1. Approval of Agenda
   B. Billingham - Moved to accept agenda
   L. Lorenzen-Huber – 2nd
   All in Favor - Unanimous

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from 01/28/11
   L. Jamieson – Moved to accept minutes
   B. Billingham – 2nd
   All in Favor – Unanimous

3. Standing Committee Reports
   A. Undergraduate Studies Committee – L. Lorenzen-Huber & J. Wilkerson
      ➢ Lesa reported a slight error with the way the GenEd courses were set up—the math and
        natural science categories were set up so students would take all math courses but no
        science. This means each department in the school now has to recheck tab sheets so
        that students have to take at least one science course.
      ➢ An issue discussed involved transfer students being admitted with 2.4 GPA into
        programs requiring 2.5, 2.6, or 2.8 GPA. The committee is working on a procedure for all
        students to go through university division before being admitted to HPER except for
        transfer student direct admits and accelerated students. Additionally, the committee is
        working on a way to fast-track those students meeting the requirements for HPER
        programs for which they desire admission.
   B. Graduate Studies Committee – No Report

   C. Budgetary Advisory Committee – L. Jamieson
      ➢ Lynn reported the BAC met with Dean Torabi March 7. He gave an overview of the
        budget as he sees it at this point and the BAC discussed how faculty and staff are
        interested in obtaining a more clear idea of where the budget in the school stands. Dean
        Torabi is working on budget approval for additional support for some departments and
        getting documentation ready for CEPH, etc. He asked whether the group would like to
        have a Dean’s update meeting in May or September. As a result, Lynn asked the
Academic Council which time frame would be best in terms of the kind of information people want or need.

- Marieke asked that AC members talk with their departments as to the information they would be interested in having Dean Torabi discuss. In turn, AC will discuss at the next meeting, and finalize our recommendation to Dean Torabi for when this meeting should take place.

- Lynn also reported the CEPH accreditation requires that BAC show budgetary oversight of the School of Public Health budget. As a result, BAC was tasked with the responsibility to develop the process for input consultation.

- BAC talked about linkage to development, and asked to have a representative from the Office of Advancement on the BAC. There was a commentary that faculty and staff within the school really have no clue as to what is going on in the Office of Advancement. Additionally, donations are down considerably which is a concern. In past years there were development people who would work with departments, so the question was asked if there is a mechanism for accomplishing a better working relationship between departments and OA.

**D. Bloomington Faculty Council – Carrie Docherty**

- Carrie shared three major items discussed at last BFC meeting. The first was a request for an exemption from the IU Bloomington general education requirement by the nursing program. Apparently the nursing program is not housed in any one IU school, but can occur at any of the branch campuses, although the bachelor degree is an IUB degree. This was tabled because BFC needed more information to really make a good decision.

- Secondly, a recommendation was made to become a part of the liberal education in America’s Promise Initiative, which is also known as a LEAP Institution. Generally there was little interest in becoming a LEAP Institution because most of the large state schools are not, while a lot of the smaller schools are. This program is at its infancy at this point and BFC was gathering more information.

- The last thing was the Merger/Reorganization/Elimination Policy Committee is being completely revised primarily as a result of what happened at HPER last year. Initially the procedures, created back in the 80’s for a specific issue, were very unclear and had never been revisited. There will no longer be a standing committee, but instead something will be created as needed by the people requiring it. They are really trying to make it more faculty-driven than administrator-driven, because they do not want changes to be initiated only from a Dean in the event that other stakeholders would be interested in initiating changes.

**E. SPH Progress Update – MPH Leadership Team/Internal MRE Task Force – M. Van Puymbroeck**

- Michael Reece sent an update that the MPH Leadership Team has finalized the competencies for all expanded concentrations, which is a major requirement for the upcoming deadline.
The team is working on a by-laws document which describes how the MPH process is managed across departments and hope this will be a good starting point for something that helps deal with curricular management issues at the level of the school. This is an important document, not only because CEPH requires it for our report to them in May, but also because it will be the first such document that will address how we manage programs that cut across multiple departments. We are involving the Budgetary Advisory Committee in this process because there are financially related issues.

A major priority for the team’s next meeting is to start discussing how we define the core faculty across departments who contribute to the program.

There are two MPH brown bags with the one in March addressing how CEPH requires assessment of competency attainment for all MPH students. April’s meeting will be an update on the team’s progress thus far. Perhaps an important one will be the goal to keep the school in the loop on all the progress we have made.

Finally, other departments have started thinking of their new MPH’s. RPTS has already drafted one that has actually been initially approved through the department and they have developed competencies and have assigned classes and will now go to the next step.

Jerry mentioned the Commission for Higher Education is meeting right now to review our two doctoral programs necessary to have a School of Public Health.

