Members Present: Facilitator – S. Young
David Lohrmann, Lesa Lorenzen- Huber (for Michael Reece), Marieke Van Puymbroeck, Joel Stager, Jack Raglin, Jerry Wilkerson, Lynn Jamieson, Liz Shea

1. **Dean Goodman remarks**

Dean Goodman presented two topics of discussion: a) the transition to School of Public Health; and, b) the general need to continue to put policies in place that are well-documented. In terms of transition, the most critical process that must be determined is the redress of any individual faculty member or unit within an existing department with issues regarding placement into a different department. In following the transition report which has gone to the Provost's office, the Academic Council will be the group hearing grievances, remonstrance’s or concerns. The Council must develop the procedures to receive and process these concerns very soon since it is possible these sort of requests will be forthcoming by the end of the fall semester.

The Dean encouraged the Council to develop a system identifying all the stakeholders who might have a concern and give them an opportunity to be heard. In terms of the Council’s decision on these cases, Dean Goodman would like a recommendation based upon either a vote or consensus. For any unambiguous vote/consensus, the Dean will follow Council’s recommendation. If the vote was 5 to 4, Dean Goodman would have leeway to make the decision, but would heavily favor the vote of the Council in making his decision. The Dean likened the Council’s role in this process to that of arbitrators in that there is some leeway for the Council and Dean to mediate back and forth. If there is a disagreement between the Council and the Dean on a particular case, the Dean would like for there to be clear communication in coming to a final decision.

Regarding policies, the Dean's office has been developing and documenting a number of policies over the last few years. The purpose of this process is to codify policies and post them on the SIP website so they are accessible and available for everyone within the School to view.

There was some discussion amongst council members and the Dean regarding these topics, but with time running out, the Dean excused himself and the council moved onto other business.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

   D. Lohrmann - motioned
   L. Jamieson – 2\(^{nd}\)
   All in Favor – Unanimous
3. Approval of Minutes from April 23, 2010 (w/Amendment) - Attached
   D. Lohrmann – motioned
   J. Raglin - 2nd
   All in Favor – Unanimous

4. Standing Committee Reports

   A. Undergraduate Studies Committee: Met earlier in the day (9/10/10) but had no action items
   B. Graduate Studies Committee: No Report
   C. Budgetary Affairs Committee: Sarah asked for a clarification as to who was on the BAC. Lynn Jamieson, Liz Shea, and Michael Reece are the AC representatives for BAC. The Research Council and Professional Service & Delivery Council are also represented along with an undergraduate and graduate student. Sarah will make arrangements with David Skirvin as ex officio for this committee’s first meeting where they will elect a chair, and then move on with their business. David Lohrmann produced a document detailing the responsibilities of the BAC, which Sarah will distribute to BAC members at their first meeting.
   D. Bloomington Faculty Council: J. Raglin
      ➢ There was long discussion by the BFC regarding their own restructuring of the Council. They have come up with a format based on the University of Minnesota’s model where the agenda committee will be expanded to an executive committee with more frequent meetings. The President would be elected with a different process. If they do all this, will it really make a big difference?
      ➢ There was also discussion about the charge of the MRE committee. Jack spoke with the Chair afterwards because he thought the charge of the MRE seemed like they only met if there were University-wide remonstrances. The Chair was in agreement with Jack that the nature of the remonstrance can be down to the level of an individual. Their charge is fairly nebulous and is designed to be that way because typically they don’t deal with remonstrance’s regarding the reorganization of entire schools. They are used to dealing with individuals who have grievances when they are being shifted from one unit to another. The Chair was also in agreement that the September 30th deadline was simply a matter of getting some documentation or notice even as informal as an email saying I would like to meet with the committee. Jack also told him about our process, which will be very valuable because MRE simply indicates a "yes/ no" decision. The AC process can come up with ideas/suggestions to solve our own problems.
      ➢ Jerry passed out a program review sheet entailing units and programs for the Academic Council’s information.
E. SPH Progress Update – MRE Report: L. Jamieson
   ➢ Two things that have to happen this year are:
     1. School Proposal and
     2. Writing up policies and guidelines in a better way because we expect that the committee will have to address the University reorganization

5. Old Business
   A. Policies from the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Office
      ➢ Sub-committee to develop Academic-Specialist review process – TABLED until 9/24/10

6. New Business
   A. AC Agenda Committee – AC Chair + 1 representative/department
      Volunteers are: L. Jamieson, J. Raglin, B. Billingham & S. Young
   B. HPER Grievance Committee – 1 representative/department
      Volunteers are: M. Van Puymbroeck, L. Shea & M. Reece
   C. Department of Environmental Health involvement with Academic Council – TABLED UNTIL 9/24/10
      ➢ Possibly invite an Ex-Officio from Environmental Health until someone is selected to represent that department on a regular basis. Sarah will do this before the next AC meeting scheduled on 9/24/10.

➢ David Lohrmann discussed the idea of developing a document that has job descriptions of the various groups, offices and Academic Council, the Chair, the representatives of the Budgetary Advisory Committee, the Chair of Budgetary Advisory Committee, Secretary of AAC and maybe a Parliamentarian.
   ➢ Having a brief description with timelines and duties would be helpful.
   ➢ Additional comments were made
   ➢ Sarah asked for any final comments or remarks before adjourning the meeting. There were none.
   ➢ Sarah asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting

Meeting Adjourned – 2:40 p.m.