1. Welcome and opening prayer:
Fr. John Jenkins opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. and invited Meredith Doellman to offer the opening prayer.

2. Approval of the minutes of February 26, 2015 meeting
The minutes of the February 26, 2015 meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Approval of the minutes of the April 15, 2015 meeting
The minutes of April 15, 2015 meeting were unanimously approved.

4. Protection of Children Policy: Adoption of a Policy Statement by the Academic Council
Fr. Jenkins introduced the topic of the Protection of Children policy, which was first presented at the April 15, 2015 meeting. An opportunity for further discussion was provided.

Prof. Kilpatrick asked why individual units, such as Athletics, Admissions, and the Center for Social Concerns, are being asked to develop separate operating procedures. He asked if a master template would be useful.

Kathy Brickley, Associate General Counsel, reported that the policy does provide a general template, with the clear provision that Risk Management will work closely with each unit that
must design a procedure. The development of individual procedures should “fall into place easily.”

As there was no further discussion, there was a motion and second to adopt the proposed policy statement providing that all requirements and procedures set forth in the Protection of Children Policy that are applicable to non-academic units shall be applicable to academic units as well. The policy statement was unanimously approved.

5. Faculty Governance at the University: Proposal for an Ad Hoc Committee

Fr. Jenkins presented the document prepared by the Faculty Affairs Committee, as charged, which proposes the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee on Faculty Governance.

The proposal identified the charge of the *ad hoc* committee as including:

- systematically surveying faculty opinion on the state of faculty governance at the University;
- outlining and clarifying the current mechanisms of faculty governance;
- determining what issues fall under the purview of “faculty governance”;
- ascertaining senior administrators’ views of the role of faculty governance to determine if there is a disconnect with the views of faculty members.

Based on information collected, the committee would then offer recommendations for enhancing faculty governance at the University.

The Faculty Affairs Committee proposed that the committee consist of nine members, to be elected from the following units or faculty categories: Arts and Letters, Architecture, Business, Engineering, Law, Libraries, Research, Science, and Special Professional. The committee would be directed to seek representativeness through consultation with groups or subgroups that are not specifically represented by an elected member—for example, junior faculty—to ensure input from all faculty stake-holders at Notre Dame.

There was a motion and second to consider the proposal.

Prof. Antsaklis asked why the Committee proposes a time length of two years for the *ad hoc* committee to complete its work.

Prof. Desch noted that the scope of the *ad hoc* committee’s charge covers a significant breadth of University units. In addition, it is expected that the *ad hoc* committee will implement a major survey, engage with focus groups, and make an extensive study of black-letter law on the subject of faculty governance. Two years was considered an appropriate amount of time.

There was no further discussion. The proposal was put forward for a vote and then unanimously approved.
As the business of the meeting was concluded, Fr. Jenkins thanked members for their continued service to the University. He noted that the terms of several members are ending and congratulated them on notable service.

Fr. Jenkins adjourned the full Council meeting. Each of the Council’s three committees then convened for business.