

BACKGROUND ON REVISION OF BL-ACA-D16 AND RELATED CREM POLICIES

Nov. 14, 2023

A. Outline of procedural steps required under current policy 2

B. Outline of procedural steps in proposed revised policy 3

C. Text of old policy with explanations where each section went 4

D. Text of new policy with explanations where each section came from. 19

E. Legislative history of BL-ACA-D18, Academic Program Initiatives, which were two 28
 resolutions calling on a future BFC to clarify the scope of this policy.

A BRIEF HISTORY

1. The CREM policy was enacted in 1982 as a narrow policy to require faculty involvement at both the unit level and the BFC level in campus decisions about potential retrenchment as a result of a severe budgetary crisis. The BFC made minor amendments in 1984. The original is substantially preserved as BL-ACA-D17, Faculty Participation in Campus-Level Budget Decisions on Financial Difficulties.

2. A resolution was passed in 1988 asking the BFC to clarify the jurisdiction of units and the BFC, and whether it applied to non-structural changes in academic programs (e.g., the Wells Scholars Program).

3. A replacement policy was enacted in 2011 as a result of concern that faculty had not been properly involved in the creation of the School of Informatics. It added the creation of new units to the scope of the policy. Its focus was on the protection of faculty appointments and student progress when units are restructured. It called only for faculty to be consulted.

4. The current version was created in 2015 to create a more robust faculty-dominated process that turned on faculty votes, gave small groups of faculty and dissenting units veto power. It appears to have been a reaction to faculty dissatisfaction with the process by which the School of Global and International Studies and Media School were created and decisions were made about which departments would move to the new school. The new cumbersome policy was uniformly opposed by deans and administrators. At least 12 different faculty speakers at the BFC meeting expressed confusion about the multiple overlapping steps and how the policy would work in practice. It was passed on a divided vote (30-20) with several people saying they would vote for it, even though they didn't understand it, because they trusted their colleagues who drafted it.

A. SUMMARY OF CURRENT CREM PROCESS

1. An initiating body prepares a proposal and presents to CREM comm & Provost
2. Provost presents to all vice provosts & all deans
3. CREM comm presents to unit policy committees
4. CREM comm decides who are the “other affected faculty” and presents to them
5. Remonstrance period (to CREM comm)
6. CREM comm prepares recommendations and sends to deans and unit faculty
7. Remonstrance period for deans (to Provost)
8. Second remonstrance period for unit faculty (to Provost)

Option A - multiple units

9. CREM (?) presents to unit faculty
10. Unit faculty vote and report to CREM/provost
11. Other affected faculty vote and report to CREM/provost
12. Third remonstrance period (to CREM)
13. Back to unit/other affected faculty for re-vote

Option B - one primary unit

- B9. CREM Comm refers to unit
- B10. Third remonstrance period (to CREM comm)
- B11. CREM Comm mediates if faculty divided
- B12. If mediation fails, goes to Exec Comm
- B13. Exec may take unspecified “actions”

Option A - majority vote yes

14. Deans convene Internal Comm.
15. Faculty, staff, students appoint members
16. Provost adds members
17. Deans report members to CREM/Provost
18. CREM Comm may request changes
19. Internal Comm prepares report
20. External Comm is appointed, process not specified
21. External Comm membership is reported to CREM/provost
22. External Comm prepares 2nd report based on 1st report
23. 2nd report goes to the deans, Internal Comm, and CREM Comm
24. Internal Comm prepares 3rd report based on 2nd report
25. 3d report goes to affected units
26. Unit faculty vote
27. Results are presented to CREM Comm/provost

Option B - majority vote no

- B14. Proposal revised & resubmitted
- B15. Fourth remonstrance period (to CTREM comm)

Option B1

Process continues from Step 12

Option B2

CREM Comm stops process

Option A - vote is favorable

28. Back to Internal Comm
29. Internal Comm forms Planning Comm.
30. Constituencies appoint members
31. Membership reported to CREM Comm
32. CREM Comm requests changes
33. Plan Comm prepares implementation report
34. Plan Report goes to CREM Comm/provost
35. CREM/provost disseminate Plan Report
36. Anyone may respond to Plan Report
37. Plan Comm. revises & distributes
38. Plan Report voted on by unit and other affected faculty

Option B - vote is negative

- B28. Back to Internal Comm
 - B29. Internal Comm may kill or revise and resubmit
 - B30. Fifth remonstrance period (CREM comm)
- Option B1* *Option B2*
 Process continues from step 24 CREM Comm stops process

Option A - approved by 2/3

39. Provost implements plan

Option B - not approved

- B39. Plan returns to Plan Comm to revise
- B40. Sixth remonstrance period (CREM Comm)

Option B1

Process starts from 37

Option B2

CREM Comm stops process

40. 5 years later, a new CREM Comm forms a campus-wide Review Committee and solicits outside peer reviews and creates some unspecified kind of report with unspecified metrics for Exec Comm and Provost

B. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED NEW PROCESS FOR UNIT REORGANIZATION

1. Provost discusses reorganization proposal with BFC Executive Comm.
2. If there is consensus, Provost forms Review Committee
 - a. Provost names chair and appoints appropriate administrators, staff & students
 - b. Exec Comm. appoints faculty members (approx. 50% of committee)
3. Review Committee takes proposal to affected units & other constituencies for feedback
4. Review Committee drafts comprehensive Recommendation Report
5. Report is presented to faculty from affected units for discussion and vote
6. Review Committee can revised and resubmit Report if concerns are raised,
7. Report and results of vote go to Provost and Exec Committee
8. Provost discusses reorganization proposal with BFC Executive Comm.
9. If reorganization has substantial support, Provost proceeds with implementation

C. TEXT OF CURRENT POLICY

Title: Creation, Reorganization, Elimination, and Merger of Academic Units and Programs,

Scope

All academic units and programs on the Bloomington campus.

