Members Present: Facilitator – S. Young
Bob Billingham, Katie Grove, Barbara Hocevar, Lynn Jamieson, Lisa Kamendulis, Lesa Lorenzen-Huber, Fernando Ona, Michael Reece, Liz Shea, Joel Stager, Marieke Van Puymbroeck, Jerry Wilkerson,

Additional Attendees: Carrie Docherty

1. **Approval of Agenda**
   L. Jamieson - Moved to accept agenda
   M. Van Puymbroeck – 2nd

2. **Approval of Meeting Minutes from 03/25/11**
   L. Jamieson – Moved to accept minutes
   M. Van Puymbroeck – 2nd
   All in Favor - Unanimous

3. **Standing Committee Reports**
   A. **Undergraduate Studies Committee – J. Wilkerson**
      - The committee met earlier in the day with no items for voting, but did discuss procedures for probation, (i.e., when students are dismissed for a semester).
      - A new summer schedule will start in 2012 so plans are beginning for ways to accommodate the different options: one 12-week session, two 6-week sessions or three 4 week sessions. Each department has the authority to schedule their summer courses any way they prefer.
      - The budget for summer school will now be included in the annual budget with the academic year proceeding from September to the end of the summer term, so funding will include the summer terms at the beginning of the fall semester. This was done with the purpose of trying to offer more courses in the summer. It does help faculty in the sense of being able to go elsewhere or do research, etc., and still teach summer school. The students can take summer coursework yet still not have their entire summer consumed.
      - General education for the entire Bloomington campus begins in the fall while HPER started last fall with the new GenEd offerings. A student must take a minimum of 6 hours of GenEd here on the Bloomington campus. Each student must take one course in the natural sciences (i.e., anything in the sciences other than computer programming, computers, mathematics or statistics).

   B. **Graduate Studies Committee – No Report**
   C. **Budgetary Advisory Committee – No Report**
D. Bloomington Faculty Council – C. Docherty

- Carrie reported there were some rumblings at the BFC meeting about the promotion and tenure process and how long the process seems to take. On March 23rd, dossiers were on President McRobbie’s desk, and they were to be at the Board of Trustees for their meeting on April 13th meeting.

- BFC is still working on the reforming the MRE Policy. With questions, discussions and amendments on the initial draft, the biggest issue was there was no student representation involved in the process. Graduate students, especially, are concerned about what’s going to happen with faculty and students, so BFC revised the policy and sent out yet another draft. Hopefully they will be moving ahead on this at the last BFC meeting.

E. SPH Progress Update – MPH Leadership Team (M. Reece)

- Michael reported the biggest current challenge is getting the core and supporting faculty documented. This should be accomplished by our next meeting. Additionally, CEPH is requiring that new bylaws be established as to how public health will be managed across the school.

- Dean Torabi has asked when the School should bring the Executive Director of CEPH back to campus to meet with faculty who are diligently working on the development of MPH degrees. The suggestion was to wait until the School has filed the Notice of Substantive Change as well as waiting to see if the Board of Trustees moves on the proposals. The due date CEPH has established is September 2nd by which the President must have submitted the application to transition to a School of Public Health. Michael suggested that faculty might have to be a little bit more accessible during the summer, due to the fact that things are going to be happening throughout the summer. Therefore, Academic Council will need to have oversight over the summer regarding the preparations for the deadline date.

4. Old Business

A. Public Health Student Association Discussion – Sarah Young

- Based on the meeting minutes from the March 11th meeting, there seemed to be some confusion on what the Public Health Student Association item was about. Section 1.5 of the CEPH accreditation requirements regarding governance speaks specifically about a student association being a part of a SPH. This is new for Academic Council as we have never involved students in the governance of the school.

- As the chair of the MPH Leadership team, Michael suggested to not think about changing any true governance structures, but that perhaps the MPH Leadership team was the place to have student representation. As a result, this group did invite the Chair of the Public Health Student Association, Emily Meyer, to attend the leadership team meetings to have a voice. Once CEPH approves the program expansion, the new Executive Associate Dean will have to figure out if this arrangement will become the
permanent place of student representation, or whether that will involve some other
governing body within the School.

B. Protocol for Relocation/Unit Movement

- A draft copy of a process for relocation and academic unit movement within the School
  was distributed. This draft was developed by a subcommittee consisting of Bob
  Billingham, Lynn Jamieson, Michael Reece, and Sarah Young.
- Only tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty are able to vote on issues related to units
  moving. The process was designed to follow the same steps as new curriculum with
  faculty submitting a written proposal to the Chair of their current department.
- The document will be sent to AC members electronically to share and obtain input from
  faculty in their departments with the intention of being ready to vote on this by our
  April 29th meeting. Approval at that time will provide interested faculty groups with the
  summer to work on proposals with movement of units not occurring until next academic
  year.

