UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
UWT Executive Council
Meeting Minutes
WCG 106
January 27, 2009
Called to order at 12:30 p.m.

In attendance:
Chair, Michael Forman, Vice Chair, Johann Reusch, Mark Pendras, Janice Laakso, Marjorie Dobratz, Sian Davis-Vollum, Gregory Benner, Josh Tenenberg
Guests: Vice Chancellor, Beth Rushing, Ex-Officio

Synopsis:
1. Approval of the agenda.

2. Approval of minutes from Jan. 7, 2009 meeting

3. Faculty Assembly roles and quorum

4. Report from Senate Executive: potential RCEP revisions

5. Research Program Incentive

6. Adjournment

---

1. Agenda was approved.

2. Minutes were approved with corrections.

3. Faculty Assembly roles and Quorum

Michael Forman opened by telling that he was also consulting with Marsha Killien (Secretary of the Faculty) and Linda Fullerton (Manager of Elections for the Senate) about the problem of achieving quora in Faculty Assembly. Forman then reviewed the *Faculty Assembly Restructuring Plan (FARP) and the Meeting Attendance breakdown* from 2001-2006 (Attachment A).

Option I of the FARP:
One option, suggested by Killien and Fullerton, would be to return to the system whereby faculty who notified the chair of their absence would be removed from the quorum count. Review of attendance information cast doubt on the effectiveness of this approach. Forman asked Josh Tenenberg about Quorum when he was Vice Chair. Josh Tenenberg responded that his impression was that not enough faculty notified of their intended absence to make up for the small attendance. Those gathered agreed that there was no reason to expect that the system once in place would be effective were it reinstituted.

Option II:
Forman reviewed the UWT handbook policy which indicates that a quorum consists of at least half the faculty and that 2/3 of these must approve of by-laws changes. He then reviewed all five points under Option II (attachment A). Marjorie Dobratz referred to part 3b concerning the EC (Executive Council) members appointed for the first 15 or 20 faculty per unit. She suggested that there be 20 faculty members per EC member.
Tenenberg asked if there are any units with faculty members over 30. Forman responded that IAS and Business are the only units where this applies.

Forman confirmed that Acting Assistant Professors are not voting members. Dobratz asked whether fulltime lecturers were part of the voting faculty. Forman confirmed that they were voting faculty.

Sian Davis-Vollum asked whether this proposed change was similar to UW Bothell. Forman confirmed that their EC resembles UW Tacoma's EC.

Dobratz asked for further clarification about the operation of UWB faculty. Forman said their General Faculty Organization (GFO) is the equivalent of our Faculty Assembly. Bothell's Executive Council acts on behalf of the GFO on most matters. As is the case with UWT, UWB's EC represents the faculty in programs. Forman clarified that this proposal was a bit different because it sought to represent faculty or, rather, to balance a more representative structure against the potentially increased burden on the programs. Janice Laakso suggested that the wording should address the changes for the faculty assembly.

Forman noted that he would consult with the UW Senate Secretary in order to fit this within the *Code*.
Mark Pendras asked if there is any opposition to these proposed changes. Forman responded that he was not aware of any.

Laakso asked whether changes should be discussed in each unit. Forman agreed that EC members should seek comment from their units.

Davis-Vollum asked whether incentives had been considered to increase attendance at Faculty Assembly. Various EC members recalled that the previous FA Chair had offered a variety of small incentives, but these had not resulted in sufficient assistance.

Tenenberg asked about the number of IAS faculty members. Forman thought there were approximately 50-55. Pendras suggested that 20 faculty members should be the threshold for an additional EC member.

Tenenberg suggested that a system of proportional representation might better reflect the views of the faculty Forman agreed but he suggested that such a system might be too complex and that it would surely increase the burden on programs. Tenenberg was concerned that IAS would be the only unit with more representatives. Tenenberg asked about the number of faculty members at UWT. Star Murray, office assistant, said there were approximately 134. Beth Rushing said she

would get an accurate total count of the voting faculty and of their distribution by program.

Greg Benner suggested that feedback should come from each unit.

Action: Forman will change the language on the Faculty Assembly restructuring plan and contact Shelby Fritz for current voting faculty members.

Pendras asked whether the Chair and the Vice Chair are voting members. Forman said they were.

