

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL**  
**Monday, October 1, 2018**  
**3:30 p.m.**  
**McKenna Hall Auditorium**  
**University of Notre Dame**

**Minutes for review**

**Members present:** Scott Appleby, Ann Astell, Brad Badertscher, Bob Bernhard, Kasey Buckles, Tom Burish, Matthew Capdevielle, Laura Carlson, Patricia Champion, Caroline Cloonan, Martijn Cremers, Michael Desch, Malgorzata Dobrowolska-Furdyna, Patrick Flynn, Tom Fuja, Mary Galvin, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Eddie Griesedieck, Ben Heller, Michel Hockx, Erin Hoffman Harding, Peter Holland, Hope Hollocher, Fr. John Jenkins, CSC, Jan Maxwell, Dan Johnson, Michael Lykoudis, Chris Maziar, Connie Mick, Sarah Mustillo, Clive Neal, Nell Newton, Glen Niebur, Hugh Page, Richard Pierce, Michael Pippenger, Ram Ramanan, Bryan Ritchie, Tony Rosales, Maura Ryan, Mark Schurr, Carter Snead, Zachary Spitzer, Diane Parr Walker, Sophie White

**Members excused or absent:** John Affleck-Graves, Luke Franz, Anne Garcia-Romero, Patrick Griffin, Michael Hildreth, Khachatur Manukyan, Nancy Michael, Samir Younes

**Observers present:** Kevin Barry, Earl Carter, Brian Flaherty, Jim Frabutt, Matt Lahey, Dale Nees, Mark Prokopius, Ryan Willerton

---

**Welcome and Opening Prayer** – Fr. Jenkins opened the meeting at 3:30 and invited Ann Astell to offer the opening prayer.

**Approval of Minutes of the meeting of August 28, 2018** – Fr. Jenkins invited a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 28, 2018. A motion was made, and the minutes were approved unanimously on a voice vote.

**Discuss and approve the proposed updates to the *Academic Articles* from the Decennial Review Committee** – Fr. Jenkins thanked the committee for their work in reviewing the Academic Articles and proposing the changes. He outlined the process that the Council would use to review and approve the changes, with Mark McKenna presenting the document, and Michael Desch acting as Parliamentarian. A motion was made to have Mark McKenna present the document. The motion was seconded, and Mark was invited to present to the Council.

**Temporary suspension of a faculty member in exigent circumstances (Article IV / Section 8 / Subsection (d))**

There was no discussion on this topic by the Council members.

**Titling of non-tenure track faculty (Article IV / Section 1 / Subsection (a))**

Discussion points included:

- The ability of a Center or Institute to appoint faculty – A friendly amendment was proposed to allow the University Centers, like University Institutes, to appoint regular faculty, other than tenured or tenure-track faculty, with the Provost's approval. The amendment was accepted without objection. Academic Support Units and other University organizations will be addressed by the Faculty Affairs Committee.
- How the proposed titles were identified – The proposed titles are the result of benchmarking peer institutions, and with the exception of the new category of Advising Faculty, the proposal is essentially eliminating the title of Special Professional Faculty (SPF) and bringing forward the secondary titles already in the Articles.
- Advising Faculty classification - Since there would be faculty in that category, the committee felt that the category should be included in the Articles. The classification of new hires would be made by the Provost.

### **Promotion criteria and timelines for each faculty category, including length of contract (Article IV / Section 3 and Article IV / Section 4)**

Discussion points included:

- Requirements for rank in the category Professor of the Practice – A friendly amendment was offered to the Assistant Professor of the Practice description to remove “demonstrated” from the description, leaving “promise as a teacher and/or researcher...” The amendment was accepted without objection. A friendly amendment was offered to the Associate Professor of the Practice description to add “ordinarily should have” before “demonstrated outstanding teaching and/or research ability, growth in knowledge and maturity...” This change is intended to make it clear that promotion to the rank of associate requires more than time in the role, while still allowing an initial appointment could be at the rank of associate where service to the unit or University would not have been possible. The amendment was accepted without objection. The same friendly amendment was proposed for the Professor of the Practice description. The amendment was accepted without objection.
- Research Faculty appointed by a Center or Institute without a direct connection to a department – It would be at the discretion of the Provost to outline requirements for inclusion of other academic units in the appointment, renewal, or promotion of Research Faculty appointed by University Centers and University Institutes.

### **CAP of the whole (Article V / Section 5)**

Discussion points included:

- The addition of Committee on Appointments and Promotions (CAP) of the whole as a requirement – A hostile amendment was proposed to require CAP of the Whole. The amendment was voted on, and passed with one objection. The proposed changes were remanded to the Faculty Affairs Committee to implement.
- Definition of Committee on Appointments (CA) of the Whole for new appointments – Requiring the inclusion of all tenured and tenure-track faculty was approved with a unanimous voice vote. Allowing the academic units to determine the circumstances under which other regular faculty should participate was approved with a voice vote, with one objection.
- Definition of Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (CRPT) of the Rank for reappointments, promotions, and tenure - Requiring the inclusion of all tenured and tenure-track faculty at or above the rank sought was approved with a unanimous voice vote. Enabling the units to include other Regular Faculty of the same type in the review of RPT cases for non-tenure track faculty, with the same limitation of the same or higher rank, was approved with a unanimous voice vote.
- CA and CRPT for units without tenure track faculty – The Articles should be updated in such a way to support the process for units without tenure track faculty.
- Promotion to named chairs – A friendly amendment was proposed to remove reference in Article V / Section 5 to promotion to named chairs because the requirements are outlined in Article IV. The amendment was accepted without objection.

### **Proportion of elected faculty on Academic Council (Article V / Section 3 / Subsection (a))**

Discussion points included:

- Options to adhere to the proposed requirement – Three options were noted to meet the proposed requirement.
  - Administrators could be removed from the Academic Council
  - The process of appointing faculty could be discontinued
  - Additional faculty could be elected to Academic Council

### **Definition of an academic unit, including degree offering and faculty hiring (Article I)**

Discussion points included:

- Appointment of faculty by University Centers and University Institutes – A reminder was made of the prior friendly amendment to allow the Provost to appoint faculty to University Centers and Institutes.
- Appointment of faculty by Academic Support Units – The Faculty Affairs Committee will take up the question of how the Articles may be updated to permit other units to appoint faculty.
- Definition of a School – Amendments were proposed to remove reference to professional training, to allow the hiring of regular faculty, and to grandfather the Graduate School. The proposed definition was updated to read, “A School is an academic unit of the University without departments. A School has the

authority to hire regular faculty and offer degree programs. For purposes of this definition, the Graduate School is a School.” The proposed amendments were approved by a unanimous voice vote.

**Adjournment** - There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10.