5. New Business

A. MPH Leadership Task Force

- It was proposed that the MPH Leadership Team become a standing task force with the
  Academic Council through the CEPH accreditation process.
- The group was originally formed to accomplish necessary details and now with those
  details having been accomplished, the School is moving onto the implementation stage.
  Currently, there is no plan in place when the clock towards accreditation starts ticking, so
  the MPH Leadership Task Force could be tasked to help to tie up all of the procedures,
  such as the internship programs, and as new MPH concentrations get developed, how do
  we figure out core and supporting faculty. The group indicated a willingness to continue
  if the Academic Council wanted them to do so, although their name should be changed
  to the Public Health Leadership Task Force.
- The HPER Constitution states that a task force can be implemented for whatever set time
  is necessary for whatever task(s) needs to be accomplished.

  Marieke V. – Moved to Appoint a Public Health Leadership Task Force
  Bob B. – 2nd
  Unanimous approval for Public Health Leadership Task Force being named for the
  duration of the transition period through accreditation of the School of Public
  Health

B. Academic Specialist Policy Changes (1st read)

- A revised policy focused upon Academic Specialist clearly articulating the progression to
  a long-term contract was distributed. One of the main changes is from a 3-year to a 7-
  year probationary period. The changes to this document bring it in line with the lecturer
  requirements for promotion.
➢ There was additional discussion had regarding various members of the Academic Council and additional changes that needed to be made to the document.

➢ This is a first reading with a vote projected for April 29, so AC members can obtain input from faculty in each of their respective departments.

Announcements

• April 22 is re-scheduled for April 29, 1:15 pm – 2:30 pm in the IMU Charter Room.

L. Jamieson – moved to adjourn the meeting
B. Billingham – 2nd
Meeting adjourned at 2:43 PM
This document outlines the process for faculty within the School of HPER to consider proposals regarding the movement of an academic program (and accordingly, faculty and students) from one academic department to another. This document (nor the process described herein) is not designed to serve the needs of individual faculty members who want to move between departments outside of the context of a move of academic programs.

For the purpose of this document, the “unit” will be defined by identified academic program. The unit may include undergraduate and/or masters majors and/or degrees. In addition, the unit may be responsible for one or more academic minor(s), certificate(s), and/or associate degree(s). Also, for the purpose of this document, faculty lines associated with the unit will follow the unit, with exceptions indicated below.

Faculty are identified as full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty and lecturers. Voting faculty, as is consistent with the HPER Constitution, is restricted to tenured and tenure-track faculty and clinical faculty.

Faculty within a given curricular unit who plan to propose a move from their existing department to another department must provide written notice to the chairperson of the current department, the chairperson of the proposed department, and the Executive Associate Dean. Such written notice must be submitted to these entities no less than 30 days prior to the submission of a written proposal as described in the process below. The Executive Associate Dean will provide notice to all faculty within HPER that a notice has been received indicating that a written proposal for unit relocation is forthcoming.

Following the notification that a proposal for unit relocation is forthcoming:

1. A written proposal will be prepared by the faculty in the curricular unit proposing to move the academic program to a new department.

2. The emphasis of the proposal should be a curricular rationale for each of the degrees, majors, minors, or certificates that are proposed. This rationale is to be a “best fit” model, based on curricular integrity. It is not to focus on personalities, personality conflicts, or on any complaints by individual faculty members.

3. The components of the written proposal must include:
   - A list of all degree programs to be impacted by such a move, including a list of all graduate and undergraduate degrees and/or majors, and all undergraduate or graduate minors, and certificate programs.
   - A list of all courses that are proposed for transition and a description of the curricular process (with timeline) that will be utilized to move the courses from the current department to the new department. This description should include any plans to change course prefix and/or numbers.
• A list of the number of students currently enrolled in each major, degrees, or certificate program and the number of credit hours generated annually by students in the collective degrees, majors, or certificates of the unit.
• A description of the efforts to engage students and the extent of student engagement in the development of the proposal and/or the extent to which students have been provided the opportunity to offer input into the proposed move.
• Identification of any students that might be negatively impacted by such a move, an explanation of potential negative consequences, and plans to accommodate the needs of those students.
• A description of how both undergraduate and graduate student advising needs will be met including plans for transitioning students from the academic advising system in the existing department to an academic advising system in the new department, including cost of additional advising capacity and/or any increased burden on faculty related to student advising.
• Delineation of the process for transitioning students to a new academic degree (e.g., should the curricular unit move necessitate that students will be transitioned to a degree other than the one in which they are currently enrolled given that the degree does not exist in the new department).
• A description of any current doctoral students advised by faculty in the unit and a description of plans to accommodate the needs of those students.
• A preliminary plan for addressing other operational aspects of each degree program and the plans for accommodating faculty, student, and staff needs associated with each (e.g., internships and practicum experiences, as well as the supervision system to be established for these; and activities linked to other academic or community partners or organizations).
• Identification of the extent to which the curricular move will necessitate consideration of any issues related to current or planned accreditations or certifications by external entities and an explanation of how such issues can be addressed.
• A list of all faculty (regardless of voting status) who are affiliated with these degree programs (e.g., having teaching responsibilities, curricular oversight, or who generally participate in the curricular activities) and an accounting of the extent to which each was involved in the development of the proposal and the extent to which each agrees or disagrees with the proposed move. Faculty members who disagree with the proposed move may attach a written summary of their disagreement to be included with the proposal. Only written comments will be considered.
• A list of all physical spaces that would be impacted by the move, including all faculty offices, research and or teaching labs or spaces, and other physical space that is typically necessary for the degrees and majors proposed to move. Details should be provided as to whether faculty are proposing to move these spaces or whether they have discussed available space in the new department.
• A list of all equipment owned by the current department that would be required to move in order to sustain the activities of the programs.
• A description of whether any centers or institutes would be involved with, or impacted by, the proposed move.

