SCHOOL OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Meeting Minutes
1:15-2:30 PM, January 28, 2011

Members Present: Facilitator – S. Young
Bob Billingham, Katie Grove, Lesa Huber, Lynn Jamieson, Michael Reece, Liz Shea, Joel Stager, Marieke Van Puymbroeck, Jerry Wilkerson

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

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from 01/14/11
   L. Jamieson – Moved to accept minutes
   M. Reece – 2nd
   All in Favor – Unanimous

3. Standing Committee Reports
   A. Undergraduate Studies Committee – No Report
   B. Graduate Studies Committee – J. Wilkerson
      ➢ Jerry shared news that a surplus of leftover fellowship money was divided among the four departments in the amount of $15,000.
   C. Budgetary Advisory Committee – No Report
      ➢ Lynn indicated that the BAC needs to be advised by the AC as to how they should move forward in working with Dean Torabi. At this point it is not necessary to meet, but at some point the committee may need to.
   D. Bloomington Faculty Council – No Report
      ➢ Jack Raglin is on sabbatical so the school needs an alternate to attend BFC meetings. Jerry will find out the appropriate steps we must take to have a substitute representative attend these meetings.
   E. SPH Progress Update – MPH Leadership Team – M. Reece
      ➢ Michael reported the team had a great meeting January 21 with the Executive Director of the Council of Education for Public Health (CEPH), Laura King, receiving a lot of clarification around issues of the timeline, the school’s transition, curricular requirements, and other basic issues the faculty had been asking about for a long time.
      ➢ On January 27, the Chairs approved the proposed course sequencing and identified the new courses to be added across the school in order to get the 5 MPH degrees/programs up and running.
      ➢ The team has been making a lot of progress establishing curricular structure, giving input into the timeline for the transition, particularly as it relates to CEPH accreditation. As a
result, the goal of the team, which was to have students beginning each of the 5 MPH programs this fall, will likely be realized!

- The MPH Leadership Team hosted a brown bag lunch session today inviting all faculty and staff in the school. Approximately 30 people attended and initiated discussions about additional MPH degrees in other departments, like RPTS and Kinesiology.
- One final thing Michael stated about the transition was the leadership team’s suggestion to the transition team that there are processes that need to be driven by accreditation as well as processes that are driven by the changes taking place in HPER. While the MPH Leadership team is overseeing the timeline driven by accreditation, the Council needs to remain involved regarding the changes taking place in HPER, because faculty are still wanting to have conversations about things such as what their department is going to be called and are we going to address reorganization? What is this council’s role in persisting with the Dean and Department Chairs to not let these conversations cease? The MPH Leadership team is recommending that they are not the group to deal with those kind of HPER processes and think AC needs to step up to start pushing for these discussions regarding matters in the school. Additionally, the MPH Leadership Team advised the transition team to add another layer to the transition plan which focuses upon university administration tasks. The fact of the matter is, that unless President McRobbie is ready to submit an application to the CEPH in the fall, all our current timelines are off. This calls for adding yet a third layer involving the IU administration so we have a good understanding of when the President will submit the formal application.
- Sarah added that faculty can expect to receive the next edition of the transition plan this afternoon (January 28) and shared a timeline received today from Steve Wolter. According to the timeline the transition team will cease to exist by the end of February. The transition team is also asking for the AC to provide internal procedures to the timeline, which is what Michael was talking about as well as the parking lot issues discussed at the brown bag today.
- Michael suggested that at our February 11 meeting the AC spend time creating our own list of "parking lot" issues, as we all have a good sense of the issues that have never been resolved and finding a time to get with the Dean on who is handling these issues.
- It was also agreed upon that the AC did not want to have a special evening meeting on February 16 with the transition team, but to finalize the transition plan during regularly scheduled meetings on February 11 and 25.

4. **Old Business**
   A. **Academic Specialist Review Process – S. Young**

- Sarah reminded the AC members that at our last meeting we discussed council members meet with the Academic Specialists in their respective departments as well as talking to their Chairs to discover/develop a consistent process that would be workable across the school for these positions. It was emphasized that the AC was not asking for the criteria on which Academic Specialists are evaluated, but the process by which they should go through.
Marieke shared that she spoke with one of the Academic Specialist in RPTS and it was her understanding the probationary period was 3 years for the school and 7 years across the university.

Jerry clarified that was not correct and explained that Academic Specialists now have 7 years probationary time across the board with the evaluation period beginning in the 6th year.

Marieke indicated that this particular Academic Specialist had not been evaluated at all, but had done the Faculty Annual Report (FAR). However, there had not been any feedback provided for this Academic Specialist. Are FAR’s required for Academic Specialists? What is expected and what kind of feedback is expected?

Jerry shared that this is exactly the problem! The School of HPER needs a procedure or process that states plainly what steps are involved for the annual evaluation of Academic Specialists.

It was suggested that the steps outlined for lecturers might be a good guideline to also follow for Academic Specialists. Jerry will pull out the lecturer information and modify it to fit Academic Specialists and send it to the AC electronically. Sarah indicated she would work with Jerry on getting this accomplished. Sarah also mentioned the AC should be ready to vote on the Academic Specialist Review process at our February 11th meeting.

B. Associate Dean Administrative Review

Bob Billingham – moved to open up for discussion
Lynn Jamieson – 2nd

Sarah asked if there were any changes that the AC would like to see made to this document?

It was discussed that this review occurs in the 4th year and that should be added under policy details.

Further discussion was had by the AC regarding this policy and there were several changes made. Sarah said that she would make all necessary changes and get the revised policy on the books.

Michael Reece – Moved to accept the policy as amended
K. Grove – 2nd

All in Favor – Unanimous

C. AC Position Descriptions

Sarah passed out a document briefly describing the duties of the positions of AC chair, parliamentarian, and BAC chair. This is the result of a comment from Dave Lohrmann last fall when he asked that we provide the descriptions of the leadership positions for AC. This was for information purposes only and not meant to be an action item.
5. New Business  
A. Allocation of Space in Courtyard Project – David Skirvin  
- David gave an update of the progress on the courtyard project. He recapped what will be in the new courtyard, such as office space, lab and auditorium.  
- He indicated that the Courtyard Project is supposed to be complete in April, but that it will probably not be completely finished until June.  
- He also mentioned that as it gets closer, faculty and staff can go to their Department Chairs to ask further questions as they meet with Dean Torabi to finalize who will be occupying offices in this area.

B. Collection of Student Data – AHS – B. Billingham & M. Reece  
- Michael reported in the data collection about students within the department of AHS in conjunction with the CEPH process, it has become apparent the School of HPER has no reasonably secure infrastructure for the management of student-related data (i.e., race, ethnicity and accurate numbers of enrollments), particularly when it comes to graduate students. As a result, AHS asked Michael Reece and Bob Billingham to request the following of the AC:  
  1) To stress to the Dean that we do need to start taking this issue seriously and perhaps even bringing in someone at the university level (e.g. Brad Wheeler), who could help our school to start thinking strategically about how we will create a data infrastructure that is of the caliber to meet the CEPH accreditation and;  
  2) Given that the staff who implement those data systems, fall under the supervision of the Executive Associate Dean, that the search committee being formed this semester for that position, consider applicants who will make it a top priority to get the data management system set up at a new level.

6. Announcements  
A. Updated HPER Constitution - Sarah handed out the latest version of the HPER Constitution so they everyone on the AC would have a copy. They may share it with others in their department.

B. Program Review – Will discuss at next meeting

Sarah asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

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

Meeting Adjourned – 2:30 p.m.