Policy Statement

A. Given that the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty [section 2.1.a.1.e] provides legislative authority to the faculty in matters pertaining to the “Creation, reorganization, merger, and elimination of programs and units affecting more than one school on the campus,” and consistent with our commitment to shared faculty and administrative governance, the policies outlined in this document shall be followed except in the cases of financial exigency, when the policies outlined in (BL-ACA-D17 Faculty Participation in Campus-Level Budget Decisions on Financial Difficulties) shall apply.

B. Circumstances such as new directions in scholarship, sciences and the arts; new expectations for students entering professional careers or pursuing advanced education; financial opportunities or constraints; or administrative efficiencies may make it prudent to consider and, perhaps, to create, merge, reorganize, or eliminate academic units (CREM), necessitating a reallocation of financial resources and the reassignment of faculty members, librarians, professional and support staff, and students to new academic homes.

Proposals to create, restructure, merge, or eliminate academic units, or to change the status of an existing unit should be made only when that action is expected significantly to enhance the ability and capacity of Indiana University Bloomington to perform its joint mission of education and scholarship.

Explanation of changes

Title simplified to Reorganization of academic units

Changed to clarify when more than one unit is involved so BFC has jurisdiction.

Deleted as redundant and hortatory

Incorporated into ¶ 5.

Simplified and incorporated into ¶ 6.

CREMs should construct academic units that will be well-respected nationally and internationally and whose achievements will enhance the institution's reputation for excellence in teaching, research and creative activity. Proposals should be both responsive to current conditions and mindful of millennia of intellectual endeavor.

C. The role of the CREM committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) is to monitor and safeguard the legislative authority of the faculty over CREM initiatives. If faculty members who are immediately and substantially affected by the CREM changes believe that they have not been sufficiently engaged in the process of planning, development, implementation and review, they may petition the CREM committee at any point. The committee will consider the petition in a timely manner, and discuss it with involved administrators and local faculty committees. The CREM committee has the authority to insist that steps be taken to ensure (i) the inclusion of all materially affected faculty members in a process that (ii) preserves the legislative authority of the faculty over CREM initiatives. The membership of the CREM committee will be determined by the Nominations Committee of the BFC and will include an ex-officio member from the provost's office. No more than one member shall be appointed concurrently from any single academic unit. Each member shall serve for a term of two years and cannot serve more than two consecutive terms. When a CREM is initiated, any member of the committee who is a member of the affected units or is determined to be an affected faculty member should step down from the committee and a replacement should be appointed by the BFC Nominations Committee.

The CREM committee will base its actions and decisions on the following key principles: preserving tenure, shared governance, academic freedom, and peer review of personnel decisions within units.

Deleted as redundant and hortatory.

Deleted because function of former CREM Committee is now performed by special Review Committee created for each reorganization.

Assurance of voice for affected faculty incorporated into procedure ¶ 28.

Incorporated into ¶ 8

D. In the case of a CREM proposal by the Indiana University administration that is focused on or proposed by a core or system school, or affects a core or system school, the University policy on Merger, Reorganization and Elimination of Academic Units and Programs Involving Core Schools will be invoked.

Incorporated into ¶ 3 and made consistent with university policy language.

E. In what follows below, unless otherwise specified, “faculty” refers to all tenured faculty and librarians, tenure-track faculty and librarians, and all categories of non-tenured faculty (lecturers, senior lecturers, teaching professors, clinical professors, research scientists and scholars, research associates, academic specialists, and professors of practice). The “provost” refers to the individual holding this office or those to whom the responsibilities have been delegated by the provost. “School policy committee” refers to policy committees as described in the BFC’s Elected Policy Committee Statement.

Moved to “Definitions: section per university policy template.

F. “Materially affected faculty members,” shall refer to (i) all faculty members whose locus of appointment in a department or school (if non-departmentalized) will be changed by implementation of a CREM initiative, and (ii) all faculty members in a department or school (if non-departmentalized) where 25% or more of the faculty would have their locus of appointment changed by implementation of a CREM initiative.

Deleted as redundant.

Policy Summary

The policies outlined in this document refer to the Bloomington faculty’s role in matters pertaining to the creation, reorganization, merger, and elimination of programs and units on the Bloomington campus, as well as the procedures which govern their implementation.

Incorporated into ¶¶ 1, 34-37.

Procedures

I. Initiation of a CREM

A. A creation, reorganization, elimination or merger of one or more degree granting units (CREM) may be initiated by university, campus, or school administrators; by faculty through any of their governance bodies (including those of individual units); or by students through any of their governance bodies.

B. An initiator as defined above in A. is obliged to inform directly the CREM committee and provost of its interest in proposing a CREM at the earliest stage of planning and provide a prima facie case for doing so. A prima facie case entails a brief rationale that explains why the CREM is considered both desirable and feasible. The initiation should take place during the Fall or Spring semester to allow for full faculty involvement.

C. The provost will present the case for a CREM to all vice provosts and deans, together with a copy of this policy.

The CREM standing committee will present the case, together with a copy of this policy, to school policy committees and potentially affected faculty members. A reasonable time for remonstrance will be provided, whereby parties may declare that they do not consider themselves to be involved in the CREM or additional parties may express their interest in participating in it.

In circumstances where there is just cause for confidentiality, dissemination may be delayed, during which time no substantive steps may be taken in the CREM.

Incorporated into ¶ 21.

Responsibility for initiating the Review process clarified as resting primarily with Provost unless they delegate.

Deleted for lack of authority for BFC to determine whom Provost needs to tell.

Obligation of Review Committee to present and obtain feedback from affected units incorporated into ¶ 28.

Deleted as redundant of general discretion given in ¶ 28.