4. The proposal is to be voted upon by all voting members of the unit, with a simple majority rule being required to move the proposal forward.
5. The proposal, with a copy of the vote tally from the unit faculty and the names of the faculty voting, is forwarded to the chairperson of each academic department and to the Executive Associate Dean.

6. The chairperson of each department will provide the full faculty in their respective departments with a copy of the proposal and a copy of the vote tally. The Executive Associate Dean will notify all faculty within the school that the proposal has been received; the proposal (and the vote tally) will be made available in electronic format to all faculty via the School Information Portal (SIP).

7. The chairpersons of the two departments will schedule a meeting of their joint faculties no sooner than 30 days following the date the proposal is made available to the faculty of the school. The Executive Associate Dean will notify all faculty within the school of the scheduled meeting; the meeting shall be open to all faculty within the school.

8. The proposal is to be discussed during a joint meeting of the full faculties of both the department in which the unit currently resides and the department to which the unit is requesting to be transferred. The departments will both debate the move and then take a vote (paper ballot by voting faculty of each department). All faculty within the school will be invited to participate in this meeting; only faculty within the two departments addressed within the proposal will have a vote.

9. A summary of the votes will be forwarded to the Executive Associate Dean, who will schedule a meeting of all department chairs within the school.

10. Once the faculty of both departments have voted (regardless of the outcome of the vote in either department), the chairpersons of all departments will meet to discuss the proposal and all votes by department faculty, taking into consideration such things as impact on the mission of the school, financial costs and benefits of the move, and capacity to cover courses. The latter is particularly relevant in cases when faculty associated with the unit have commitments to teach courses in more than one unit in the current department. The chairpersons of the two departments indicated in the proposal will negotiate the move, and each must provide written notice of their individual approval or disapproval of the proposed unit move, within 60 days following a positive vote by the faculty of each department. The chairpersons of the other departments within the school must also provide a written notice of the extent to which they support the relocation of the unit being considered.

11. Once the chairpersons have completed their discussions, and each has provided a written statement of approval or disapproval—the proposal, a summary of all votes, and other relevant information resulting from negotiations, will be submitted to the Academic Council by the Executive Associate Dean.

12. Within 30 days of receiving these materials, the Academic Council will discuss the possible move and will vote to recommend approval or disapproval to the Dean. In its considerations, the Academic Council Chair may request additional materials and/or request that representatives from the department or unit meet with the Academic Council.

13. The Chair of the Academic Council will transmit the proposal and a record of all votes to the Dean. The Dean will have 30 days to consider the proposal and will make the final decision
about the relocation of the unit. The Dean may request additional materials and/or request meetings with representatives from the department, unit, or Academic Council.

14. Should the Dean approve the relocation of a unit, the Dean will charge the Executive Associate Dean, the chairpersons, and faculty within the unit and/or receiving department with the development of a plan and timeline for implementing the proposed move.

In Cases of Dissent:

Individual faculty members (with voting rights) within a unit, who dissent from a final decision about a unit’s relocation (and who wish to remain in their current department and become affiliated with a different unit or move to a different department), will provide a written statement and rationale to the chairperson of their current department. The chairperson will be responsible for negotiating the retention of that individual faculty member within that department. Faculty who dissent with the decision of the chairperson may pursue review by the Academic Council using procedures outlined by the Academic Council related to faculty grievances associated with such issues. In some cases, the Academic Council may recommend to such a faculty member that the case would be more appropriate for consideration by the Indiana University-Bloomington Committee on Mergers, Reorganization, and Elimination.