

# A Process for Academic Reorganization

A Faculty Senate Reorganization Task Force Proposal

Draft: December 6, 2016

Revised: January 17, 2017; March 1, 2017

*This process aims to adhere to the following statement by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP): "Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university."<sup>1</sup>*

## Introduction

Any decision to reorganize units within the university requires evidence, input, scrutiny, careful consideration, and time. Time is necessary to engage in discussion, contemplate various strategies, gather evidence, and construct analyses. Though this process appears long, it is necessarily long to ensure that all parties involved have sufficient time to make careful and considered evidence-based decisions.

The same time, care, and consideration required in carrying out a reorganization went into the creation of the process laid out in this document. The need for a clearly-defined process was borne out of a need for transparency and faculty involvement. This process was designed to meet both of these needs, as well as provide a means for gathering evidence, feedback, and support from across the university.

## Definition of Terms

This process is intended only for the Colleges, Schools, Conservatories, and other units defined in the University of Missouri System's Collected Rules and Regulations, under the Faculty Bylaws for the University of Missouri-Kansas City (300.020, Section C):

### ***Colleges, Schools, Conservatories, Libraries and other units***

1. ***Definitions*** -- *A college, school or conservatory (hereinafter colleges, schools, or conservatories will be referred to as schools) is a unit which offers or supervises programs of study leading to baccalaureate or advanced degrees. A unit or combination of units, offering courses which do not lead to a degree, is not a school.*
2. ***Schools*** -- *Presently existent schools are: College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business and Public Administration, School of Biological Sciences, School of Computing and Engineering, School of Dentistry, School of Education, School of Law, School of Pharmacy, Conservatory of Music and Dance, School of Graduate Studies, School of Medicine, School of Nursing and Health Studies.*

---

<sup>1</sup> AAUP, "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," section 2c ("Internal Operations of the Institution). Accessed 11 January 2017. <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

3. **Libraries** -- Libraries include: Miller Nichols Library, Leon E. Bloch Law Library, Health Sciences Library, Dental Library.<sup>2</sup>

Throughout this document, the term “unit” shall refer to any of the Colleges, Schools, Conservatories, and other units defined by the Collected Rules and Regulations above. When Bylaw changes are made to these definitions, this document should be updated to reflect those amendments and the process in this document will then apply to the units as defined by any revisions to the Collected Rules and Regulations.

It should be noted that the term “unit” defined in the Collected Rules and Regulations above does not refer to departments and programs. The reorganization of departments and programs are up to the Deans’ discretion. This document, therefore, should not be read as a reorganization process for departments and programs. It is only applicable to units defined as above, each of which may contain several departments and programs.

The term “affected unit(s)” shall refer to the unit(s) considered in a reorganization, which could vary in number. Though the entire university and all of its units are indeed affected by reorganization changes, the term as it appears in this document refers to those units that would be reorganized as a result of the reorganization process.

## Process A: Faculty Impetus for Reorganization

This process describes how faculty can build consensus and provide preliminary evidence for a reorganization before introducing the idea to the Chancellor. The intention is that this process would only be used if an idea for reorganization developed organically among faculty.

1. The initiating faculty should come from an affected unit.
  - a. If a proposal for reorganization would affect more than one unit, the initiating faculty must obtain assent from faculty from each affected unit.
  - b. Initiating faculty from outside an affected unit must obtain assent from faculty from each affected unit.
  - c. Initiating faculty from affected units shall heretofore be called "the Initiators."
2. The Initiators request to speak to their respective faculty governance groups (an agenda item for a regular meeting) in accordance with the bylaws of their respective units.
  - a. During the respective unit faculty meetings, the faculty engage in a discussion on the proposed reorganization.
  - b. Each affected unit's faculty governance group should submit a statement on the proposed reorganization to their Dean and the Deans of other affected units.

---

<sup>2</sup> UM System CRR 300.020, Section C. Chapter 300: Faculty Bylaws. Date of last amendment: 6-17-16.  
[https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected\\_rules/faculty/ch300/300.020\\_faculty\\_bylaws\\_umkc](https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/faculty/ch300/300.020_faculty_bylaws_umkc)

3. After receiving statements from each affected unit's faculty governance group, the Deans of affected units should issue individual statements on the proposed reorganization in reply to each faculty governance group's statement.
  - a. All statements from the Deans and the faculty governance groups should be shared with the Faculty Senate.
  - b. The Faculty Senate reviews the statements from the affected units' Deans and faculty governance groups.
  - c. The Faculty Senate makes an advisory vote to endorse or rebut the proposed reorganization and provides its feedback, along with the report, to the Provost.
  - d. The Faculty Senate may choose to delay the advisory vote in order to gather additional information from the faculty governance groups and/or Deans of affected units. The Faculty Senate must provide a deadline for the gathering of additional information, so it may review the additional information provided and make an advisory vote.
4. The Provost provides feedback, along with all of the accumulated statements from affected units and the Faculty Senate, to the Chancellor for final determination. If the Chancellor decides to proceed with reorganization, the recommended steps are discussed in "Process B" below.