D. The CREM committee will discuss a response to the prima facie case and the degree to which the CREM would affect multiple units on campus. The CREM committee will consider issues including but not limited to: widespread curricular changes that affect units across campus, and intellectual organization of multiple units. Based on this discussion, the committee will make a public recommendation concerning which faculty or units are affected. If the deans of schools or faculty members are dissatisfied with this recommendation, they can appeal to the provost. The provost will then decide which units and which individual members of faculty are substantially affected.

E. If only a single unit is affected substantially, the CREM will proceed according to the CREM policy of the affected unit.

Should the unit not have a CREM policy, the unit's policy committee will adapt this policy to suit its particular circumstances.

If individual faculty members or governance bodies within the unit believe that they have not been sufficiently engaged in the CREM process, they may petition the CREM committee. In such cases, the CREM committee will mediate between the individual, the appropriate governing bodies and administration officers as discussed in Policy Statement § C. In cases in which mediation is unsuccessful, the CREM committee will refer the case to the BFC Executive Committee, which may take further action.

Authority to discuss whether a Review Committee is needed, which units are affected, and which faculty are affected, transferred to Provost and Executive Committee in ¶¶ 22-24.

Incorporated into ¶ 1.

Deleted as beyond the authority of the BFC; Substituted by ¶ 1(d).

Deleted because there will be no CREM committee. Authority of Executive Committee to resolve issue incorporated into ¶¶ 22-24.

F. If a CREM substantially affects more than one unit, the governance bodies of the affected units will be presented with the prima facie case for a CREM by the initiator. The faculty will vote on whether or not to proceed with the CREM, in accordance with the voting procedures in the governance documents of the affected units, and according to a procedure, established in concert by the affected units prior to the vote, for combining the votes of individual units into a collective outcome.

Incorporated into procedures ¶ 28.

Individual affected faculty who are not voting members of any of the affected units will convene as a body and vote according to procedures that accord with the norms of governance at IUB.

Deleted as undefined and unworkable.

a. The count of the votes and mechanisms for voting will be reported to the CREM committee and the provost.

Deleted as unnecessary waste of time.

In the event that the CREM committee considers that appropriate procedures have not been followed and the legislative authority of the faculty has been violated, and subsequent to discussions with involved administrators and local faculty committees, the CREM committee may require that a vote be held again under appropriate procedures.

Deleted as incomprehensible.

b. If the affected units, according to the outcome of the vote described above, are unsatisfied with the prima facie case for a CREM, the initiator may resubmit a substantially revised proposal to the affected units for a new vote.

New policy has a single process for unit approval. This “preliminary” process deleted as redundant and unnecessary waste of time.

At the request of one or more of the affected units, and following consultation with all the affected units and the initiator, the CREM committee may disallow a revised proposal on the grounds that it has not been substantially revised or that an unreasonable number of revised proposals have been submitted for faculty approval.

Deleted. Decision to continue, halt, or modify a reorganization proposal rests with Provost and Executive Committee.

II. Internal and external review committees

A. Should the affected units vote in favor of proceeding with a CREM, their deans will constitute an internal review committee composed of an equal number of members appointed by (1) the deans of the affected units, and (2) elected representatives of the faculty from each affected unit (e.g., the school policy committee or another elected body).

In the case of schools which include multiple units, each of the units within the school that are substantially impacted by the CREM must be represented on the internal review committee.

The internal committee will also include one representative of each of (1) the undergraduate students; (2) the graduate students; (3) professional staff; and (4) support staff from the affected units, to be selected by their representative organizations. The committee may also include substantially affected faculty members from outside the units, at the provost's request. No more than 25 individuals should constitute the internal committee. The deans will report on the membership of this internal committee to the CREM committee and the provost. The CREM committee may request the provost to make changes in the membership of the committee in the event of procedural violations.

B. The internal committee will consult widely and write a report on the desirability and viability of the CREM.

The internal committee will also, in coordination with the deans of affected units, appoint an external expert committee. The external expert committee will be composed of members who are not employed by Indiana University and are appointed in equal number by (1) the deans of the affected units and (2) by the faculty members of the internal committee. The deans will report on the membership of the external committee to the CREM committee and the provost.

Use of multiple overlapping committees a waste of time and resources. New policy has one responsible committee.

Authority to convene review committee rests with Provost and Executive Committee, who may delegate.

Deleted as unworkable, especially for the College which would probably be affected by almost any reorganization.

Incorporated into ¶ 23.

Rile of CREM committee deleted.

Incorporated into ¶ 28.

Authority to include outside experts incorporated into ¶ 29, but not mandatory. The concept of an entire outside committee is unworkable.

C. The external committee will be tasked with assessing the desirability and feasibility of the CREM in light of the prima facie case, the internal committee's report, and reports emanating from periodic reviews of academic units affected substantially by the CREM. The external committee will make detailed recommendations on the CREM, based on its expertise and framed by a clear evidence-based rationale. The report will be presented to the deans of the affected units, the internal committee, and the CREM committee.

D. Taking into account the assessment and recommendation of the external committee, the internal committee will produce a one-page executive summary of and response to the reports and present this summary, as well as both its own report and that of the external review committee, to the affected units.

The affected units will vote according to procedures described in I.F. The results of this vote will be reported to the provost and the CREM committee. In the event that the CREM committee considers that appropriate procedures have not been followed and the legislative authority of the faculty has been violated, and subsequent to discussions with involved administrators and local faculty committees, the CREM committee may require that a vote be held again under appropriate procedures.

E. If the affected units, according to the outcome of the vote described above, are unsatisfied with the case for a CREM based on the documents provided in II.D. above, the internal committee may resubmit a substantially revised proposal to the affected units for a new vote. At the request of one or more of the affected units, and following consultation with all the affected units and the internal committee, the CREM committee may disallow a revised proposal on the grounds that it has not been substantially revised or that an unreasonable number of revised proposals have been submitted for faculty approval.

Separate external committee deleted.
Review process centralized into one committee.

All these overlapping reports consolidated into one recommendation report, ¶ 30.

