

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

AGENDA

- 1. Opening Prayer:** Ann Astell
- 2. Approval of Minutes of the meeting of August 28, 2018**
- 3. Discuss and approve the proposed updates to the *Academic Articles* from the Decennial Review Committee**

Our discussion of the proposed updates to the Academic Articles will follow parliamentary procedure, with Michael Desch serving as Parliamentarian, and Mark McKenna presenting the recommendations on behalf of the Decennial Review Committee of the Articles.

The process will be as follows:

- o Fr. John will invite a motion to have Mark McKenna present a proposal to the Council
 - o Once this is seconded, the floor will be open for discussion on the proposal.
 - o The proposed changes have an inter-dependency. Accordingly, Mark will present the issues in the sequence described below.
 - o For each issue, the rationale for the change will be described, and the floor will be open for discussion and debate. Academic Council members may make a proposal for an amendment that can be either friendly or hostile. While not technically sanctioned in *Roberts' Rules of Order*, many assemblies have adopted the convention of regarding proposed amendments as either "friendly" or "unfriendly" to the sense of the original motion as a matter of convenience. A friendly amendment is one the proponent accepts as in the spirit of the original proposal and unless there is an objection from the floor is accepted as part of the original motion. A hostile motion, in contrast, is one which the proposer regards as contrary to the original proposal and as such requires a formal motion, second, and vote to determine whether it becomes part of the original motion.
 - o If an amendment is to be made, the process is this: A council member makes a motion for an amendment to be considered. That motion requires a second. That opens the amendment for discussion. After discussion, Fr. John, as chair, calls the question to end debate. If there is unanimous consent to end the debate, a vote is held on the substantive amendment. If there is an objection to ending debate, a two-thirds majority vote is required to end debate, after which the proposed amendment is voted on before discussion continues to the next issue.
- Rather than conducting word-by-word changes on the floor, a given issue may be remanded to the appropriate committee of the Academic Council for reworking.

At the end of the discussion of all of the issues, Fr. John moves to call the question on the original proposal as amended and by unanimous consent (or a 2/3s vote if there is objection) to close the discussion and to vote on the proposal as a whole (and as amended in the discussion if that so occurs).

The sequence of the issues to discuss will be:

- a. Temporary suspension of a faculty member in exigent circumstances (Article IV / Section 8 / Subsection (d))
- b. Titling of non-tenure track faculty (Article IV / Section 1 / Subsection (a))
- c. Promotion criteria and timelines for each faculty category, including length of contract (Article IV / Section 3 and Article IV / Section 4)
- d. CAP of the whole (Article V / Section 5)
- e. Proportion of elected faculty on Academic Council (Article V / Section 3 / Subsection (a))
- f. Definition of an academic unit, including degree offering and faculty hiring (Article I)
- g. All other changes not previously discussed

- 4. Adjournment**