## Process B: Chancellor Impetus for Reorganization

1. The formal impetus to reorganize a school should come from the Chancellor, with input from the Provost, or as a result of faculty impetus process described in "Process A" above.
2. The Chancellor and Provost appoint a Reorganization Study Committee of key stakeholders which includes:
  - a. The Chancellor and Provost (ex-officio).
  - b. The Deans of affected units, and potentially Deans from units that have research and teaching partnerships with affected units.
  - c. Representatives from key faculty governance bodies, including Faculty Senate and the elected faculty leadership from affected units.
  - d. The affected units' Budget Committees.
  - e. The University Budget Committee, with input from the Faculty Senate Budget Committee.
3. The Reorganization Study Committee should collect appropriate data.
  - a. The data gathered should be sufficient to determine important factors, such as (but not limited to):
    - i. The effect of reorganization on:
      1. academic programs
      2. partnerships (teaching, research, and external)
      3. leadership, personnel, and staffing of affected units
      4. student interests
      5. alumni from affected units
      6. budget

- ii. Other factors determined by the Reorganization Study Committee.
4. The Reorganization Study Committee should provide sufficient and compelling evidence-based justifications for reorganization. These should include, but are not limited to, any or all of the following measures of justification:
  - a. Achieving the mission of the University as articulated in the University strategic plan
  - b. Increased attainment for students
  - c. Increased Research and Scholarship productivity
  - d. Increased budgetary efficiency
  - e. Capitalize on new research and teaching opportunities
  - f. Keep up with the changing demands for research and teaching in different areas
5. If the Reorganization Study Committee finds that there is not enough sufficient and compelling evidence to justify a reorganization, they must submit a report of their findings to the Chancellor and the Provost.
6. The Reorganization Study Committee should develop goals for the reorganization to meet the justifications for the reorganization.
  - a. The Reorganization Study Committee must agree, by simple majority vote, upon the justifications and goals in order to move forward. In the event of an even split vote, the Provost can vote to break the tie.
  - b. The Reorganization Study Committee should produce a report for the Provost that details the justifications and goals of the reorganization and should include any minority opinions.
7. Once the Reorganization Study Committee approves the justifications and goals by simple majority vote, they submit their report to the Provost.
8. The Provost appoints a Reorganization Implementation Committee charged to investigate the reorganization:
  - a. The charge should include the justifications and goals from above.
  - b. This group should be broadly empowered to gather the data necessary to do their work and should be aided by faculty and administrative groups as they gather this data.
  - c. The broad range of data may include but is not limited to:
    - i. Necessary changes to bylaws within a re-organized unit or units
    - ii. Advising and articulation issues
    - iii. Budget information
  - d. The Reorganization Implementation Committee should make a recommendation to the Provost.
    - i. The recommendation should outline:
      1. What reorganization is recommended and why
      2. The necessary steps for a reorganization to occur
      3. What the timeframe is for the reorganization
      4. What metrics should be used to judge the success of the reorganization and other plans for assessment
      5. What, if any, ramifications on units across the University are expected
      6. What, if any, changes would be made or recommended to University administrative structures to support the reorganization

7. Budgetary requirements for the reorganized units
  8. Staff and administrative positions affected by the reorganization
  9. How tenure is preserved
  10. How contracts with non-tenured faculty are affected
  11. Challenges that may be faced in carrying out the reorganization
  12. Community or other stakeholders that should be informed about the reorganization (donors, alumni, etc.)
9. The Provost shares the Reorganization Implementation Committee's recommendation with the Deans and Faculty Chairs from affected units.
    - a. Faculty from the affected units shall vote on the recommendation within their respective faculty governance groups.
    - b. If the affected units' faculty governance groups all accept the recommendation by simple majority vote, the Provost is notified with the results and shares the final recommendation with the Faculty Senate.
    - c. If a faculty governance group from at least one affected unit does not accept the recommendation with a simple majority vote, they must submit a statement to the Provost detailing why the recommendation was not approved.
  10. The Provost shares the recommendation, along with the voting results from the affected units' faculty governance groups and any statement(s) submitted, with the Faculty Senate.
    - a. The Faculty Senate must, by simple majority vote, approve the recommendation.
    - b. If the Faculty Senate does not approve the recommendation, the Faculty Senate should submit a statement to the Provost detailing why the recommendation was not approved.
  11. The Provost shall write a statement, offering endorsement of the recommendation or detailing why the Provost will not offer endorsement.
  12. The Provost will submit the Reorganization Implementation Committee's recommendation and any accompanying statement(s) from the Provost, the faculty governance groups, and the Faculty Senate to the Chancellor.
    - a. If all affected units' faculty governance groups and the Faculty Senate vote to accept the final recommendation and the Provost endorses the plan, the recommendation is put forth as a Bylaw change, affecting the composition of the University. The Chancellor can then recommend to endorse and accept the change.
    - b. As all Bylaw changes must, the recommendation goes through UM System and the Board of Curators.
    - c. If the recommendation does not pass a vote by all affected units' faculty governance groups, the Faculty Senate, or does not receive an endorsement from the Provost and/or the Chancellor, the Provost will charge the Reorganization Implementation Committee with modifying the recommendation to address concerns expressed in any statements submitted by these parties.
  13. If the recommendation is sent back to the Reorganization Implementation Committee for modification, they shall have a maximum of one academic year to complete modifications and resubmit their recommendation to the Provost.
    - a. Steps 9 through 12 of "Process B" are then repeated with the modified recommendation.