Incorporated into ¶ 31

CREM committee section deleted.
Power to determine procedures including a re-vote given to Review Committee in ¶ 28.

Incorporated into ¶ 31. Power to decide if a re-vote or revised proposal is appropriate given to Review Committee, ¶¶ 28, 31

III. Planning committee

A. Should the affected faculty vote to proceed with the CREM, the internal committee will form a planning committee. The planning committee will include elected representatives of the faculty from each affected unit and ex officio members of the offices of the deans of the affected units. It will also include one representative of (1) the undergraduate students; (2) the graduate students; (3) professional staff; and (4) support staff from the affected units, to be selected by the appropriate bodies through their representative organizations. The planning committee may constitute sub-committees as needed. The internal committee will report on the membership of the planning committee to the CREM committee, which has the right to require changes in the membership of the committee in the event of procedural violations.

B. The planning committee will produce a comprehensive plan, as outlined in VII. The planning committee will also compile a list of all affected faculty members, including any substantially affected individuals who have not yet been included in the CREM. The provost will give final approval to the list.

C. The plan and list of affected faculty members will be shared with the provost and the CREM committee.

The provost will disseminate the plan to vice provosts and deans.

The CREM committee will be responsible for circulating the plan to school policy committees and all faculty members. All faculty members, librarians, students, and staff shall have a reasonable period of time to be decided in consultation with the Executive Committee of the BFC, to review and respond to the plan. The planning committee may make amendments to the plan based on this feedback.

Separate planning committee deleted. Review and recommendation process centralized into one committee.

Incorporated into ¶ 23.

The comprehensive report is now the responsibility of the Review Committee.

Incorporated into ¶¶ 31-32.

Deleted. BFC lacks authority to micro-manage Provost's process.

Incorporated into ¶¶ 31-32.

IV. Finalization

A. A plan revised by the planning committee will be presented to and voted on by the voting eligible faculty in the affected units and other faculty members identified as affected in Policy Statement § F. as one body.

a. The plan will not be deemed to have faculty approval if less than two-thirds of the votes cast by eligible faculty support the plan.

The planning committee may resubmit a substantially revised proposal to the affected units for a new vote.

At the request of one or more of the affected units, and following consultation with all the affected units and the planning committee, the CREM committee may disallow a revised proposal on the grounds that it has not been substantially revised or that an unreasonable number of revised proposals have been submitted for faculty approval.

b. The plan will be deemed to have faculty approval if at least two-thirds of the votes cast by eligible faculty members support the plan.

The CREM will then proceed as outlined in the “General Matrix for the Administrative Approval Process for New Academic Programs and New Academic Structures.”

B. The final votes will be reported to the CREM committee and the provost.

Redundant repetitive voting on same issue consolidated into one vote, ¶ 31.

Incorporated into ¶ 31.

Authority to revise and resubmit given to Review Committee in ¶ 28.

Deleted. In shared governance, committee makes recommendations but does not have unilateral veto power.

Deleted. Redundant of § a above.

Deleted. This is an administrative responsibility.

Incorporated into ¶ 32.

V. Arrangements for faculty graduate students, and academic courses

A. **Tenure.** Except under conditions of financial exigency (cf. AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure: “Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.”), the appointments of tenured faculty members and librarians shall not be terminated as a consequence of such reorganization. Necessary reductions in the number of faculty shall be achieved instead by voluntary attrition or reassignment and in consultation with the BFC. (See BL-ACA-D17 Faculty Participation in Campus-Level Budget Decisions on Financial Difficulties)

Incorporated into ¶ 11.

B. **Expectations for Probationary Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure Track Faculty.** Faculty members and librarians who are affected by the reorganization of units and programs during the tenure probationary or probationary period will be reviewed for tenure and promotion under the criteria and standards of the original home unit at the time they were first appointed or the criteria and standards of their new unit, depending on the faculty member’s choice. The timing of the decision about which criteria will be used will be agreed upon by the faculty member and the unit head, and noted in writing in the faculty member or librarian’s personnel file. The review for tenure will be conducted by the voting eligible faculty of the new home unit.

Incorporated into ¶ 13.

C. Where there is a remaining body of faculty from the original unit who are not part of the new tenure home, the new tenure home will use the split appointment tenure process as a model:

Incorporated into ¶ 13.

1. The voting eligible faculty from the original unit will review the dossier and provide a letter, written by the former unit chair, offering their evaluation of the candidate to the new unit before it votes on the candidate’s case.

Deleted. BFC has no authority to micro-manage unit P&T process.

2. As in Full-Time Equivalent splits, the new home unit is encouraged to consider seriously the letter from the original unit in voting.

Incorporated into ¶ 13.

D. Expectations for Promotion. Tenured faculty will be reviewed for promotion according to the criteria of their new home unit by the voting eligible faculty in their new unit.

Incorporated into ¶ 13.

E. Reassignment to New Academic Home. Faculty members and librarians whose academic home unit is merged, reduced, eliminated, or in some other fundamental way reorganized may be reassigned to a new academic home based on the mutual fit of scholarly, scientific or artistic interests. Every effort shall be made to find a new home that is agreeable both to the affected faculty member and to faculty members in the receiving unit, with the understanding that in rare instances it may be impossible to find an arrangement that fully satisfies all parties. The dean of the affected unit and the Vice-Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs (VPFAA) have ultimate responsibility for finding a new academic home for affected faculty members

Incorporated into ¶¶ 11, 12

Faculty members and librarians remain obligated to perform customary research/creative activity, teaching and service responsibilities throughout the period of reorganization, subject to the availability of required resources.

Incorporated into ¶ 14.

F. Compensation and Other Benefits. Reorganization of academic units and programs shall not result in base pay reductions, in the alteration of negotiated agreements or in the loss of time accumulated for vacation or sabbatical leave eligibility.

Incorporated into ¶ 15.