Dobratz noted that under Option II part 5, the voting could take up to five weeks. Forman clarified that the there was nothing in the new plan to require this. In fact, the new plan would require the Chair to convene the Faculty Assembly within no more than two weeks from the date of the actions described.

Tenenberg asked whether there is a statute of limitations. Further discussion led the members to agree about the need for more specific time lines around the measures to ensure accountability in number V.

Benner suggested expanding the time allotted to convene. Tenenberg asked whether there are existing voting requirements in the *UWT Bylaws*. Tenenberg suggested there should be a timely obligation to post Minutes. Benner suggested that action items should be updated and highlighted on a web page. Forman responded that agendas could be posted in advance of meetings though this might result in inflexibility before rapidly changing events. Minutes can only be posted after their approval. Actions taken by the EC under the new structure could be promulgated as those of the UW Senate already are.

Action: Forman will distribute a new document by January 30, 2009.

4. Report from Senate Executive: Potential RCEP revisions
Forman advised that changes to RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs process) were likely to come up at the next Senate meeting. *See attachment B*

Chapter 26 of the UW handbook covers the RCEP process. Proposed changes include adding *Chancellors*.

RCEP process

1) Emergency conditions: Chapter 26-31
2) Reorganization of units
    - If units transition into colleges

Reusch advised that there were concerns raised at an all-UW Faculty Senate/Assembly Leadership lunch that Deans meet and make decisions without faculty representation.

Dobratz noted that there already is faculty representation in the Senate.

Tenenberg noted that Global Honors might be an in between program.

Reusch asked about how the external faculty committees were convened (p.13, B 2a.). Forman noted that the Chair of the Faculty Senate convenes these meetings.

Dobratz asked whether there were criteria to ensure that practices are fair.
Pendras noted that these changes are improving the processes and keeping faculty in mind.
Forman noted that he was still concerned about the definition of programs. Rushing noted that the definition of units is a larger problem within the code.
Forman noted that for the Seattle campus their budget cuts were modeled at a higher amount than UWT. Forman advised that there was a complex process for closing a program. Pendras asked whether such measures had already been proposed. Forman said that the discussion in the Senate Executive Committee indicated that it was possible that the administration would consider cutting programs if the financial situation got worse. Forman said that Ch. 26-31 and 26-41 created safeguards and complex processes which served to protect units and faculty.

Dobratz noted that B 2 a-d did not refer to the budget (Attachment B). Forman noted that 26-31 specifies how financial emergencies can be declared.

5. Research Program Incentive
Greg Benner introduced an additional item toward: the concerns of faculty and staff about the fact that the Research Program incentive policy was not being implemented. The Faculty Assembly approved the research incentive program on June 2, 2008. There was a brief discussion. Rushing said that Academic Affairs is working on this.

(http://www.tacoma.washington.edu/academic_affairs/docs/Faculty%20Research%20Incentive%20Program.pdf)

Action: Forman advised that he would add this to the agenda at the next meeting.

6. Adjournment 1:51 p.m.

Attachment A:

Fac Assembly restructuring plan

TWO OPTIONS

Current rule for quorum: half the voting members with all units represented.

Option I: Return to system whereby faculty members would inform the chair of their intended absence. This would remove them from the quorum count.

Problem: It does not appear to have worked. At least for the meetings where we could find a record, there was not a quorum more often than there was.

Option II: Expand functions and membership of the Executive Council.

I. EC acts on behalf to the Assembly in all functions with the exception of amendments to the UWT Handbook.

II. Amending the Handbook would require:

A. Minimum of 2/3 vote of EC providing there is a quorum at the meeting.

B. EC then submits to the faculty who would vote according to the current rules: minimum of 2/3 vote of assembled faculty or catalyst vote where at least half participate and 2/3 approve. Again, all units would have to be represented.

III. Representation in EC. currently, the EC represents faculty in units. If the EC is to take on a larger role, it needs to come closer to representing faculty. Together, two units (IAS and Business) account for about 2/3 of the voting faculty (about 139 people) and two have 15 or fewer members. I propose the following:

A. Every program elects at least one EC member

B. the larger units choose one member for each 15 or 20 faculty after the first 15 or 20.

Consequence: this would expand EC from 7 to 11 or 12 regular members (if 15). The numbers are just a first approximation. At 15, IAS, business, and IT would pick additional members. At 20, only IAS and Business would pick additional members (2 IAS, 1 Business).

