

5-1-1992

## Minutes of the Faculty Meeting

Anthony D'Amato

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/lawreview>



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Anthony D'Amato, *Minutes of the Faculty Meeting*, 1992 BYU L. Rev. 359 (1992).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/lawreview/vol1992/iss2/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Brigham Young University Law Review at BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in BYU Law Review by an authorized editor of BYU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu](mailto:hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu).

## Minutes of the Faculty Meeting\*

The regular meeting of the Faculty was called to order on Tuesday, September 17, 1991, at 4:10 p.m., in Room 223.

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the previous meeting of the Faculty. A point of order was raised to the effect that the minutes of the preceding meeting could not be found. An amendment was then offered to the main motion to approve the minutes of the preceding meeting irrespective of what they contained. There was a general heated discussion as to whether this was constitutional. At 6:24 p.m., a document was found. While it was not the minutes of the preceding meeting, it was in fact the hours of the preceding meeting. A substitute motion was then offered to approve the hours of the preceding meeting. The motion carried.

A motion was introduced by the Student Petitions Committee to approve the transfer of James Johnson for his third year to the Mahareshi Law School so that he could be with his significant other. The motion carried.

The Student Petitions Committee then moved that the Faculty approve the transfer of Laura Lawson for her third year to the Mahareshi Law School so that she could be with her significant other, whose transfer to Mahareshi Law School had recently been approved by the Faculty. The motion carried.

The Dean asked the Faculty whether it wished to consider a consideration of adding Section 6.17 to the Rules of the Law School. He pointed out that the Faculty had three choices: first, to consider Section 6.17, second, to consider considering Section 6.17, and third, to disapprove Section 6.17 and then proceed to reconsider its disapproval. A general debate followed on the proper procedure to take with respect to Section 6.17. A motion was made to disapprove Section 6.17; it carried. Then a motion was made to reconsider the disapproval of Section 6.17. A substitute motion was made to postpone the reconsideration. The substitute motion was tabled and the main motion carried.

A question was raised as to whether Section 6.17 now

---

\* Copyright 1991 Anthony D'Amato.

stood as approved or disapproved. The Dean said that, because of the parliamentary intricacy of the preceding motions, he did not know the status of Section 6.17. Then a question was raised as to the content of Section 6.17. The Dean said he was unaware of its content, and asked whether any faculty member knew what was in Section 6.17. There was general silence.

The Dean then called for the report of the Building Committee. The Faculty was told that construction on the new wing of the Law School was proceeding at a rapid pace. The Committee cited as evidence the fact that, since its last report, the new structure had grown considerably. However, one faculty member presented an alternative explanation. He said that the structure had not in fact grown, but rather that everyone had become smaller. There was general debate. The Faculty was unable to resolve which of the two competing theories was correct. A motion was introduced to table the report of the Building Committee. The motion carried.

The Dean then reported on the fund-raising efforts for the new wing. He said that there was good news and bad news. The good news was that the Building Campaign Fund had reached midpoint. The bad news was that the Building Campaign Fund still had halfway to go. A hat was passed around the table. The Dean urged all professors to contribute 50% of their last month's salary. A total of \$2.16 was collected.

The Curriculum Committee reported upon the advisability of holding classes on Saturdays. There was a brief debate. It was pointed out that students on Mondays tended to forget the previous week's work, undoubtedly because of the long two-day weekend. A motion was made to add Saturday classes to the Law School schedule. A substitute motion was made to add Sunday classes as well, because it was in the spirit of the main motion. The substitute motion was defeated. Then there was debate that the main motion was rendered inconsistent by the defeat of the substitute motion. However, the main motion carried.

Dinner was then served, consisting of corn chips and water. The total bill was \$2.16.

A motion was introduced to substitute potato chips for corn chips at the next faculty meeting. A vote was taken. The Faculty was evenly divided. The Dean then offered to cast a tie-breaking vote. The hypothetical question was raised that if the Dean were to cast a tie-breaking vote, what would he vote for? The Dean replied that he would vote for corn chips. A

substitute motion was introduced to disempower the Dean from casting tie-breaking votes. The Dean ruled the motion out of order. The Dean's ruling was followed by a general food fight.

A faculty member demanded to see a verified copy of the original motion regarding potato chips. However, the original motion had become a paper airplane and had last been seen flying out the window.

The Dean asked whether there was any old business. The Associate Dean moved to reconsider the earlier action of the Faculty that either approved or disapproved Section 6.17. The Associate Dean moved that, although no one knew what Section 6.17 contained, whatever it contained should only be given retroactive effect and should be denied precedential effect. A question was raised by a faculty member whether there was any power to deny precedential effect to a given action by the Faculty. Arguments were heard on all sides. In the middle of the night, the question was raised whether denying precedential effect to a faculty action would itself have precedential effect. Debate continued throughout the night on this aspect of the question. A substitute motion was introduced the following morning that if the main motion regarding Section 6.17 was denied precedential effect, then the amended motion to deny precedential effect itself be denied precedential effect. A motion was made at 10:30 a.m. The motion carried. Unfortunately, your loyal Secretary was too tired to notice what it was that carried.

Finally, under the heading of "New Business," the Law School's faculty representative to the General University Committee gave a report on the state of the University. She reported that the University has been declared bankrupt and all its buildings and assets are being auctioned off. A motion was made to conceal the fact that the Law School is part of the University. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made to adjourn. The motion was tabled until the next regularly scheduled faculty meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



Tony D'Amato, Secretary.\*\*

---

\*\* Judd & Mary Morris Leighton Professor of Law, Northwestern University.