G. Continuity of Degree Programs. Every effort shall be made to enable students enrolled in degree programs at the time of reorganization to complete the requirements for those degrees by including arrangements for completion of degree programs in the plan of a CREM, as outlined in (IX.G).

Incorporated into ¶ 16.

H. Contracts. Contractual rights and obligations of non tenure track faculty and graduate students shall be honored.

Incorporated into ¶ 12, 17

I. Grievances. Faculty members and librarians who object to personal consequences of the reorganization of academic units and programs may file a grievance with the Faculty Board of Review, with the VPFAA, or the CREM committee.

Incorporated into ¶ 18.

VI. Evaluation of CREMs

A. The CREM committee undertakes to ensure that an evaluation of each CREM occurs after five years, in accordance with policy BL-ACA-D20, IU Bloomington Procedures for Program Reviews. A campus-wide committee with representatives from different IUB Schools and the BFC who are outside the academic unit and administration will be created for purposes of the review. The committee will include representatives of professional and support staff, and undergraduate and graduate students. An additional peer-review faculty committee from other universities will also provide assessment of the new unit to the committee. The committee must solicit the written evaluations of no fewer than four outside leaders in the field, half selected by the dean(s) of the new or reorganized unit(s) and half appointed by the faculty of the new or reorganized unit(s). The committee will determine the metrics appropriate for the review, with the aim of identifying success or any shortfalls which must be ameliorated by further work, organizational change, implementation of new policies, or investment in the unit. The designated committee will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the newly reorganized unit.

Entire section deleted as redundant of, and inconsistent with general university and campus policies governing periodic review of academic units and programs, including ACA-65, Procedures for Program Reviews and BL-ACA-D20, IUB Procedures for Program Reviews

B. The evaluation/review will assess such issues as:

1. The quality and demand for the program(s) created or reorganized.
2. The achievement of planned key strategic outcomes that were expected.
3. Enrollment statistics.

4. Student retention, progression and graduation rates.
5. Employment trends for graduates of the new or reorganized unit(s).
6. Post-re-organization policies and faculty appointment procedures.
7. Faculty recruitment and retention.
8. Role of and support for interdisciplinary research and creative activities, if relevant.
9. Faculty and students' research, creative activities, and teaching performances through transition with an emphasis on the implementation of new courses and curricula.
10. Unit(s) viability, including financial viability and administrative efficiency.

C. The report of the evaluation will be presented to the BFC Executive Committee and to the provost.

VII. Required elements of a CREM plan

A. **Budget.** A detailed budget, including a rationale for new human and other resources, will be required. If the unit in question is a new school or college, for example, the budget should include an estimation of salaries and how the school will be funded. The budget should include a financial projection that estimates the number of years in which the costs of the CREM will be recouped.

B. **Degree and curriculum design.** The plan for a new program, school, or college should include an explanation of the centrality of the program to the mission of the IU Bloomington campus..

It should also include a description of the curricula, including the requirements for degrees and programs. In addition, there should be a timetable for the approval of new degrees and programs by all relevant internal and external bodies by the anticipated date for the completion of the CRM and establishment or reorganization of academic units, as outlined in the "General Matrix for the Administrative Approval Process for New Academic Programs and New Academic Structures."

[deleted]

Incorporated into ¶ 30(2)

Incorporated into ¶ 30(1)

Incorporated into ¶ 30(7)

C. Unit(s) structure plan. The plan should include an organizational chart that outlines the structure of the unit(s). A restructuring plan must include a description and explanation of each component of the suggested structure.

Assuming this meant administrative officers, incorporated into ¶ 30(5).

D. Space and infrastructure plan. When applicable, the implementation committee should include a plan for a new building, including anticipated location of faculty, administrative, and staff offices, as well as teaching and research/creative spaces. For programs and entities moving into a current building(s), the plan should include a map of research and teaching spaces as well as of office-space to which personnel will be assigned.

Incorporated into ¶ 30(3)

E. Reassignment of staff to new positions. A list of proposed staff position reassignments must be included in the plan.

Incorporated into ¶ 30(6)

F. Transition timetable. A timetable for initiating and eliminating the degree programs, for introducing new degrees or programs (for example, choosing majors and minors, graduate student recruitment, and so on) must be included in the plan.

Incorporated into ¶ 30(7-8)

G. Legacy arrangements. Legacy arrangements for students in degrees and programs being eliminated (including staff and faculty support) must be included in the plan.

Incorporated into ¶ 30(8)

H. Faculty governance documents. Arrangements for faculty governance documents (including tenure and promotion guidelines and other policies and procedures) to be drawn up by the faculty of the affected units within a reasonable time must be included in the plan.

Incorporated into ¶ 30(9).

D TEXT OF PROPOSED NEW POLICY

Title: Reorganization of Academic Units

Scope

- (1) A. This policy applies to the reorganization of academic units on the Bloomington campus if the reorganization:
- Creates or eliminates a school;
 - Creates or eliminates a department or program with academic appointees from more than one school;
 - Moves a department or program from one school to another;
 - Is not otherwise covered under a school reorganization policy.
- (2) B. This policy does not apply to the reorganization of units as a result of a university-wide financial exigency, when the policies outlined in university policy ACA-41, Faculty Role Regarding University Financial Exigency [link] and BL-ACA- D19, Faculty Selection for University Financial Exigency Committee [link] shall apply.
- (3) C. In the case of a reorganization proposal that affects a school that has a presence on more than one campus, and will affect departments, programs or academic appointments on more than one campus, university policy ACA-79, Merger, Reorganization and Elimination of Academic Units and Programs Involving Core Schools shall apply.
- (4) D. Any question regarding whether a reorganization falls under this policy shall be resolved by consultation between the Provost and the Executive Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC).