- b. If after the reintroduction of a modified recommendation, the recommendation does not garner all necessary votes and endorsements, the recommendation is shelved and will not be examined for three academic years.
  - c. After the three academic years have passed on a recommendation that was shelved, the Chancellor should review the recommendation.
    - i. The Chancellor may choose to revive the recommendation. If the recommendation is revived, the Provost should reintroduce the recommendation through the processes described in Steps 9 through 12 to garner the necessary votes and recommendations.
    - ii. If the Chancellor does not revive the recommendation, the recommendation is dissolved.
    - iii. If the Chancellor revives a modified recommendation that undergoes the processes described in Steps 9 through 12 and again does not garner the necessary votes and endorsements, the recommendation shall be dissolved.
14. When a recommendation is accepted and endorsed by all parties and the Bylaw change is passed by the UM System and the Board of Curators:
- a. The Provost and the Reorganization Implementation Committee shall oversee the implementation of the recommendation.
  - b. The Reorganization Implementation Committee shall submit one-year, three-year, and five-year assessment reports to the Provost, following the assessment plans laid out in the recommendation.

## Sample Timeline Scenario: Processes A and B

This sample timeline shows how the university could move through Processes A and B with a well-supported idea for reorganization.

**Process A** describes how faculty can build consensus and provide preliminary evidence for a reorganization before introducing the idea to the Chancellor. The intention is that this process would only be used if an idea for reorganization developed organically among faculty.

**Process B** describes how the Chancellor, with input from the Provost, would initiate a reorganization. Process B may or may not result from Process A.

Process A Year	Process B Year	Month	Process Step
Academic/ Fiscal Year 1		September	The Initiators introduce the idea of a merger between units to their respective faculty governance groups ( <b>Process A, 2.A</b> ).
		November	The faculty governance groups from each affected unit issue statements to their Deans and the Deans of other affected units ( <b>Process A, 2.B</b> ).
		February	The Deans of affected units issue their statements in reply to the faculty governance groups; all statements sent to Faculty Senate ( <b>Process A, 3.A</b> ).
		April	After reviewing the statements, the Faculty Senate makes an advisory vote and forwards any feedback and all statements to the Provost ( <b>Process A, 3.c</b> ).
		May	The Provost reviews all statements, provides feedback, and passes everything along to the Chancellor ( <b>Process A, 4</b> ).
	Academic/ Fiscal Year 1	September	The Chancellor and Provost appoint the Reorganization Study Committee ( <b>Process B, 1</b> ).
		May	The Reorganization Study Committee submits a final report to the Provost ( <b>Process B, 7</b> ).
	Academic/ Fiscal Year 2	September	The Provost appoints a Reorganization Implementation Committee ( <b>Process B, 8</b> ).
		February	The Reorganization Implementation Committee makes a recommendation to the Provost ( <b>Process B, 8.D</b> ). The Provost shares the recommendation with Deans and Faculty Chairs of affected units. ( <b>Process B, 9</b> ).

		March	The affected units' faculty governance groups review and discuss the recommendation.
		May	The affected units' faculty governance groups vote on the recommendation ( <b>Process B, 9.A</b> ).
	Academic/ Fiscal Year 3	September	The Provost shares the recommendation, the voting results, and any statements, with the Faculty Senate ( <b>Process B, 10</b> ).
		October	The Faculty Senate votes on the recommendation ( <b>Process B, 10.A</b> ).
		November	The Provost submits a statement of endorsement, and all other accumulated materials to the Chancellor ( <b>Process B, 11 and 12</b> ).
		December	The recommendation, along with the Chancellor's endorsement, is put forth for a Bylaw change ( <b>Process B, 14</b> ). After the Bylaw change is passed, the Reorganization Implementation Committee and the Provost oversee the implementation of the recommendation.