**What follows is a summary of speaker contributions.**


I. Approval of Minutes
- Minutes from April 29, 2009 Meeting (09.54M): unanimously approved
- Minutes from April 29, 2009 Organizational Meeting (10.04M): unanimously approved

II. Announcements and Discussion
Dean’s Report:
Dean Gonzalez welcomed all members and spoke about the budget situation. The University has not been an exception in regards to the impact of the recession. This year, the legislature cut about 4½ % of state appropriations (base money). And, because the University is on a bi-annual budget, there will be another cut of roughly 2% next year. So the total bi-annual base appropriations cut is about 6 ½ %. That amounts to $474,000 this year and roughly $200,000 next year. Federal stimulus cash was used to supplant the money that was cut from the state appropriations, so the amount of money flowing to the University was constant. But, because the state appropriations were supplanted with cash from the stimulus—which ends two years from now—the 6 ½ % base cut is still an issue. Therefore, the President has taken some immediate measures. For example: 1) the implementation of a salary freeze; 2) the implementation of some cost-cutting measures to try to accumulate base money, including an immediate halving of all travel budgets for every unit; 3) for every staff position that becomes open, half of the money used to support that position will be sequestered (as a result, any position that becomes open will have only half the money required to replace it). The University is committed to avoiding furloughs or layoffs, but replacing those who leave/retire may not happen immediately. Discussions are on-going in regards to how to best handle the budget situation and the problems that have and may arise from it.

The Dean also addressed REPA (Rules for Education Preparation and Accountability) changes. Two things in particular were highlighted in regards to the impact on the University:
1. These changes make it impossible for Secondary Education teachers to become licensed by majoring in Education; it eliminates the Secondary Education major. Students are
required to major in the subject area they will teach and can only minor in secondary education.

2. The state can dictate the content of education minors, and they can determine the number of hours that can make up those minors.

Dean Gonzalez passed out a summary of the REPA changes and encouraged familiarity with and understanding of the changes. Beginning October 1, the proposal is open for public comment (comments must be in writing, and all comments are supposed to be considered in policy revisions). The Dean encouraged all—faculty, etc.—to submit focused comments aimed at 1) suggesting ways the policies could be changed and 2) elucidating the problems/issues that may arise from the policies. The Core Campus retreat is October 9th; the Long Range Planning Committee has changed the retreat schedule so that time can be devoted to REPA. (Discussion of the REPA changes ensued among the members present.)

Agenda Committee
a. Core Campus Retreat, October 9, 2009—Bradford Woods: announced
b. Fall faulty meeting, October 30th, 2009—10:00am: announced
c. Open Access Proposal was forwarded to IU Legal Council: one of the University attorneys made clear that this proposal cannot be imposed. It would violate University policy.
   Result: the Agenda Committee will discuss possible next steps (for example: re-wording the proposal, sending it back to the Technology task force, etc)

III. Old Business

IV. New Business
a. Higher Education Minor in College Pedagogy Proposal (10.06).
   An explanation of the proposal was offered and brief discussion ensued. F. Pawan raised the point that there do not seem to be any electives that include bi-lingual education, multicultural education, or diversity. Discussion of this point ensued. D. Hossler will convey to the appropriate people the point raised by F. Pawan.
   Result: proposal was unanimously approved.

   An explanation of the proposal was offered and a discussion ensued. Peg Sutton pointed out an error in wording: rather than replacing the current practice with one that “allows faculty to vote for whomever they choose,” it should read “allows faculty to nominate whomever they choose.” This change was agreed upon.
   Result: proposal was unanimously approved; the wording change will be made, and the new procedure will be implemented for a 2-year trial period, after which it will be re-evaluated.
c. Policy Proposal regarding Participation in the School’s Promotion and Tenure Committee Discussion and Vote (10.08).

Explanation of proposal was offered and a lengthy and substantial discussion ensued. This proposal seeks to reverse the current practice.

Result: there was unanimous agreement to send the proposal back to the Faculty Affairs Committee with the request they prepare a set of guidelines that will 1) define members’ roles on committees; 2) make clear that each member should absolutely be present for department discussion; 3) make clear that members should vote objectively, not from personal feeling; 4) make it clear that members, when discussing and voting, should distinguish between personal complaints on the one hand and formal, documented issues based on evidence on the other.

V. New Courses/Course Changes

It was announced that courses listed are open for 30 day remonstrance.

**Meeting was adjourned by Jose Rosario at 2:35pm.**