Where it came from

(sections for old policy unless specified)

Simplification of Consolidation, Reorganization, Elimination and Merger of Academic Units and Programs

Expanded from scope section, Procedure ¶ I.E, and review of minutes of BFC discussion of BL-ACA-D18, Academic Program Initiative.

Reflects recent updates to ACA-41 and D19.

From Policy ¶ D and university Policy ACA-79.

From other policies involving a faculty committee, e.g., BL-ACA-B12, Search & Screen Procedures for Campus Administrators.

Policy Statement

(5) A. Circumstances such as developments scholarship, new directions in sciences and the arts, changing student expectations, financial opportunities or constraints, or administrative efficiencies, may make it prudent to consider the reorganization of academic units, and may necessitate a reallocation of financial resources and the reassignment of academic appointees, staff, and students to new academic homes.

(6) B. Reorganization should occur only when that action is expected significantly to enhance the ability of Indiana University Bloomington to perform its academic mission.

(7) C. It is in the mutual interests of the faculty and Provost to provide the highest quality academic units at Indiana University-Bloomington. Consultation among the Provost, faculty, and other constituencies is therefore the most desirable way to consider the reorganization of academic units. The review procedures set out in this policy, in which primary responsibility is vested in a diverse committee, is presumptively the most useful method of consultation.

(8) D. This policy should be interpreted and applied in a way that is guided by the principles of shared governance, academic freedom, honoring tenure and faculty appointments, and preserving the role of peer review in decisions affecting academic personnel.

(9) E. All university and campus policies on diversity apply to the selection of a Review Committee and the reorganization process.

(10) F. Primary faculty responsibility for reorganization under this policy is vested in the BFC Executive Committee which meets regularly with the Provost, can refer matters to any relevant standing committee, and can act promptly to create a Review Committee.

Slightly edited version of first part of Policy ¶ B.

Slightly edited version of second part of Policy ¶ B

Borrowed from BL-ACA-B12, Search & Screen Procedures for Campus Administrators.

From last sentence in Policy ¶ C.

From BL-ACA-B12, also was in the original 1982 version of CREM

New.

(11) G. The appointments of academic appointees with tenure or long-term appointments shall not be terminated as a consequence of a reorganization except as provided in university policies ACA-41, Faculty Role Regarding University Financial Exigency [link], and ACA-52 §§ D-E, Involuntary Dismissal of Academic Appointees [link].

1. Necessary reductions in the number of faculty with tenure or long-term appointments shall be achieved instead by voluntary attrition or reassignment and in consultation with the relevant unit faculty governance organizations.

2. Appointees whose academic home is eliminated or substantially changed may be reassigned to a new academic home based on the mutual fit of scholarly, scientific or artistic interests. Every effort shall be made to find a new home that is agreeable both to the affected appointee and to faculty members in the receiving unit, with the understanding that in rare instances it may be impossible to find an arrangement that fully satisfies all parties.

3. The dean of the affected school and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs have ultimate responsibility for finding a new academic home for affected faculty members.

(12) H. Probationary appointees and those with one-year appointments whose academic home is eliminated or substantially changed may be reassigned to a new academic home based on the mutual fit of scholarly, scientific or artistic interests. A reasonable effort shall be made to find a new home that is agreeable both to the affected appointee and to faculty members in the receiving unit, with the understanding that in some instances it may be impossible to find a satisfactory arrangement.

Expanded version of Procedure ¶ V.A, to make consistent with recent changes to ACA-41 and 52 and include NTT on long-term appointments..

From Procedure ¶ V.A.

From Procedure ¶ V.E

From Procedures ¶ V.E.

Expansion of Procedure ¶ V.E.

(13) I. When an academic appointee is moved to a new unit, tenure and promotion reviews shall be conducted under the criteria and standards of the new unit, subject to these provisions:

1. Tenure-track appointees who are moved during the probationary period may choose to be reviewed under the tenure standards of their original home unit at the time they were first appointed.

2. Whenever an appointee is reassigned to a new home, there shall be a memorandum of understanding concerning the distribution of professional responsibilities and how input shall be gathered from the former home unit for tenure or promotion decisions.

(14) J. Appointees remain obligated to perform customary research/creative activity, teaching and service responsibilities throughout the period of reorganization.

(15) K. Reorganization of academic units shall not result in involuntary base pay reductions or alteration of negotiated agreements with academic appointees, or in the loss of time accumulated toward vacation or sabbatical leave eligibility.

(16) L. Every effort shall be made to enable students enrolled in degree programs at the time of reorganization to complete the requirements for those degrees, and arrangements for completion of degree programs shall be included in the reorganization plan.

(17) M. Contracts and agreements with graduate students, including the continuation of their fellowships, stipends, student academic appointments, and research programs, shall be honored.

(18) N. An academic appointee adversely affected by the reorganization of academic units may file a grievance with the Faculty Board of Review.

Clarification of Procedure ¶ V.B, C & D to make consistent with current IUB practices.

From Procedure ¶ V.B.

New; consistent with current practice.

From Procedure ¶ V.E.

Edited and clarified version of Procedure ¶ V.F

From Procedures ¶ IV.G.

From Procedures ¶ V.H.

From Procedures ¶ V.I.

(19) O. Each school should have a policy for the creation, reorganization, elimination and merger of departments and programs within that school which is approved by its faculty governance organization.

Reason for policy

(20) The Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty provides legislative authority to the faculty in matters pertaining to the creation, reorganization, merger, and elimination of academic units that affects more than one school on the campus. These matters are critical to our academic mission. Consistent with our commitment to shared faculty and administrative governance, this policy specifies the role faculty play in campus reorganization.

Procedures

(21) A. A reorganization of academic units may be proposed by university or school administrators, faculty governance bodies, student government, or any member of the university community. A reorganization proposal should be presented to the Provost who shall decide whether to move forward with it.

