Members Present: Facilitator – Sarah Young
Kathleen Gilbert for (Michael Reece), Lesa Lorenzen-Huber, Lynn Jamieson, Jack Raglin, Dong Chul Seo for (Bob Billingham), Liz Shea, Joel Stager, Marieke Van Puymbroeck

1. Approval of Agenda
   L. Jamieson - moved to accept the agenda
   K. Gilbert – 2nd
   All in Favor – Unanimous

2. Update on Transition Plan – Drs. Compton & Lohrmann
   ➢ Sarah invited Drs. Compton and Lohrmann to the last AC meeting of the fall semester in order for them to provide the council with an update on the transition plan. Dr. Compton and Dr. Lohrmann are co-chairs for the Transition Plan Advisory group along with Steve Wolter serving as the facilitator for this process. Their charge by Interim Dean Torabi has been to develop a plan which provides guidance for how the school will transition to a SPH. Along with an advisory group selected from each department, they will also be working closely with the MPH leadership team initiated through the AC.
   ➢ Dr. Lohrmann shared that Dr. Torabi recently sent an email asking for faculty to complete a short questionnaire for the purpose of capturing and cataloging anything that faculty are doing across departments, across programs, institutes and centers related to public health. The rationale for doing this was to illustrate the school is not moving from something that we are not to something that we want to be, but that we are already doing research that is appropriate for a SPH and that our transition is simply a mini-step transition and not a huge leap of faith. He indicated this will help faculty and staff to see how they fit in to the School of Public Health, the definition of public health, the mission of public health and the central services of public health. He encouraged council members to spread the word and have faculty in their departments complete the questionnaire.
   ➢ Dr. Compton added this is a bottom up process, not a top down process and the advisory team will be engaging everyone in this process. The advisory group met this morning critically viewing the mission, vision and values of the school as well as data information that has already been collected. A SWOT analysis will be conducted not to reflect an end point but a beginning for our school. Faculty will have an opportunity to provide input regarding this process up through May 5, 2011, although there will be a short term deadline of January 17, 2011 in order to prepare a report to President McRobbie. The transition will take place until our school becomes accredited.
Dr. Lohrmann mentioned January 5th, 2011 as an opportunity for faculty and staff to convene and have input to the draft, to the milestones and so on. For those who cannot be there, some type of virtual input will be put together.

After December 15th another opportunity will be distributed for faculty and staff to participate in the SWOT analysis. A virtual process will be set up so that all faculty and staff will feel they are able to participate in this process even though we will be entering the semester break. The idea is to gather from the SWOT and other mechanisms information that would allow us to create some themes that might represent the new school and begin to use those themes to help in the positioning of our SPH in the state.

Marieke Van Puymbroeck asked where did the areas of focus in the evidence review come from in terms of the rural health focus? Did those come from your advisory committee or somewhere else?

Dr. Lohrmann answered that through the Indiana Department of Education (IDoE) voluntary self-assessments from local health departments of the 10 essential services of public health is available. IDoE compared the self-assessments of rural counties to urban counties and found there was no significant difference between rural and urban, but did show some real deficient areas regardless of rural or urban. Last year the University of Wisconsin released data of all the health measures of every county in the country by state. The suggestion from the advisory group was to get that data and analyze it based on rural and urban settings. Having done that, we identified the criteria used at the state health department resulting in 25 different measures. Rural was found to be significantly different on 16 of the 25. In terms of where does Indiana rank, the American Public Health Association has a rank in all of these measures and Indiana's rank is abysmal. The rural is significantly less healthy than the urban, but all Indiana residents are unhealthy compared to the rest of the nation.

Dr. Compton said the advisory group is seeking primary source documents and if anyone has primary source documents, whether from the federal or state government, etc., this would be very helpful. He is also working on a project involving active living, wellness and a built environment, so they will have primary source documents to help in completing this project.