---However we do the numbers, we need to balance representativeness against the service burden to the unit.

IV. Review: Faculty Assembly would meet at least once per quarter (no change). At these meetings, the Chair would report to the faculty on the EC's activities, etc.

V. Review: the Faculty may contest or reverse any action of the EC. Two routes:

A. by petition of at least 20% of the voting faculty, the Chair would convene the Faculty Assembly within two weeks. The petition may consist of a collection of signatures presented to the chair, with copy to the vice chair.

B. by majority vote in at least three of the Faculty Assembly committees, the chair would convene the Assembly within two weeks.

Fac Assembly Attendance (1/28/2009)

The Need:

We have had a long term problem attaining a quorum (50% of the voting faculty) in meetings of the Faculty Assembly. In the past, we tried to remedy this problem by allowing faculty to inform the chair of their planned absences, thereby removing themselves from the count. This did not work between 2004-2006. This option was removed in 2006-2007.

Meeting Attendance (currently, 138 voting faculty):

Date	Attendance	Excused	Unexcused
March 01, 2001	28	25	0
April 19, 2001	29	29	12
June 8, 2001	43	17	12
November 8,2001	39	29	30
December 12, 2001	60	10	14
February 14, 2002	49	25	5
March 6, 2002	57	16	10
April 16, 2002	29	None reported (nr)	Nr
May 2, 2002	Nr	Nr	Nr
October 16, 2002	Nr	Nr	Nr
December 11,2002	Nr	Nr	Nr
January 23, 2003	Nr	Nr	Nr
March 12, 2003	Nr	Nr	nr
April 30,2003	Nr	Nr	Nr
May 28, 2003	Nr	Nr	Nr
October 22, 2003	Nr	Nr	nr
December 2,2003	Nr	Nr	Nr
January 28, 2004	Nr	Nr	Nr
March 10, 2004	Nr	Nr	Nr
April 21, 2004	Nr	Nr	Nr
December 1, 2004	33	Nr	nr
January 25,2005	25	Nr	Nr
February 17, 2005	25	Nr	Nr
April 20, 2005	31	Nr	Nr
Oct. 19, 2005	27	Nr	Nr
Nov. 29, 2005	32	Nr	Nr
Jan. 17, 2006	34	Nr	Nr
March 1, 2006	14	Nr	Nr
April 18, 2006	29	Nr	Nr
Sept. 19 2006	58		
Oct. 11, 2006	37		
Nov. 9, 2006	35		
Feb. 5, 2007	40		
March 8, 2007	34		
April 2, 2007	24		
May 3, 2007	37		
May 29, 2007	35		
Sept 18 2007	48		
Oct. 10 2007	32		
Nov. 15 2007	38		
Dec. 15 2007	33		
Jan 17, 2008	35		
Feb 5, 2008	34		
March 4	29		
April 9	26		
May 8	46		
Sept 16	52		
Nov. 19	34		

Attachment B:

Faculty Senate Proposed Changes
(Additions are underlined; deletions are struck through)

Changes to Volume Two, Part 2, Chapter 26, Section 26-41

Section 26-41. Procedures for ~~Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs~~ Restructuring of Academic Units

PREAMBLE:

This section provides a process for collegial dialogue and consultation when budget reductions, resource reallocations, or shifting academic priorities lead to consideration of organizational restructuring. The process provides administrative leaders with counsel from faculty, students, and staff, both internal and external to the unit under review for restructuring, and provides directly and indirectly affected or interested parties a forum for gathering or contributing information and perspectives. This consultative and collegial process is intended to lead to fully informed decisions regarding program reorganizations, consolidations, and eliminations.

A. ***(new A.)*** General provisions and definitions.

1. ***(old A.)*** For the purposes of sections B and ~~D~~ C below, a "program" is defined (comprising both 'department' and 'program' as defined in Sections 23.23.c and d) as follows:

   a. ***(old A.1.)*** A department or other degree-granting unit (other than a departmentalized school, ~~or~~ college, or campus); or a sub-unit within a department, an academic unit in a non-departmentalized school or college, or a group of faculty (from one or more departments) which offers a distinct degree, or a track within a degree that is described as a distinct option in the University Catalog, or in the course catalog of the college or school in question, or is customarily noted as such on student transcripts.