(22) B. If the Provost decides to move forward with a reorganization proposal, the Provost shall:

1. Inform the BFC Executive Committee, full BFC, and the faculty governance bodies at the affected units.
2. Present a proposal that explains why the reorganization is both desirable and feasible and addresses the relevant topics set out in paragraph J.
3. Set a timeline for the review that allows ample time for the process and takes into consideration the normal cycle of faculty appointments, graduate student recruitment, and student course registration.
4. Request that the BFC Executive Committee provide names of faculty to serve on a Review Committee.

New; was only implicit in old policy.

New to comply with university policy template.

Edited version of Procedures ¶ I.A.

From Procedures ¶¶ I.B & D, edited and clarified that it is Provost with ultimate responsibility in consultation with Executive Committee.

From Procedures ¶ I.B.

New; consolidates several paces where current policy allows reasonable time for process.

New; clarifies that responsibility rests with Executive Committee, that may delegate.

(23) C. The Provost appoints the members of the Review Committee. The committee should contain:

1. Members selected by the Provost in consultation with the deans of the affected schools.
2. An approximately equal number of faculty recommended by the BFC Executive Committee, some of whom should be from the affected unit(s).
3. At least one representative of the undergraduate students, the graduate students, and the staff.
4. The Committee usually should have a minimum of 12 and maximum of 25 members.

(24) D. The final committee membership should be agreed upon by the Provost and the BFC Executive Committee, and no person should be on the committee who is opposed by either.

(25) E. The Provost may select the chair of the Review Committee.

(26) F. The Provost shall provide a charge to the Review Committee that includes a description of the proposed reorganization.

(27) G. The Provost shall arrange for adequate staff and financial support for the activities of the Review Committee.

(28) H. A Review Committee shall establish its own operating procedures but must in all reviews:

1. Consult widely with affected members of the university community.
2. Consult with the affected unit policy committees.
3. Include one or more open meetings that provide an opportunity for questions and discussion.
4. Produce a comprehensive Recommendation Report.

From Procedure ¶¶ II.A, III.A, clarified that authority rests with Provost, not deans.

From Procedure ¶¶ II.A, III.A,

From Procedure ¶¶ II.A, III.A.,

From Procedure ¶¶ II.A, with a minimum added so no one thinks every committee needs 25 people.

Borrowed from BL-ACA-B12, Search & Screen Procedures for Campus Administrators.

Borrowed from BL-ACA-B12

Adapted from BL-ACA-B12,

From BL-ACA-B12

Consolidates steps in Procedures ¶¶ I.C, D & F, II.B, C,D, E, , II.C., and IV.A. into one statement of committee discretion plus only 4 mandatory items,

From 1st part of Procedure ¶ II.B

Assuring voice for affected faculty from Policy ¶ C, Procedure ¶ I.C & F.

Modified version of Procedure ¶ I.F.

Makes it explicit.

(29) I. The committee may consult with experts in the discipline from outside Indiana University.	From 2nd part of Procedure ¶ II.B.
(30) J. The Recommendation Report should cover:	
1. The significance of and justification for the reorganization to advancing the mission of I.U. Bloomington.	From Procedure ¶ VII.B
2. The budgetary impact including both resources and expenditures.	From Procedure ¶ VII.A
3. The physical plant impact including changes in the location of faculty and administrative offices and teaching, research and creative activity space.	From Procedure ¶ VII.D
4. Plans for current and future academic appointments, including how probationary faculty will progress toward tenure and job security for non-tenure-track faculty.	New; implicit in old policy.
5. Plans for the interim and permanent addition, reassignment, or elimination of deans and other senior administrators and a timetable for such changes.	From Procedure ¶ VII.C.
6. A list of proposed staff reassignments, additions or eliminations and a timetable for implementing any changes.	From Procedure ¶ VII.E
7. A description of any courses, programs or degrees being added, reduced or eliminated, a timetable for such changes, and legacy plans for students currently in those programs who will be affected.	From Procedure ¶ VII.F
8. How graduate students will be supervised and funded and legacy plans for graduate students currently in those programs who will be affected.	From Procedure ¶ VII.F
9. Arrangements for interim and permanent faculty governance documents, including tenure and promotion guidelines.	From Procedure ¶ VII.H
10. Any implications of the reorganization on unit accreditation.	New.

(31) K. The Recommendation Report shall be presented to and voted on by the eligible faculty in the affected units. The Report will be deemed to have faculty approval if at least two-thirds of the votes cast by eligible faculty members support the plan. If fewer than two-thirds of the faculty support the plan, the Review Committee may revise and resubmit the proposal to the affected units for a new vote.

(32) L. The Report and final votes will be reported to the BFC Executive Committee, the affected units, and the Provost.

(33) M. If the Provost is unable or unwilling to follow the Committee's recommendations, the Provost shall inform the Review Committee and the BFC Executive Committee and provide a statement of the reasons why. The Provost shall then consult with the Executive Committee about whether to revise and resubmit the reorganization proposal to the same or a different Review Committee.

Definitions:

(34) a. "Academic unit" is a school, department or program that has one or more academic appointees and/or offers courses for credit or degrees.

(35) b. "School" includes schools, colleges, and any other academic unit headed by a Dean.

(36) c. "Department" is an academic subdivision of a school typically headed by a Chair.

(37) d. "Program" is an academic subdivision housed in, or affiliated with, one or more schools, typically headed by a Director. The term may include subdivision with titles other than program, such as centers, institutes and workshops.

(38) e. "Academic home" is the academic unit in which an appointee's primary appointment is located.

Consolidates similar provisions in Procedure ¶¶ II.D & E, IV.A..

Two-thirds requirement from Procedure ¶ IV.A.

From Procedure ¶¶ III.C, IV.B.

Standard language from other policies where committees make recommendations to the Provost, e.g., P&T, Search & screen.

Note: 1988 BFC resolution (BL-ACA-D18) called for better definitions.

