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**Process A: Faculty Impetus for Reorganization**

1. The initiating faculty should come from an affected unit.
	1. If a proposal for reorganization would affect more than one unit, the initiating faculty must obtain assent from faculty from each affected unit.
	2. Initiating faculty from outside an affected unit must obtain assent from faculty from each affected unit.
	3. 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.
	1. During the respective unit faculty meetings, the faculty engage in a discussion and the Initiators call for a vote to form an exploratory committee. The vote may take place at a time designated by the bylaws of each unit.
	2. Each affected unit's faculty governance group must affirm by vote the formation of an exploratory committee in order to appoint members.
	3. If a faculty governance group from an affected unit does not approve the formation of an exploratory committee, the Initiators must wait a minimum of one academic year before re-introducing a proposal for reorganization (either the same proposal, identical or modified, or a wholly new proposal).
3. If each affected unit’s faculty governance group affirms the formation of a Reorganization Exploratory Committee, each faculty chair appoints members to serve as unit representatives on the exploratory committee.
	1. The Reorganization Exploratory Committee should include the Initiators from the affected units and any other key/interested faculty.
	2. The chairs of each respective unit should coordinate on the number of members to appoint to ensure equal representation on the Reorganization Exploratory Committee.
4. The Reorganization Exploratory Committee shall submit a final report, including stakeholder feedback, other relevant data, and an evidence-based recommendation for/against reorganization to the faculty chairs of each affected unit and ask to share the report at a regular meeting of each unit's faculty governance group.
	1. Each faculty governance group discusses the report and the Initiators call for a vote to move forward with the proposal.
	2. In order to move forward with the proposal, each affected unit's faculty governance group must affirm this move by majority vote.
	3. If at least one affected unit's faculty governance group rejects the proposal, the proposal is dead and the Initiators must wait a minimum of one academic year before re-introducing a proposal for reorganization (either the same proposal, identical or modified, or a wholly new proposal).
	4. A faculty governance group may delay the vote for only one session in order to send the report back to the Reorganization Exploratory Committee for more information; a vote must take place at the following session.
5. If all affected units' faculty governance groups approve to move the proposal forward, the Reorganization Exploratory Committee submits its report to the deans of each affected unit and to the Faculty Senate.
	1. Each dean of an affected unit provides written feedback to the Faculty Senate.
	2. The Faculty Senate review the Reorganization Exploratory Committee's report and the deans' feedback.
	3. The Faculty Senate may choose to delay the advisory vote and send the report back to the Reorganization Exploratory Committee for additional information. The Faculty Senate must provide a deadline in order to review the revised report and make an advisory vote.
	4. The Faculty Senate makes an advisory vote to accept the report and provides its feedback, along with the report, to the Provost.
6. The Provost provides feedback, along with the report, 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:
	1. The Chancellor and Provost (ex-officio).
	2. The Deans of affected units, and potentially Deans from units that have research and teaching partnerships with affected units.
	3. Representatives from key faculty governance bodies, including Faculty Senate and the elected faculty leadership from affected units.
	4. The affected units’ Budget Committees.
	5. The University Budget Committee, with input from the Faculty Senate Budget Committee.
	6. Representatives from staff, students, and alumni of affected units.
3. The Reorganization Study Committee should collect appropriate data.
	1. The data gathered should be sufficient to determine important factors, such as (but not limited to):
		1. The effect of reorganization on:
			1. academic programs
			2. partnerships (teaching, research, and external)
			3. personnel and staffing
			4. student interests
			5. budget
		2. 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:
	1. Achieving the mission of the University as articulated in the University strategic plan
	2. Increased attainment for students
	3. Increased Research and Scholarship productivity
	4. Increased budgetary efficiency
	5. Capitalize on new research and teaching opportunities
	6. 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.
	1. The Reorganization Study Committee must agree, by 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.
	2. 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 majority vote, they submit their report to the Provost.
8. The Provost appoints a Reorganization Implementation Committee charged to investigate the reorganization:
	1. The charge should include the justifications and goals from above.
	2. 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.
	3. The broad range of data may include but is not limited to:
		1. Necessary changes to bylaws within a re-organized unit or units
		2. Advising and articulation issues
		3. Budget information
	4. The Reorganization Implementation Committee should make a recommendation to the Provost.
		1. 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.
	1. Faculty from the affected units shall vote on the recommendation within their respective faculty governance groups.
	2. If the affected units’ faculty governance groups all accept the recommendation by majority vote, the Provost is notified with the results and shares the final recommendation with the Faculty Senate.
	3. If a faculty governance group from at least one affected unit does not accept the recommendation with a 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.
	1. The Faculty Senate must, by majority vote, approve the recommendation.
	2. 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.
	1. 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.
	2. As all Bylaw changes must, the recommendation goes through UM System and the Board of Curators.
	3. 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.
	1. Steps 9 through 12 of “Process B” are then repeated with the modified recommendation.
	2. 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.
	3. After the three academic years have passed on a recommendation that was shelved, the Chancellor should review the recommendation.
		1. 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.
		2. If the Chancellor does not revive the recommendation, the recommendation is dissolved.
		3. 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:
	1. The Provost and the Reorganization Implementation Committee shall oversee the implementation of the recommendation.
	2. 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.