Marieke mentioned the MRE internal task force, which is made up of Sarah Young, Lynn Jamieson, Michael Reece and Bob Billingham will meet after spring break and be contacted by Sarah.

3. **Old Business**
   A. **IRB Approval for Graduate Students**
      - Marieke reminded the council that at our last meeting we decided for first read providing time to go back to our departments to discuss and then vote on it at today’s meeting. Carrie is here representing the research council and can answer any questions about the document.
      - Marieke asked if there was any discussion regarding the policies and procedures for the masters and doctoral students.
      - Jerry indicated that there will be no proposal meeting until the committee has been approved and then IRB approved will be submitted.
      - The six month waiting period will not start until all three documents (i.e., committee form, proposal, and IRB approval) go across campus.

   **L. Jamieson – Moved to Accept Changes to IRB Approval for Graduate Students**
   **B. Billingham – 2nd**
   **All in Favor - Unanimous**
B. Update from Departments on Program Movement – M. Van Puymbroeck

- Marieke reminded everyone to talk to our departments about department structure and if there was a need for or a desire for change.
- Georgia Frey shared that her department is preparing for an external departmental review, and will talk about movement after that.
- Bob Billingham shared that AHS had their meeting today and one of their faculty suggested most of the discussion has been around the graduate program yet they wanted to be sure that whatever the process is, and whoever is involved in those decisions, that they keep in mind the affect those decisions will have on the undergraduate program.
- Lynn Jamieson mentioned RPTS has been reviewing both undergraduate and graduate programs, but have not talked about movement. As a result of the undergraduate/graduate review, there could be some things that come out of this.

C. Early Retirement Incentive Plan Discussion – C. Docherty

- Carrie stated that this is something that came from BFC as well. She mentioned that she forwarded the document to Sarah, Dean Torabi and all the Chairs. At the last BFC meeting there was not necessarily an update, but all of the comments were received and several of the people from our school did provide really good comments to the committee and will be taken under consideration. Hopefully they will have a final policy to us for the next meeting and the thing to remember with this is that it is going to happen and it is only going to be for this year. If people are contemplating doing this, they must realize that when the policy comes out it will not be happening for the next couple of years.
- Jerry said that if people end up retiring under this plan, the position will not be replaced for one year, but duties would be disbursed in the department in the interim. This will all take place at the Dean’s discretion.

D. Public Health Student Association – M. Van Puymbroeck

- This is a continuing discussion item from our February 11 meeting. CEPH requires SPH to have a student entity that has some role in the governance of the academic processes of the school. Marieke said that Sarah did not think we have enough information yet to discuss this, but in case anyone had any additional information we can discuss it now.
- Jerry suggested that she thinks that any budgetary issues regarding this Association should go to the Budgetary Advisory Committee.

5. New Business - None

6. Information

A. Non-Activity Space – M. Van Puymbroeck & J. Wilkerson

- Marieke stated that per David Skirvin, the policy for use of non-activity space is being modified to include that it must be related to the academic units of the School of HPER. The requests numbers are increasing and the way that the facility and space committee decided to deal with this was by eliminating it to being related to the academic mission for use at the
School of HPER. The activity spaces that people have been requesting are the Royer Lobby, the hallways, public corridors, HPER 123 and HPER 125.

B. Classroom Scheduling – J. Wilkerson

- Jerry said that there has been some concern regarding the scheduling of the new auditorium for huge classes and until that facility becomes online, we really can’t assign it because it goes through the university system electronically, however it’s been made clear that with the exception of evening classes, and whole school meetings, the School will manage that part of the facility with top priority for large classes.
- Jerry has asked the Chairs to submit classes with enrollments of 100 to 170 students, and then we will prioritize based on size and time and try to be as efficient as possible.
- Jerry has asked Dr. Lohrmann to be in charge of the new MPH classes in terms of scheduling for the new facility, but of course they also have to meet size requirements to receive priority.

7. Online Policies – J. Wilkerson

- Jerry mentioned that the Bloomington Faculty Council wants to be assured that schools have policies and have called for all policies to be submitted in PDF form. They are going to put them all online for the school and university. Jerry will pull all of those together, but there are some that need to be updated. Some of those will have to go through the Academic Council to be approved before she sends them over.
- The policies need to be in order according to when they were approved by the council. Jerry will present them in a list for action in the remaining semester or in the fall. Whatever is approved, she will send it forward. The same goes for departments if they want departmental policies as well.

8. Announcements

- Reminder that our next meeting on March 25 is scheduled from 2pm – 3:30 pm in HPER 125
- April 22 meeting will not be held, but is re-scheduled for April 29

B. Billingham - motioned for meeting to be adjourned
L. Jamieson – 2nd
Meeting Adjourned – 2:05 p.m.