

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Amendment B to S13-9**  
9 **Merging, Dividing, Transferring, Eliminating Academic Units**

10  
11 Legislative History: Amendment A to S13-9 rescinded S06-7 (Merging, Dividing,  
12 Transferring, Eliminating Academic Units). An earlier version of this recommendation  
13 was passed by the Senate in Fall 2019 and subsequently vetoed by President Papazian  
14 in Spring 2020. This proposal would amend S13-9 taking into consideration the  
15 concerns of the President.

16  
17 **Whereas:** Issues related to implementation of S13-9 centered on the need for  
18 proposals to merge, divide, transfer, or eliminate a unit to be in writing  
19 to inform voting, and  
20

21 **Whereas:** Greater clarity on the content to be included in proposals to merge, divide,  
22 transfer, or eliminate a unit will facilitate discussions prior to and  
23 subsequent to changes, and  
24

25 **Whereas:** A collaborative process with reasonable timelines would facilitate  
26 implementation of S13-9, therefore be it  
27

28 **Resolved:** That S13-9 be replaced with the attached proposal, and be it further  
29

30 **Resolved:** That this policy, following approval by the President, be implemented with  
31 the 20-21 Academic year and until that time, processes to merge, divide,  
32 or eliminate Academic Departments in progress as of spring 2020  
33 continue under the existing policy.  
34

35 **Rationale:** The referral to the Organization and Government committee highlighted the  
36 difficulties encountered in recent attempts to implement S13-9. For example, the policy  
37 does not specify that a proposal to merge, divide, transfer, or eliminate a unit must be in  
38 writing (though section 8 in S13-9 did mention a “copy” of the proposal). The serious  
39 nature of proposals to merge, divide, transfer, or eliminate units makes clarity in policy  
40 of particular importance. A clear understanding of implications for students, faculty, and  
41 staff is important and facilitates informed discussion and subsequent decisions. The  
42 updates proposed here would facilitate the effective implementation of S13-9 and  
43 address concerns related to the need for greater precision, collaboration, reasonable  
44 timelines, and discussion of issues.  
45

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

Approved: 5/4/20  
Vote: 12-0-0  
Present: Altura, Grosvenor, Okamoto, Shifflett, Gallo, McClory,  
Higgins, French, Kao, Skinnell, Sasikumar, Millora  
Absent: None  
Financial Impact: None  
Workload Impact: Some additional work for faculty/administrators to prepare  
documentation prior to voting.

## University Policy

### Merging, Dividing, Transferring, Eliminating Academic Units

When a proposal is made by an academic unit, college dean or the Provost (or other university authority) to divide or eliminate an academic unit, to merge it with another academic unit or to transfer it to another college, the basic principle established by this policy is that there should be meaningful collaboration with all affected academic departments, faculty, staff, and students before any such proposal is approved or implemented. Any associated termination of degree programs shall comply with S99-4, Degree Termination.

Meaningful collaboration calls for all affected academic units and administrators to be engaged in discussions leading to the development, by the affected chair(s) and dean(s), of written documentation to be distributed to faculty to inform voting. Documentation must provide a rationale for the proposed organizational change. In addition, the documentation must identify anticipated impacts in each of the following areas.

- A. College and department resources ~~(defined by local context)~~
- B. Retention, tenure, and promotion
- C. Curriculum and accreditation
- D. Implications for students (e.g., degree completion, assistantships), lecturers, tenure track and tenured faculty (e.g., entitlements, academic assignments), and staff (e.g., positions/responsibilities)

The dean(s), in consultation with chair(s), should establish a reasonable timeline for (a) the evaluation of the written proposal prior to voting (e.g., 10 duty days) and (b) voting (e.g., allow between 5 and 10 duty days) in the fall or spring semester. Voting would be conducted in accordance with the policy on department voting rights (S17-6). The Provost will announce the timeline for voting on the proposal related to merging, dividing, transferring, or eliminating academic units.

The vote of the regular (tenured and tenure-track) faculty and the vote of the temporary faculty in the affected academic unit(s) shall be tallied and recorded separately. The vote of the faculty shall be advisory only. The results of the voting should be made public within 7 calendar days.

If any parties involved in the process believe that policy was not followed, they may request a hearing before the Organization and Government Committee (O&G) of the Academic Senate within 20 faculty duty days after the results of the vote are announced. For O&G to proceed with a hearing, the request must make a clear case that meaningful consultation among affected faculty did not occur. O&G will not evaluate the merits of the proposed reorganization, only whether the principle of meaningful consultation was followed. At the hearing, all such academic units and authorities may be heard, as well as all faculty of affected academic units. After the hearing, the Organization and Government Committee shall make a written report to the Provost, the

104 President, and the Academic Senate with its determination of whether meaningful  
105 consultation among all affected parties was achieved.

106

107 A copy of all approved proposals, as well as an account of the consultation process, will  
108 be provided to the Academic Senate Office by the dean(s). The Academic Senate will  
109 archive the information so it can serve as a resource to the University community.

110