

Policy for the formation of new departments within the College of Science and Engineering

- A. Formation of new departments:** This policy applies to the formation of new departments via the following:
1. The split of an existing department into two or more new departments
 2. The full or partial fusion of two or more existing departments
 3. Any other restructuring of departments involving elements of sections A.1. or A.2. above
- B. Rights of administration:** Per the CBA (section 5.2.5) the decision for the formation of new departments is a right held by management, but the dean may elect to involve faculty in the process via the procedure outlined below.
- C. Role of PPBC:**
1. Authors and maintains this policy in collaboration with the dean
 2. Reviews proposal for the formation of a new department and advises dean
- D. Decision process**
1. The leadership of the existing department (in case of a split) or departments (in case of a fusion) makes an informal request to the dean to initiate the decision process for the formation of a new department
 2. If the dean approves of the initial request, they invite departmental leadership to prepare an initial formal proposal (section E) that is shared with all department members (TT faculty, NTT faculty, and staff) and the dean
 3. The dean appoints an external impartial manager moderating the decision process in the department or departments
 - i. The manager meets with different departmental stakeholders (tenured TT faculty, non-tenured TT faculty, NTT faculty, staff, students) and the dean and implements mechanisms for feedback on the initial formal proposal that ensure input can be given freely without impact of power differentials
 - ii. The manager communicates feedback from stakeholders to all department members and the dean. This feedback must be taken into account for a final version of the proposal
 - iii. The manager is responsible for administering an advisory vote by all faculty and staff, reporting results separately (when appropriate) for tenured TT faculty, non-tenured TT faculty, NTT faculty, and staff to the dean
 4. Taking the final proposal, advisory vote, and stakeholder input into account, the dean may decide to advance the proposal to the college level (Steps 5. and 6.)
 5. The college administration will provide a written statement that provides a brief assessment of the impacts of the new structure on personnel, financial, and space resources

6. The final proposal and impact statement will be shared with the following groups that – collectively or as individual members – may provide feedback to the dean:
 - i. All members of the department or departments for which a restructuring is being proposed
 - ii. PPBC
 - iii. DAC
7. Taking the final proposal, impact statement, and feedback from section D.6. into account, the dean may recommend the formation of a new department to the provost.

E. Proposal Elements

1. Rationale for the formation of a new department
 - a. Justifications must address the need for the restructuring and how the change aligns with the missions and strategic plans of CSE and the university
2. Architecture of the proposed restructuring
 - a. Personnel: List any positions that will have to be created and any positions that will be lost. Include rosters that detail how existing faculty and staff will be distributed among departments
 - b. Describe the leadership structure of the new department or departments, including allocation of any course releases associated with major leadership or service activities. Include organizational chart.
 - c. Describe the allocation of the following among the new structures:
 - i. Staff roles
 - ii. Existing departmental funds (including both department operating budget and other funds)
 - iii. Curriculum, including service classes and GURs
 - iv. Space
 - v. Equipment
3. Arrangements for the transition to the new structure
 - a. Include a timeline for the restructuring (including creation of new department operating policy and procedures documents, COPEP addenda, and curricular processes if required)
 - b. Describe arrangements to avoid problems/conflicts during the transitional period (e.g., P+T review, allocation of overhead from grant proposals, etc.)
4. Cost/benefit analysis of impacts
 - a. Address potential costs and benefits, at the department, college, and university level (if relevant), on the following:
 - i. Students
 - ii. Staff
 - iii. Faculty (including T+P process)

- iv. Curriculum and teaching (including service courses and GURs)
- v. Research
- vi. Service
- vii. Financial resources
- viii. Space resources
- ix. Equipment
- x. Academic governance
- xi. Accreditation (if applicable)
- xii. Scholarships
- xiii. Donations/giving