to consider the benefits of being a part of the state’s preeminent University and the influence the regional campus has as a result of being a part of this collective entity compared to the potential problems that may arise. Finally, Dr. Applegate noted that the $1 million, though certainly not small change for anyone, is not a significant number in light of the considerable benefits that arise from the reciprocity.

After Dr. Applegate departed, Virginia Anderson and Chancellor Patterson-Randles discussed for a few moments a bout the history and tentative nature of the reciprocity agreement over the past several years. It once again made clear that, despite the efforts of John Grew and others in Bloomington, the Commission members are fully set against considering Kentucky students for performance funding. We must ultimately continue to consider enrollment management and how we can continue to draw in new students.

The Chancellor noted that Jason Meriwether has accepted a verbal offer to be the new V.C. of Enrollment Management and Student Affairs. Once paperwork is finalized, this will be announced publicly, and his first day will be July 1. Further, the VCAA search is nearing its close, with three on-campus visits at the beginning of May. The Chancellor concluded her remarks by thanking Dr. Squires and the Faculty Senate for all that they do for IU Southeast.

Dr. Curt Peters offered a few words of thanksgiving to those he had the privilege of working with over the past year.

**Actions items:**

Dr. Squires subsequently took the floor and began to progress through the Agenda. Dr. Squires presented a list of May and August graduates to the Senate, and they were approved. The next time, the General Education Core Statement (**Circular 13-10A**), was voted on and approved by the Senate.
Circular 13-10B – Gen. Ed. Requirements and Learning Outcomes – This item was picked up again after last meeting’s delay, and a lengthy discussion ensued. Victor Waingeh brought further clarification, and Bryan Hall added additional insight. After a great deal of discussion, it was decided that the Senate should vote on the various iterations of the proposal individually, and in order. Iteration A was voted on, and accepted, and the other proposals were subsequently dropped.

Circular 13-10C – Promotion and Tenure Proposal – Virginia Anderson provided a friendly amendment, and the proposal was subsequently adopted.

Circular 13-10D – Proposed change to electronic packets – This proposal was accepted with minimal discussion and no disagreement.

Circular 13-10E – BIOL-L 346: Survey of Molecular Developmental Biology – This item was approved without discussion.

Circular 13-10F – PSY-P 340: Sleep and Dreams – This motion was passed without issue.

Circular 13-10G – Biology Degree Plans – David Taylor noted that the Biology course just approved had been inserted into this new iteration of the Biology program, and the packet was subsequently accepted without issue.

Circular 13-10H – Modern Languages Capstone Proposal – Because of a lack of information concerning the credit hours assigned to the Capstone and how it appears on the transcript, this item was tabled until further information was available.

Circular 13-10I – Budget Recommendations 2013-2014 – This item was approved as written without discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:09 PM.