1. Correction/Approval of Minutes from October 23, 2009
Bob Billingham – moved
Dave Lohrmann – seconded
6__ Yes    0__ No    4__Abstain

- Under old business, Ombudsman Policy, the committee voted on changes to be made to the policy and passed it at the last meeting. Dave Lohrmann did make changes to the policy as the committee agreed upon, and the policy was passed on.
- The vote for the changes was unanimous.

2. Approval of Agenda
Bob Billingham – moved
Lynn Jamieson – 2nd motion
10__ Yes    0__ No    0__ Abstain

3. Standing Committee Reports

Motion was made by Bob Billingham and 2nd by Lynn Jamieson to open discussion for item 3A under Standing Committee Reports.

A. Undergraduate Studies Committee: Bob O’Loughlin
- Dr. Susan Smith proposed changes this morning on behalf of the Safety Faculty to change just the major and minor titles for the majors and minors listed on the handout. The minor title would change from Safety Management to Safety and major title would change from Safety Science to Safety. The reason being is that Safety Science is one component but they also have safety education.
- The committee is to look over the document, but do not need to vote on it until the next meeting.
- Kathy Gilbert additionally adds that there were some minor changes with dietetics. There will also be a 3rd round with genetics. The request forms will come out next week.

B. Graduate Studies Committee: No Report
C. **Budgetary Affairs Committee:** No Report

D. **Bloomington Faculty Council:**
   - Jack Raglin stated that Tom Gieryn talked about updating policies. They have a number of old policies specifically where administrative terms are attached to them and they are no longer in existence, so they are going through a tedious extreme process which Raglin opted to share a few pages with the committee about how they are changing the administrative titles to fit with these policies regarding the new university structure. The other thing they are going to develop is a policy blocker which is some kind of web base/net base site, where it would have all the updates of policies and back drafts of much older policies so you can compare them. They will not have administrative procedures which they distinguish from the policies. Finally they constituted a merger reorganization elimination committee. Jack has the list of members available if anyone is interested in seeing it.

E. **Faculty Productivity Policy - Table**

4. **New Business**

   A. **Dean’s Transition Committees Report**
      - The Dean indicated that we are getting close to certainly some discussion and potentially some decision points relating to the configurations around the transformation in the school.
      - He would like to send a vision proposal up the chain of command sometime in February.
      - We need to find time in December where we can start coming to more formal resolution on some of the issues.
      - There are 4 issues and 2 which are more important. They are:
         1. Full discussions with Dean’s Associates and retreat groups on new degrees/revised degrees.
         2. Reconfiguration of departments
         These two are of most importance because they are Academic Council issues and they are particularly important for accreditation, therefore they have to go into our visioning statement for approval by the Trustees before we move ahead.
         3. The location of Centers Institutes and Auxiliaries
         4. Staffing patterns
         These two are not required for accreditation.
- The Dean will meet with those groups to discuss staff configurations over the next semester.
- The Dean will have discussions with the Centers Institutes and Auxiliaries also. Where they have overlap with the academic structure then we need to bring to formal resolution here.
- The passed out and discussed the following documents:
  - New & Revised Degrees
  - Degrees at the MPH level
  - Degrees at the Doctoral level
  - Master of Public Health degrees (matrix for master’s and doctorate)
  - Master of Public Health degrees (regular form)
- The Dean’s Associates are made up of people that are fairly prominent across our fields.
- They did not talk much about degrees
- For accreditation, there are 5 areas that require degrees which are slightly different from the master’s and doctoral level. Those 5 are:
  - Health Administration
  - Biostatistics
  - Epidemiology
  - Behavioral Social Sciences
  - Environmental Health
- A school of Public Health has to have at least 3 doctoral degrees in those 5 areas. In those 3 areas where there are doctoral degrees, there needs to be 5 full time faculty members, not necessarily tenured faculty, but a mixture of faculty, in which our lexicon would be lecturers, clinical appointments, clinical professors, and tenured track professors. According to the group that got together, they suggested 4 doctoral programs.
- The Dean proceeded to go over the spreadsheets
- The Dean will eventually ask for a vote from the Academic Council Committee to confirm degrees we will want to have.
- Regarding the master’s degrees, the Transition team is giving advice about this as well as the Dean’s Associates. The consensus is that this looks good to senior faculty who are on the transition team, so this is another piece of information the Academic Council Committee should have.
- If we go with the things that are more known to CEPH and we are accredited, then CEPH is not going to come back and look at us for how many years we get accredited, whether it be 5 or 7 years, hopefully at least 5, and the degrees we develop after that, are not going to come under scrutiny in the first accreditation, so we have a lot of additional years to really refine them.
- One of the things that will make our school unique is if we think beyond the fact that the organizing principal isn’t anchored into our discipline or our guild if you will, but anchored towards our professional aspirations.
- The Dean will be eventually asking for an endorsement of the clusters to form into our departments.
- The Dean intends to send everything out, which includes everything you have gotten today to faculty, students and staff for another round of commentary.
- He would like to move in December to an endorsement so that we can move ahead with these to start a process for departmental reconfiguration around clusters which seems to be fairly uniformly supported by majority and develop the degrees that we need to, so that we can propose them to the ICHE (Indiana Commission for Higher Education), with the idea of bringing this all to President McRobbie and the IU Board of Trustees by February and by the latest in April
- Naming issues including renaming some of these areas, departments and school needs to be named. Once we can agree on this, hopefully in December, then the Dean sees a series of retreats or workshops around name structures and once we do that, he will start putting a vision statement together, which we can then all look at and approve, then he can start sending it up the line sometime in February.

5. Old Business

A. HPER Promotion Procedures (see new attachment)
- Tenure and promotion document updated and revised according to our discussion from the last meeting
- Changes were discussed to the Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor document and changes will be made and resubmitted to the committee.
- It was suggested by D. Lohrmann that perhaps the policy from a year ago should be updated, so that it is consistent.
- J. Raglin brought the discussion to the table again.
- J. Raglin stated that an email from faculty had been sent to him suggesting alternatives.
- It was suggested for a statement to be added that for committee members to recues themselves, they must have written permission from the Executive Associate Dean.
  There is consensus that it is too authoritative.
- S. Young stated that sufficient cause needs to be explained a little bit more.
- J. Raglin suggested that if a committee member feels uncomfortable dealing with that for any reason that is sufficient cause. J. Raglin explained what sufficient cause could entail, such as, I published with this person, my relationship is too close, etc.
  At the university level all they have to do is say, “I’d rather not be on this committee” and they do not ask because sometimes the sufficient cause comes to a sensitive nature, to have them air that out in a written document which can be problematic.
- If too many people recues themselves, we will have to revisit this.
- Another issue that was mentioned was that if someone recueses himself, he can no longer be on the committee. J. Raglin stated that this is problematic if you have 4 or 5 people recuesing themselves for a single individual. It should be on a case by case basis.
- Every Full Professor in the school has to serve.
David Lohrmann moved to remove this topic from the table.
Bob Billingham – 2nd
All in Favor - Unanimous

Quorum – Yes
Call to Question – Bob Billingham
Motion was made by David Lohrmann and 2nd by Lynn Jamieson
All in Favor – Unanimous

B. Vacation Policy (attachment from previous meeting) – NO DISCUSSION

K. Gilbert moved to adjourn. L. Jamieson second.
Meeting adjourned.