ACADEMIC COUNCIL
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 28, 2006


Members Absent:  Patrick Murren

Members Excused:  John Affleck-Graves, Rev. Mark Poorman, C.S.C., Charles Barber, Michael Lykoudis, James McAdams, Hugh Page, Maura Ryan, Susan G. Sheridan, Scott Van Jacob

Observers Present:  Mary Hendriksen, Capt. Mike Neller, Brandon Roach, Daniel Saracino, Dennis Brown, John W. Stamper (for M. Lykoudis), Don Wycliff

Observers Absent:  Harold Pace

Observers Excused:  Kevin Barry

The Reverend John Jenkins, C.S.C. opened the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Lieutenant Colonel Kelly Jordan offered a prayer.

1. Minutes of the meeting of August 24, 2006:  The minutes of the meeting of August 24, 2006, were approved without change.

2. Changes in the Academic Articles related to the Vice President of Research:  [In November 2005, Provost Thomas Burish charged the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Education and Research with the task of recommending how best to organize the offices that oversee graduate education and research at Notre Dame.  One specific question for the committee was recommending whether the central administrative offices overseeing graduate studies and research should report to the same person, as is true under the
University’s current structure, or whether they should report to two separate individuals.


In a letter to the faculty dated September 14, 2006, Provost Burish communicated his response to the task force report and his desire to split the position of Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research into two positions. The changes proposed today to the Academic Articles rename one position “Vice President for Research” and modify the language that describes the duties of the position. As indicated in the September 14th letter, the title of the person responsible for Graduate Studies has not yet been determined. Hence, the proposed changes to the Academic Articles do not address graduate studies at this time.]

Provost Burish opened the discussion by explaining that after receiving the report of the ad hoc committee, he engaged in a fairly extensive vetting process with Notre Dame faculty and staff, a majority of whom supported the recommendation to split the position. Normally, when making a change such as this, he would begin with the Executive Committee and ask them to recommend consideration of the change to an Academic Council committee. That committee would study the matter, then announce its recommendation to the full Council, with a discussion and vote to follow. In this case, however, because the recommendation had already been vetted so thoroughly and was offered by a faculty committee—and because he would like to hire the new vice president this year—he asked the members of the Executive Committee to bring the proposed change directly to the Council as a whole. They agreed. Thus, only provisions dealing
with the Vice President for Research are at issue today. At some later point, the Provost noted, it may be necessary to change the language again, depending on the title given to the head of Graduate Studies. He added that the Executive Committee reviewed the proposed changes and recommends approval.

Prof. DeBoer asked whether approval of this document would create a power vacuum at the Graduate School, in that it creates a vice president for research but seems to remove the vice president for graduate studies.

Provost Burish responded that he has no intention of removing Prof. Don Pope-Davis from his current position as head of graduate studies. There is simply a new definition of his position. There are many positions at the University not named specifically in the Academic Articles. The proposed change should have no impact on Prof. Pope-Davis’ activities.

Prof. Merz, a member of the ad hoc committee, commented that one of the goals of the committee was to make the position of vice president for research a significant figure on campus—indeed, a major member of the senior administrative team. In light of that goal, in reading the proposed change to Article I, Sec. 3 dealing with the order of officers who serve as acting president in the absence of the president, he wonders why the vice president for research should not immediately follow the provost and executive vice president in the list. In the proposed language, the vice president for research is given a position behind the associate provosts and vice president for student affairs.

Prof. Brown, also a member of the ad hoc committee, responded that—as is true with the order of succession in the constitution of the United States—the order of
succession in the *Academic Articles* need not correlate with the order of importance in the academic hierarchy.

Provost Burish concurred, pointing out that the succession list is based primarily on which members of the administration are best informed at any one point in time to carry out the duties of the president.

There being no further discussion, Fr. Jenkins called for a vote on the changes to the *Academic Articles* required by the establishment of the position of Vice President for Research. They passed unanimously.

3. **Committee meetings:** There are three standing committees on the Academic Council: Undergraduate Studies, Faculty Affairs, and Graduate Council. In this “retreat” meeting of the Academic Council, members of each committee gathered to identify agendas of items for consideration during the coming academic year.

Fr. Jenkins adjourned the Council as a whole at 4:50 p.m. so that committee meetings could take place.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ann Linney
Vice President and Associate Provost