Members Present: Facilitator – S. Young
Bob Billingham, Lynn Jamieson, David Lohrmann, Liz Shea, Joel Stager, Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin (for Michael Reece), Doug Knapp (for Marieke Van Puymbroeck), Jerry Wilkerson

Absent: Jack Raglin

1. Approval of Agenda (with Additional Agenda Item)
   - S. Young added a report from the Agenda Committee to the agenda.

   B. Billingham - moved to accept the agenda as amended
   L. Jamieson – 2nd
   All in Favor – Unanimous

2. Approval of Minutes from September 24, 2010 (with Amendment)
   - D. Lohrmann asked that amendment be made to the first line of the Approval of Agenda section to read at the end of the first sentence, “at the request of the Applied Health Science faculty.”

   D. Lohrmann – moved to accept the minutes as amended
   L. Jamieson - 2nd
   All in Favor – Unanimous

3. Standing Committee Reports

   A. Undergraduate Studies Committee: D. Knapp
      - There was a discussion on the health education minor.
      - There was discussion on the distance education certificate. The courses will go through the system before the tab sheet will be voted on.

   B. Graduate Studies Committee: D. Lohrmann (No Report)
   C. Budgetary Advisory Committee: L. Jamieson (No Report)
   D. Bloomington Faculty Council: No Report
   E. SPH Progress Update – MRE Report: L. Jamieson
      - The MRE Committee asked to have individual interviews with various people. Their first interview was to be held with Jack Raglin.
      - MRE is meeting next week to review the remonstrance information and the results of the two meetings.
F. **Agenda Committee: B. Billingham**
   - Sarah Young, Lynn Jamieson and Bob Billingham met with Dean Goodman. The main three items of discussion were as follows:
     1. There are many policies that need to be updated and put on the SIP. They were already aware of that. This is an ongoing process.
     2. Dean Goodman would like for the Academic Council to start grappling with the by-laws of the school (the new Constitution).
     3. The most important item of discussion was the integration of the new school and the Academic Council’s role in terms of smoothing over the rough edges in terms of people not being happy with where they are assigned. Dean Goodman stated that the decision is to be made in “organizational logic”.

   - Dean Goodman emphasized the fact the other departments, other schools, other programs are coming to the School of HPER because they are very interested in the this new direction that the school is going in and they are proposing joint or cooperative programs with our school.

4. **Old Business**
   A. **Dept. of Environmental Health Involvement with AC – S. Young**
      - At our September 24 meeting, the council voted to allow one ex-officio member from the Department of Environmental Health to attend AC meetings for this academic year. This decision was based upon the following reasons:
        1. To serve on AC, a department representative must meet eligibility requirements, specified in the Constitution, for being a voting member of the HPER faculty.
        2. Currently, the Department of Environmental Health does not have any faculty members (which the exception of the chair, who as an administrator, is not eligible to serve) who meet the criteria for being a voting member of the HPER faculty.
        3. To allow a non-eligible person to serve as a voting member of the AC would violate the HPER Constitution and would call any motions and resolutions passed by AC into question.

      - It has been suggested that our decision is perceived as excluding Environmental Health. There was discussion and general consensus that the HPER Constitution must be followed as it continues to be the School of HPER governance document in effect until a full transition to a school of public health occurs.

      - D. Lohrmann drafted an amendment to the constitution to include language that specifically addressed the change from 9 to 12 voting members, along with the actual inclusion of the department name of Environmental Health.
After a lengthy discussion, there was a motion by D. Lohrmann to initiate an amendment to the constitution to expand the AC membership to include the Department of Environmental Health. There was no second to the motion resulting in a failed motion.

B. Policies from the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Office

1. Sub-committee to develop Academic Specialist review process

- S. Young distributed two handouts, 1) the policy that AC passed for Academic Specialists in 2009, and 2) the Vice Provost proposal for all non-tenured track appointments. There are two issues the Council needs to address involving Academic Specialists:
  - First, there is a discrepancy between the university standards which provide a probationary period of seven years and the HPER policy which specifies a three year probationary period. Changes need to be made so that we are in line with the rest of the university.
  - The second issue is that we do not have a procedure for evaluation of Academic Specialists.
  - It was suggested that a task force ought to be formed to look at these issues, specifically focusing upon consistency with university policy and creating a review process. The deadline for completing this task is the end of the fall semester, as the process will be implemented in January, 2011 for Academic Specialists who need to be reviewed.
  - Bob Billingham volunteered for Applied Health Science, Jack Raglin was volunteered for Kinesiology, and Lynn Jamieson volunteered for RPTS.

C. Protocol for receiving & hearing remonstrances & grievances

- The charge of the AC this fall semester is to establish a protocol for receiving input from individuals or groups of individuals within the school who are concerned or have a disagreement with how they have been aligned in the transition document, where the four departments have been identified.
- Sarah asked L. Jamieson who sits on the MRE to share their step-by-step process rather than re-invent the wheel.
- It was suggested that we start by asking people to write a letter outlining their arguments, giving the council a chance to read. The next step could be inviting concerned parties and stakeholders to the meeting to ask questions and perhaps restate their case. Upon hearing from concerned stakeholders, the council would make a recommendation to the Dean based upon evidence provided and organizational logic (i.e., what is best for the school). Beyond organizational logic, other considerations include impacts on accreditation, on students currently enrolled in the program, the nature of responsibilities for the faculty members, and the impact of graduate versus undergraduate programs.
- In the first AC meeting of this year, the Dean suggested that we have input from all stakeholders, including the Chair from the department to which they are being assigned,
the Chair from their current department, the Dean, and possibly, alumni. It was suggested that hearings should not involve the Dean until our recommendation is written and complete since he has the final authority on each decision.

Sarah suggested that she draft a process and have that ready for the next meeting for the council to look at and discuss further.

5. New Business
   A. SPH Constitution Task Force (TABLED)
   B. Job Description for AC Chair, Chair of BAC, and AC Parliamentarian (TABLED)
   C. Academic Associate Dean Administrative Review (TABLED)

D. Knapp - moved for meeting to be adjourned
B. Billingham – 2nd

Meeting Adjourned – 2:40 p.m.
Motion to Amend Constitution of the
School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation

Rationale: Under the proposed plan for transition of the School of HPER into a school of public health, a fourth department, Environmental Health, will be constituted and is to have equal status with the existing three departments. When this occurs, faculty members in that department should have full representation on the HPER Academic Council.

The purpose of this motion is to facilitate such representation by formally amending the Constitution of the School of HPER. According to the School of HPER Constitution, this motion to amend the Constitution can be initiated by a majority vote of Academic Council. The Presiding Officer (Dean) must call a special faculty meeting of the school within three weeks to discuss the amendment. Thereafter, a vote of all eligible members must be conducted within 30 days.

Motion

Moved that membership on the School of HPER Academic Council be expanded in accordance with the following three interrelated conditions.

1. Amend Article VI. Academic Council of the Constitution of the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation to read:

   A. Membership. The Academic Council shall consist of members as follows:
      1. Twelve (12) voting members, three (3) each elected from the Departments of Applied Health Science, Environmental Health, Kinesiology, and Recreation, Park and Tourism Studies.

2. This amendment shall go into effect only when the Department of Environmental Health is officially recognized by Indiana University as a formally constituted academic unit within the School of HPER.

3. This amendment shall go into effect only when at least two eligible voting members of the School of HPER are officially (i.e., in writing) assigned by new hire and/or by transfer from existing departments, to a duly recognized Department of Environmental Health; only faculty members who meet the criteria for voting membership under Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution are eligible to serve on the Academic Council as representatives of the Department of Environmental Health.