Dr. Lohrmann said also shared they are considering the 5 or 6 priority health issues (i.e., tobacco, obesity, HIV/STDs, infant mortality and hospital transmitted infection or quality of health care) from the Indiana Department of Public Health. The advisory group wanted a broad perspective so the school could encompass wellness and well-being, mental health and social health as well as physical health issues.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 22, 2010

M. Van Puymbroeck – moved to accept the minutes
L. Jamieson - 2nd
In Favor – 7
Abstentions - 1
Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 12, 2010
L. Jamieson – moved to accept the minutes
M. Van Puymbroeck – 2nd
In Favor – 6
Abstentions – 2

4. Standing Committee Reports
A. Undergraduate Studies Committee – K. Gilbert:
   ➢ Kathy reported the UGS committee approved a name change of the fitness specialist major to health fitness specialist. This is a name change only as the content of the major will remain the same.
   ➢ They also had a discussion on general education and transfer credits. The committee voted to require students to take 6 general education credit hours on the Bloomington campus. What this means is while there may be students transferring in courses that match 31 credits of course work, they will still have to take 6 credits on the Bloomington campus. In other words, students cannot transfer the entire amount of credits.
   ➢ A sub-committee from UGS was formed to work with Stephanie Brown in the HPER IT office to update the HPER web site. Currently, the website is not consistent with some departmental websites. This problem will be remedied within the next few weeks and will help clarify curriculum issues for students.
   ➢ One other issue the UGS will be addressing is related to senior students who need to get into courses that are already filled. A related problem involves prerequisite courses already filled to capacity because other students enrolling in the course early on in their careers, or by non-major students enrolling in courses as electives. The UGS is going to identify which courses need to have hard prerequisites and other instructions in place to allow our majors to be able to complete coursework in a timely manner. Because 80% of the school's operating budget comes from undergraduate credit hours, it is crucial that UGS deal with these very important issues.

B. Graduate Studies Committee – J. Raglin:
   ➢ Jack Raglin reported the main agenda item was reviewing applicants. There was also a discussion about implementing a new English language proficiency test, but they did not vote on this yet, as this topic needed more discussion.

C. Budgetary Advisory Committee – L. Jamieson:
   ➢ Lynn Jamieson reported that the Budgetary Advisory Committee has not met since October, but she reported on a meeting of campus faculty representatives with Neil Theobald held on November 29. Neil Theobald indicated on the revenue side IU is doing well, but at the same time the expenditures for healthcare will continue to be a problem which will have a continual impact on whatever revenues the university receives. He anticipated a 2% cost of living raise. He indicated the State will not fund R&R in the
future yet the Bloomington campus needs $20 million in R&R, so that will likely come out of the base budget.

- While there is interest in funding higher education in the state legislature, they are defining higher education as community colleges leaving the four-year institutions lacking. As a result IU is not expecting any major increases in next years’ budget. Additionally, there is an expectation to hold down tuition.
- Budget hearings should be finished by late January, 2011. Dean Torabi has asked the Budgetary Advisory Committee to hold off in proceeding forward with the allocation of the $250,000, so that he can see where all the money is and is able to see what we have to work with.
- Lynn suggested that Dean Torabi call a State of the School address meeting near the end of January to discuss what our current budget situation is, and then we may be able to make reasonable input to our current budget. Sarah will follow up with Dean Torabi regarding whether he would be open to having the State of the School address meeting and additional questions regarding faculty being able to view the budget, etc.

D. Bloomington Faculty Council – J. Raglin:
- Jack reported there were three agenda items. The first was the vote to revise the BFC by-laws and constitution which passed. The intent of this action was to reinvigorate the BFC creating a higher profile. As a result there will be a revised executive committee, which Jack shared will be helpful. However, the new by-laws will not be implemented until 2012 or 2013.
- The second agenda item was a discussion about the healthcare assessment which has changed a lot. Individuals can now provide their own information from their personal physicians. There was a lot of concern about privacy issues, so that has been suspended at this time. Bruce Jacobs is going to head up a university-wide committee to look at this next semester to decide how the information should be perceived.
- The third agenda item was a professor of practice, which Jack believes will definitely be implemented. This is mainly for schools like SPEA and KSB who hire big-names of the business world or high-ranking government officials to teach yet they don’t have the traditional degree background. They will be on a 3-year contract, and then they will be reviewed at 3 years and would be on a rolling 5-year contract if approved. This is a fairly common practice as half of the Big Ten schools have these positions. It was a first read on the issue and there was a lot of feedback.