~~2. Either a sub-unit within a department, or a group of faculty from one or more departments, which offers a distinct degree, or a track within a degree that is described as a distinct option in the University Catalog, or in the course catalog of the college or school in question, or is customarily noted as such on student transcripts.~~

   b. ***(new b.)*** A disagreement as to whether the object of a proposed action constitutes a program shall be resolved by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, whose decision shall be binding. The dean or chancellor and the faculty group affected by the proposed action shall each submit a statement of their position to the chair of the Committee, which shall deliver its ruling within ten instructional days of the receipt of both statements.

2. ***(new 2.)*** (An "instructional day" is a day on which scheduled classes meet during Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarters and excludes weekends, holidays, vacation and examination periods.)

3. For purposes of these proceedings, extension of any specific deadlines may be granted by the Secretary of the Faculty, who will inform the parties in writing of the reasonable grounds for which such extension has been sought, and granted.

4. Copies of all documents required under section 26-41 shall be filed with the Secretary of the Faculty.

5. Any written recommendations received by the Secretary of the Faculty under this section 26-41 must be made available to any member of the faculty on request.

B. Procedures for reorganization, consolidation or elimination of programs.

1. If a dean or chancellor after consultation with his or her elected faculty council (Section 23-45.C) determines that a budget reduction, ~~or~~ a reallocation of resources, or a realignment of academic priorities can only be implemented by measures that will have one or more of the following results:

   a. the termination of an undergraduate or graduate program as defined in Section A above;
   b. the removal of tenured faculty, or of untenured faculty before completion of their contract;
   c. a significant change in the terms, conditions or course of employment of faculty;
   d. a significant change in the overall curriculum of a college, ~~or~~ school, or campus, or of the University as a whole; or
   e. a significant departure from the stated mission of a college, ~~or~~ school, or campus, or of the University as a whole;

   the dean or chancellor shall request authority from the Provost to initiate a formal review to identify one or more programs for elimination, reorganization, or consolidation with another unit and/or reduction in size. The Provost shall consider such requests in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

2. If the Provost grants the dean's or chancellor's request for such authority:

   a. The dean or chancellor shall notify the Secretary of the Faculty of his or her intention to initiate a review under this section of the *Faculty Code*. The Secretary of the Faculty shall, after consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate, appoint within ~~seven~~ ten ~~calendar~~ instructional days ~~a Program Identification~~ an External Faculty Committee composed of five faculty members (including one designated as the committee's Chair) from outside the college or school in which the review is to take place.
   b. The External Faculty Committee, when convened by its Chair, shall establish a schedule of meetings for its own Committee. Such independent meetings of the External Faculty Committee will allow its members to form independent conclusions regarding the arguments and evidence supporting the proposed action of the dean or chancellor. The responsibility of the External Faculty Committee is to ensure that the recommendations of the elected faculty council and of the dean or chancellor are based on a process that was fair, thorough, impartial, and consistent in its use of appropriate criteria and materials. (The External Faculty Committee shall retain copies of all the materials it has considered, which it will make available to the Review Committee, should one be appointed under B.4 below.)
   c. ***(old b.)*** For the duration of the reorganization, consolidation or elimination procedures, and for the business of these procedures only, the members of the ~~Program Identification~~ External Faculty Committee shall also be added to the ~~college~~ elected faculty council of the college, ~~or~~ school or campus in question as *ex officio* members ~~with~~ without vote. They shall participate in all ~~discussions~~ meetings of that council, convened by its faculty chair or the dean or chancellor, leading to the identification of programs for reorganization, consolidation or elimination, and shall have full access to all materials and personnel consulted by the dean or chancellor and ~~college~~ the elected faculty council in this process. This combination of the elected faculty council and the External Faculty Committee is hereinafter referred to as the augmented faculty council.
   d. If the ~~college~~ elected faculty council does not include student members, the dean or chancellor shall request that the student organization (or organizations) of the affected school, ~~or~~ college or campus shall appoint a graduate student and, where appropriate, an undergraduate student to ~~the augmented college council, provided that no such student organization exists, such appointments shall be made by the GPSS and the ASUW~~ serve, with voting rights, with the augmented faculty council for the business of these procedures only. If no such student organization exists, such appointments shall be made by the GPSS or other appropriate recognized graduate student organization and the ASUW or other appropriate recognized student organization.

