Members Present: Facilitator – S. Young
Bob Billingham, Georgia Frey for (Liz Shea), Katie Grove for (Jack Raglin), Lesa Huber-Lorenzen, Lynn Jamieson, Michael Reece, Marieke Van Puymbroeck, Jerry Wilkerson

Absent: Joel Stager

1. Approval of Agenda
   M. Van Puymbroeck - Moved to accept agenda
   L. Jamieson – 2nd
   All in Favor – Unanimous

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from 12/10/10
   L. Jamieson – Moved to accept minutes
   M. Van Puymbroeck – 2nd
   All in Favor – Unanimous

3. Dean Torabi Comments – Sarah invited Dean Torabi to address the AC at their first meeting of the spring semester:
   ➢ Dean Torabi thanked the Academic Council for all they do. He wants to make sure that all programs are protected in each department and has already spoken with the Executive Director of CEPH and has been assured that basically all of the departments can be a part of the School of Public Health although there will be minor curriculum adjustments that must be made.
   ➢ Dean Torabi also reemphasized that in order to be a School of Public Health, they have to have 3 Ph.D.’s and 5 MPH concentrations. The Ph.D.’s have gone through the channels including the school level and have been approved by the Board of Trustees and now are waiting for approval through the Indiana Commission of Higher Education. Michael Reece is chairing the MPH Leadership Team and all core MPH degrees have been approved at the school level. Additionally, he encouraged RPTS to develop an MPH in their department.
   ➢ Dean Torabi updated the Academic Council regarding where things stand with the budget. In an attempt to save the school money, he has decided not to hire a Global Health Associate Dean at this time and has delayed an external search for an Executive Associate Dean, preferring to look internally to fill the position. Other searches within departments will continue to move forward, as those positions have been allocated for in the budget. He has also cancelled the HIRONS contract for marketing the SPH.
   ➢ Dean Torabi has asked David Skirvin, Assistant Dean of Management, to work with the Academic Council regarding space pertaining to the Courtyard project. He has asked him to solicit input regarding space.
He asked Jerry to stay on in the position of Executive Associate Dean until her Retirement, to which she graciously agreed to do.

4. Standing Committee Reports
   A. Undergraduate Studies Committee – No Report
   B. Graduate Studies Committee – No Report
      ➢ Michael Reece had a comment regarding his disappointment that it has been almost 2 years since a proposal has gone out of the AHS department that the School of HPER consider being a little bit more flexible with its competence of the doctoral exam policy.
      ➢ Jerry Wilkerson stated that it had been approved, but Michael stated that it had no notification of a change. The problem seems to be that the graduate coordinators have failed report back to their respective departments.
      ➢ Jerry said that she would go back and look at the minutes from this committee, get back with Michael on this issue, and will also talk to the graduate coordinators about their dissemination of information.
   C. Budgetary Advisory Committee – No Report
   D. Bloomington Faculty Council – No Report
      ➢ Sarah asked Georgia Frey to follow up with David Koceja regarding who should be the BFC representative since Jack Raglin is on sabbatical this semester.
   E. SPH Progress Update – MPH Leadership Team – M. Reece
      ➢ Michael reported that the group has been making incredible progress with the curricula infrastructure for the 5 MPH concentrations in place.
      ➢ Michael also indicated that the group had met this past week finalizing the competencies and assigning those to the actual courses. They have been looking at course sequencing in terms of when courses would be offered across the school.
      ➢ One of the issues the group is struggling with now is that to put this into place, they will have to offer some courses more often than they are currently, for example the Epidemiology coursework has currently only been taught in the Spring by Applied Health Sciences, but it will now have to be offered every semester.
      ➢ With the competencies and tab sheets are in place and approved, the next big issue will be who counts as SPH faculty. It is critical that the 11 positions that are currently underway are filled with outstanding people.
      ➢ Because the MPH Leadership Team has been assembled, Michael was certain that everything can be completed by April as planned.
      ➢ A few members of the team met this morning to go over the transition timeline posted in the Royer Foyer. What started out to be pretty disorganized, has ended up as very positive in that they all walked away having a better understanding of what the timeline should look like in order for the School of Public Health to be formed.
      ➢ One of the things the group did ask for this morning and Michael already mentioned to Dean Torabi, is that a lot of the timeline for starting the accreditation process is dictated by where we currently stand in terms of approvals from IU administration. Until approval
comes from CHE on the new Ph. D’s, the whole notion of notifying CEPH is irrelevant. The MPH Team would appreciate insight into this process to help clarify the next steps.

Michael explained that approval will be sought in May to expand our current MPH program with CEPH likely approving that expansion at their June meeting. Once approval is received, the summer and early fall can be used to work on our application, which is a notification of intent to transition. With a fall application approval, we will have two years to submit our self-study. The MPH Team is meeting with the Executive Director of CEPH next Friday afternoon and will go into this meeting with 4 agenda items: 1) Provide CEPH ED with a status update on what they have been doing, how they have been working toward the expansion of the program, and ask if she has any concerns; 2) Present a proposed timeline and give her the opportunity to critique it to help alleviate misinterpretations; 3) Ask what her thoughts are on a good configuration of departments in terms of the 5 concentration areas; and, 4) Ask her what she thinks the future of undergraduate education will look like down the road with this transition to a School of Public Health.

It was suggested that Michael also inquire as to what the future of graduate education will look like down the road with this transition.

The transition planning group has taken the MPH Leadership Team’s advice to split the timeline into two sections, one being a CEPH driven timeline, and the second being internal procedures. The MPH Team would like for Academic Council take control of the internal procedures timeline discussing what those internal processes might be and what impact those might have upon the organization of the new SPH.

5. Old Business
   A. Academic Specialist Review Process – AC members to report back – TABLED (until next meeting due to fact that departments may not have met yet)
      ➢ This will enable AC members time to talk with their Chairs in their respective areas/departments, to see where they are in terms of processes and whether they think the process is fair or whether they feel like changes need to be made to that process.
      ➢ Sarah will check with Environmental Health for representation of new faculty members added to their department who can represent them at Academic Council.

   B. Associate Dean Administrative Review – TABLED (until next meeting)

6. New Business
   A. Allocation of Space in Courtyard Project – David Skirvin – TABLED (until next meeting)

7. Announcements – J. Wilkerson
   ➢ Jerry announced a request from department chairs for a calendar of accreditations in order to determine which programs will need to be reviewed. As has been reported previously, the entire university will be undergoing program review. Yet, an accreditation exempts a program
or curriculum from doing a program review at the university level. At this time, the program review is primarily focused upon undergraduate programs and curricula. Jerry distributed the guidelines for program review and indicated that department chairs also received those guidelines.

- Central to the program review are learning outcomes for courses which connect to the program objectives which match the missions of the department, school, and university. Additionally, evidence of student learning is critical.
- To assist our faculty in preparing for this and accomplishing these tasks a learning outcomes development workshop will be held on March 25, 2011 by faculty within the school who have learned how to train others on how developing learning outcomes. The attendees of this workshop are then to find another faculty colleague interested in developing learning outcomes and train them. Through a snowball effect the idea is to cover all the courses within our school to include learning outcomes.

Sarah asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

L. Jamieson - motioned for meeting to be adjourned
B. Billingham – 2nd

Meeting Adjourned – 2:30 p.m.