E. SPH Progress Update – MPH Leadership Team – Lynn Jamieson:
- Michael could not be at the meeting so he gave Sarah a written report to share with the Council. Sarah asked Lynn to share additional information since she was also at the group’s meeting.
- Lynn said the group is looking at the competencies for each of the concentrations and getting those ready so there will be core faculty in each group. It was helpful to get an
idea of how relative departments can contribute eventually or even develop a public health masters in their own department. The concentrations have all been approved, with the current focus upon developing necessary courses to be ready for incoming students in Fall 2011.

4. **Old Business**
   
   A. **HPER Constitution Amendment Vote**
   
   - Sarah Young shared with the council the results of the vote amending the HPER constitution.
   - **69% of eligible faculty voted** (i.e., 50 out of 72 eligible—tenure, tenure-track and clinical faculty). The vote was **45 in favor of the amendment and 5 against** which translated to 90% vote which passed the two-thirds majority requirement.
   - Sarah will follow up that the amendment is added into the HPER Constitution.

   B. **Academic Specialist Review process sub-committee**
   
   - Lynn Jamieson reported the sub-committee did not meet but she got feedback from Bob Billingham but not Jack Raglin who is the third member of the sub-committee.
   - Thinking out loud, Lynn wondered with the different roles and responsibilities of academic specialist positions in our school whether it was necessary to have these individuals go through a school-wide review process rather than being directed to the academic unit in which they work and have their chair conduct a typical annual review of their accomplishments.
   - Additionally, Lynn suggested a 3-year rolling contract as very important along with having the Chair of the department where the Academic Specialist resides conduct an annual review.
   - Jack Raglin stated the primary issue is whether the review should be at the discretion of the Chair or if it should be at a higher level, and whether that should be constituted by a committee or the Dean.
   - Sarah asked whether this is something the Academic Council wanted to take back to their respective departments and discuss with the Chairs and/or Academic Specialist in their departments? It was decided that AC members report back on this issue by our January 14th meeting.
   - Jack asked that Lynn send him a draft of the request, then once it is final, send it out the Academic Council members so that they can get it to their department Chairs. This needs to be accomplished prior to the January 14 meeting of the AC.

5. **New Business**

   A. **Associate Dean Administrative Review**
   
   - Sarah indicated that the council members should have received a copy of the Associate Dean Administrative Review Policy in their handouts. This is a draft of a policy review of the Associate Dean’s that took place last year when Jerry Wilkerson and David Koceja were reviewed. Since that group had no guiding documentation to follow, Kathy Gilbert
and Sarah Young drafted these guidelines to be considered as policy for future reviews. This is a first read and we will look to vote on this at our next meeting (i.e., January 14).

- Liz Shea asked if there was a policy when the Executive Associate Dean is out on leave for an interim person to be in place while that person is away. There is no such policy at this time. It was suggested by Kathy Gilbert that some type of protocol be put in place so that there is someone that is able to step in and fill that role if the existing Executive Associate Dean has to be out for a length of time. Sarah will discuss further with Dean Torabi.

- Joel Stager asked where things stand on having an approved IRB before students can have proposal meetings. He thought someone from Research Council (RC) was supposed to be following up on this. Dong Chul Seo mentioned the RC did have a meeting discussing this situation and came to a consensus that according to the current rule, it would be better to hold all the documents until the committee looks at the proposal, then they will send out all the documents at that time. Dong Chul said that the current rule has to be changed and can be done at the school level. Jack Raglin stated that it can be changed at the master’s level, but cannot be changed at the doctorate level. A recommendation from RC needs to be made to the Graduate Studies Committee then on to the Academic Council. Sarah will follow-up with Carrie Docherty (current RC chair) on this issue.

Sarah asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

J. Raglin - motioned for meeting to be adjourned
M. Van Puymbroeck – 2nd

Meeting Adjourned – 2:30 p.m.