e. ***(old c.)*** The dean or chancellor, in consultation with the augmented ~~college~~ faculty council, associate deans and other appropriate advisory bodies or affected groups in the college, ~~or~~ school or campus, shall examine measures to meet the required budget reduction, ~~or~~ resource allocation goals or realigned academic priorities, including the ~~elimination of programs, and alternatives to elimination such as reorganization and consolidation~~ reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of programs, and alternatives to such actions.

f. The information used as a basis for the identification of programs for reorganization, consolidation, or elimination, and of alternatives to such actions, shall consist of:

1) documents that pre-date the dean's or chancellor's request (under B.1 above), including:

a) the reports resulting from periodic reviews of programs or departments, any interim revisions of them, and responses to them by the dean or chancellor, the ~~college~~ elected faculty council, and the faculty of the program(s) in question.
b) accreditation reviews, if such exist for the program(s) in question.
c) any other performance data gathered and maintained by the school, college or campus, provided they are up-to-date and have been previously submitted to the faculty of the program(s) in question for review and response.
d) all relevant documentation resulting from the ongoing long-range planning process in the school, college or campus, and

2) such other information requested by the dean, chancellor, or the augmented ~~college~~ faculty council as deemed necessary, or independently requested by the External Faculty Committee, provided it is up-to-date and has been submitted for review and response to the faculty of the program(s) ~~in question for review and response for~~ under consideration, and the faculty in the program(s) have had at least five instructional days to submit their comments on the information.

g. ***(old e.)*** In proposing program reorganizations, consolidations or eliminations, the dean or chancellor shall protect, to the maximum extent possible:

1) the overall curriculum of the school, college or campus and the University and the educational needs of its students, consistent with the role and mission of the University;
2) in the case of a reorganization or consolidation, the quality of the program in relation to ~~e.~~g. 1) above;
3) other programs in the University, including interdisciplinary programs, that may be affected by the proposed action(s);
4) the University's commitment to tenure; and
5) the University's commitment to ~~affirmative action.~~ diversity in faculty, staff and students.

~~f. Deliberations leading to the identification of programs for elimination shall be confidential until the conclusion of the identification process, except that, at least two instructional days before any public announcement, the dean shall inform the faculty of the identified program(s) of their status, in writing, and shall make available to them the report described in B.3 and B.3.a below and its supporting documents. At least one instructional day before any public announcement, the dean shall convene the faculty of the identified program(s) for the purpose of explaining the review procedures to them, and informing them of the provisions under sections B.3 and 5 below for representation of their views and presentation of supporting evidence.~~

h. When the Chair of the elected faculty council determines that the augmented faculty council is ready to conclude its review, a formal vote on the proposed action shall be taken by its eligible voting members. The result of that vote shall be communicated in writing to the dean or chancellor, who at least ten instructional days before any public announcement, shall communicate directly in writing with each faculty member of the affected program(s) to inform them of his or her intended action. The dean or chancellor shall make available to them the report described in B.3 and B.3.a below and its supporting documents, and the accompanying statement by the External Faculty Committee described in B.3.b below (when

available). At least five instructional days before any public announcement, the dean or chancellor shall convene the faculty of the identified program(s) for the purpose of explaining the review procedures to them, and informing them of the provisions under sections B.5 and B.6 below for representation of their views and presentation of supporting evidence.

3. The dean's or chancellor's intention to reorganize, consolidate or eliminate the identified program(s) shall be announced within a period of ~~thirty~~ forty-five instructional days from the appointment of the ~~Program Identification~~ External Faculty Committee (2.a above). This announcement shall be made in the form of a detailed and specific report accompanied by a separate, independent statement from the ~~Program Identification~~ External Faculty Committee. Both of these documents shall be submitted by the dean or chancellor to ~~the President~~, the Provost and the chair(s) of the affected unit(s), to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and to the Secretary of the Faculty, who shall publish them in a *Class C Bulletin* within ~~seven~~ five instructional days of receiving them.

   a. The dean's or chancellor's report shall:

      1) justify the proposed measures in relation to existing program review materials and other publicly available planning documents;
      2) describe the impact of the proposed measures on the faculty in the identified program(s), on other programs, and on the curriculum and students of the school, college or campus ~~of the college~~ as a whole, ~~and on the faculty affected~~; and
      3) be accompanied by all supporting documents, which need not be published in the *Class C Bulletin* referred to in B.3 above, but must be made available to any faculty member on request.

   b. The External Faculty Committee's accompanying statement shall be prepared and signed by ~~the~~ its chair ~~of the Program Identification Committee~~, and shall reflect the opinion of a majority of the External Faculty Committee. It shall indicate:

      1) ~~whether the Committee supports or does not support the proposal of the dean, giving reasons therefor, and~~ whether in its view the program review process was fair, thorough, impartial and consistent in its use of appropriate criteria and materials, and
      2) ~~whether in its view the program identification process was fair, thorough, impartial, consistent in its use of appropriate criteria and materials, and free of conflict of interest~~, whether the External Faculty Committee supports or does not support the proposal of the dean or chancellor, giving reasons therefor.

4. ~~For each college in which these procedures are being applied,~~Upon receipt of the report and statement detailed in B.3 above, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, after consultation with the Chair of the External Faculty Committee and with the advice and consent of the Senate Executive Committee, shall appoint a Review Committee consisting of ~~five~~ four faculty members (including one designated as committee chair), one member of the External Faculty Committee, one representative of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate or other appropriate recognized graduate student organization, and one representative of the Associated Students of the University of Washington or other appropriate recognized undergraduate student organization (all with full participatory rights). The formation and membership of this committee shall be announced in the *Class C Bulletin* described in B.3 above.

5. ***(new 5.)***~~This committee shall conduct an open review of the dean's proposal, with particular reference to the justification offered, and~~ The Review Committee's primary goal is to review the dean's or chancellor's report from the perspective of the University and the public ~~and, to this end, shall conduct an open review of the dean's or chancellor's proposal, with particular~~ reference to the justification offered. The Review Committee may receive or request additional materials or arguments from the dean or chancellor, from the External Faculty Committee, from the faculty, students and staff of the identified program(s), and other constituencies in the University or the public at large. Meetings to invite public comment shall be scheduled at times that permit participation by the public. Within ~~twenty~~ thirty instructional days of ~~the publication of~~

~~the *Bulletin*,~~ its appointment, the Review Committee shall deliver its written recommendation to the President and the Provost. The recommendation shall be transmitted at the same time to the dean or chancellor and to the chair(s) of the affected program(s).

6. ***(old 5.)*** Following the submission of the Review Committee's written recommendations, the dean or chancellor may propose a modified course of action, and the affected program(s) may submit an additional statement. This statement may suggest alternatives to the measures proposed by the dean or chancellor, giving detailed reasons based on educational policy and/or past reviews of the program(s) in question, and may include additional relevant documentation. Any such materials must be transmitted to the President and Provost within ten instructional days of the delivery of the Review Committee's report.

7. ***(old 6.)*** After the President (or the President's delegate) confers with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, he or she shall transmit a ~~final~~ decision on the matter and accompanying recommendations to the Board of Regents, and to the dean(s) or chancellor(s), the chair(s) of the affected program(s) and the Chair of the Faculty Senate within ~~thirty~~ fifteen ~~calendar~~ instructional days of receiving the Review Committee's recommendations~~, but in no case later than the final day of Spring Quarter~~. The President's decision shall take careful account of the impact of the reorganization(s), consolidation(s) or elimination(s) on the University's ability to perform its educational role and mission, and on the diversity of the University community.

C. ***(old D.)*** Procedures for ~~L~~limited ~~R~~reorganization and ~~C~~consolidation of ~~P~~programs.

1. In order to reallocate resources, ~~or~~ implement educational policies or realign academic priorities, a dean or chancellor may at any time propose the reorganization of one or more programs within a school, college, or campus, or their consolidation ~~or amalgamation~~ with other units. The reallocation of graduate degree programs (Section 23-24.B) from one qualified academic unit (Section 23-24.D) to another, or to an interdisciplinary program within the Graduate School, is a limited reorganization that should follow the procedures outlined in this section.

2. ***(new 2.)*** If the proposed measures will not have the effects described in B.1 above, the dean or chancellor may proceed with the measures, provided:

   a. the proposal results from detailed discussion with the affected program(s), and with appropriate faculty advisory committees in the school, college or campus;
   b. a detailed justification of the proposed actions is submitted to the Provost and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, taking account of the documentation described in ~~B.2.d~~ B.2.f above; and
   c. the measures are not implemented until the conclusion of a period of twenty instructional days during which the faculty of the affected program(s) may exercise the option described in ~~section D.2~~ C.3 below.

3. ***(old 2.)*** If a majority of the voting faculty of ~~an~~ the affected academic program(s) determines by a vote ~~judges~~ that a proposed reorganization or consolidation will have one or more of the effects described in B.1 above, such majority may petition the Provost for a review under the procedures for reorganization, consolidation or elimination of programs (under Section B above). The Provost shall consider such petitions in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and within ten instructional days may either direct the dean or chancellor to conduct a program reorganization, consolidation or elimination of program review following the procedures described in Sections A and B.2 through 7 above, or decline to do so, in which case a detailed statement must be transmitted to the petitioners, the dean or chancellor, and to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, explaining this decision. ~~why an elimination review is not deemed appropriate~~.

D. ***(old C.)*** Procedures for ~~the~~ reorganization, consolidation or ~~E~~elimination of a ~~C~~college or ~~S~~school.

1. If the Provost and a majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting concur that a budget reduction, ~~or~~ a reallocation of resources~~,~~ or a realignment of academic priorities should be achieved by the elimination of a particular college or school in its entirety, or by its reorganization or consolidation with another college or school, the Provost shall ~~invite~~ request that the Chair of the Faculty Senate ~~to~~ appoint a Review Committee, ~~constituted as described in B.4 above.~~ of five faculty.

2. The Provost shall submit to the Review Committee a detailed justification of the proposed measure, prepared on the basis of the materials described in B.2.~~d~~f above and other appropriate planning documents made available by the central administration, provided they have been previously submitted to the dean or chancellor and faculty of the college or school in question for review and comment. The justification shall:
   a. review alternatives and explain why elimination of the college or school is preferable; and
   b. protect to the maximum extent possible the aspects of the University described in B.2.~~e~~g above.

3. The Secretary of the Faculty shall publish the Provost's proposal, and the accompanying justification, in a *Class C Bulletin* within ~~seven~~ five instructional days of receiving them.

4. The Review Committee shall conduct ~~an open~~ review of the Provost's proposal in the manner described in B.~~3~~5 above, and shall deliver its written recommendation to the President, Provost, deans or chancellors of the affected college or school, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, within thirty instructional ~~calendar~~ days of the publication of the *Bulletin*.

5. Following the delivery of the Review Committee's report, the Provost may propose a modified course of action, and the dean or chancellor of the affected college or school may submit an additional statement of the kind described in B.~~5~~6 above. Any such materials must be submitted to the President within ten instructional days of the delivery of the Review Committee's report.

6. Within fifteen instructional days of the comment period provided for in D.5 above, and ~~A~~ after the President (or the President's delegate) confers with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, he or she shall transmit a final decision and accompanying recommendations to the Board of Regents, the deans or chancellors, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate. ~~as prescribed in B.6 above.~~

E. ***(new E.)*** Procedures for limited reorganization and consolidation of colleges and schools.

1. In order to reallocate resources or implement educational policies, or align academic priorities, the Provost may at any time propose the consolidation of colleges and schools. If the proposed measure will not have the effects described in B.1 above, the Provost may proceed with the measures, provided:

   a. the proposal results from detailed discussion with the affected colleges or schools, and with appropriate faculty advisory committees in the colleges or schools;
   b. a detailed justification of the proposed actions is submitted to the President and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, taking account of the documentation described in B.2.f above; and
   c. the measures are not implemented until the conclusion of a period of twenty instructional days during which the faculty of the affected college/school(s) may exercise the option described in E.2 below.

2. If a majority of the voting faculty of an affected college or school determines by a vote that a proposed reorganization or consolidation will have one or more of the effects described in B.1 above, such majority may petition the President for a review under the procedures for elimination of a college/school. The President, or the President's delegate, shall consider such petitions in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and within ten instructional days may either direct the Provost to conduct a review following the procedures described in section D above, or decline to do so, in which case a detailed statement must be transmitted to the petitioners and the Chair of the Faculty Senate, explaining why a review under section D above is not deemed appropriate.