New. Umbrella term to replace "Colleges, schools, units and programs"

Clarification of implicit definition

Clarification of implicit definition

New; not previously defined.

Clarification of implicit definition in old policy

(39) f. “Faculty” means tenure-track faculty and librarians and non-tenure-track faculty as defined in sections 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 of the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty [link].

From Policy ¶ E and clarified.

(40) g. “Academic appointees” refers to all faculty plus other academic appointment categories as defined in ACA-14, Classification of Academic Appointments. [link]

Clarifies that Student Academic appointees and emeriti are no included.

(41) h. The “Provost” refers to the individual holding this office at Indiana University-Bloomington, or those to whom the responsibilities have been delegated by the Provost.

From Policy ¶ E and clarified that Provost may delegate.

(42) i. “School or unit policy committee” refers to policy committees as described in BL-ACA-D7, Unit Policy Committees.

From Policy ¶ E

(43) History:

From old policy.

- a. Created as the Merger, Reorganization and Elimination of Academic Units and Programs; BFC 12/14/1982; Amended 10/16/1984; Amended 4/19/2011
- b. Revised and current CREM version approved, BFC 4/28/15.
- c. Amended by BFC Executive Committee 2/26/2019.
- d. Amended 4/05/2022 to move section on “Faculty Participation in Campus-Level Budget Decisions on Financial Difficulties” into a separate policy (D17).
- e. Substantially revised by BFC on _____.

E. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF BL-ACA-D18, ACADEMIC PROGRAM INITIATIVES

1. BL-ACA-D18 provides:

Resolution 1:

A. The Bloomington faculty has constitutional authority to establish policies regarding academic program initiatives which establish new programs or revise existing ones.

B. The Bloomington Faculty Council confirms the authority of the faculties of the schools to establish and revise academic programs, including programs which they may establish by negotiation with other schools.

C. Academic program initiatives on the Bloomington Campus not authorized by the faculty of a school must be approved by the Bloomington Faculty Council.

D. Where the faculty of a school considers that its academic programs will be adversely affected by an academic program initiative of another school, either school may refer the matter to the Bloomington Faculty Council to make policy recommendations to the Vice President on the questions raised by the conflict.

E. The Educational Policy Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee should establish and maintain liaison with the policy and curriculum committees of the schools.

F. When the Budgetary Affairs Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council considers the budgetary implications of academic program initiatives, that committee should refer initiatives to the Agenda Committee when matters of campus-wide academic policy may be involved.

Resolution 2:

The University Faculty Council and the campus faculty councils should review our faculty constitutions to determine what constitutional revisions are needed in light of the university's current complex structure and missions.

2. Summary: BL-ACA-D18 was passed in the wake of the creation of the Wells Scholars Program in 1988. The faculty's concern was that the allocation of authority over important curriculum changes between the BFC and the unit faculty was unclear. The two resolutions in D18 were not intended as policy, but were traditional resolutions calling for future action by the BFC and UFC to review (and amend if necessary) the Constitution and academic policies to make sure they reflected the proper balance between campus-wide jurisdiction and unit-jurisdiction to approve new curricular programs with campus-wide impact.

3. On Nov. 19, 1987, the Agenda (Executive) Committee submitted a somewhat abstract discussion item to the BFC because it believed "the Council should act to clarify its position on faculty authority regarding academic program initiatives and the circumstances in which different faculty bodies may exercise that authority." By academic program initiatives it was referring to the "development of the Wells Scholar Program." By faculty authority, it was referring to provisions in the Constitution of the Faculty that give faculty legislative authority over the "standards of admission ... of students, determination of curriculum, ... and other educational policies of the University." The dispute was whether that faculty authority should be exercised by individual units or the BFC.

4. On February 2, 1988, the matter came on to the BFC agenda for an “initial discussion.” The chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee (CARC) introduced it and phrased it as concern that the Wells Scholars Program had been “announced as a fait accompli prior to consultation with other elements of the academic community.” The discussion focused on whether it was sufficient that the administration consult with faculty that it selected to serve on the Wells Program Committee, or whether some kinds of important educational issues should always go through the BFC. Other issues were mentioned, including whether the faculty had any role in scholarship programs involving the IU Foundation, and whether the schools had the authority to decline to follow campus-wide educational rules like grading policy. It was pointed out that the phrase “campus-wide academic programs” is vague and undefined. The whole thing was then referred to CARC.

5. On April 20, 1988, the matter was placed back on the BFC agenda but not reached, and put over until the 88-89 academic year. The report from CARC reiterated that it was motivated by the process used in developing the Wells Scholars Program, but addressing the broader abstract question of “the roles and functions of the campus' schools and offices, its ad hoc committees, the Bloomington Faculty Council and its standing committees, and the administration regarding faculty roles] in the adoption of major academic program initiatives.” It asserted the principle that “[n]ew campus-wide academic programs and the revision of existing ones will not be promulgated or instituted without prior approval by the Bloomington Faculty Council.” It proposed two resolutions intended to “commence a process of review and revision of our faculty constitutions to reflect a structure of authorities and governing bodies more suited to our current circumstances.” It proposed the two resolutions.

6. On November 1, 1988, the matter came back onto the BFC agenda. and the two resolution were formally proposed jointly by CARC and the Educational Policy Committee. They made clear they were discussing academic initiatives that “relate to teaching [and] involv[e] students” and curriculum, and express the balance of jurisdiction between the BFC and the units. Some doubt was expressed whether any new teaching/curricular programs other than the Wells Scholars Program would fall under BFC jurisdiction because curriculum is approved by each school independently, even if interdisciplinary. The only other example anyone came up with was the creation of SPEA. These were not policies but resolutions designed to initiate the development of concrete policies and constitutional amendments “go[ing] forward” that defined a process for faculty involvement.

7. There used to be a hard-copy booklet called the Bloomington Academic Guide which contained four things: policies enacted by the BFC, policies affecting IUB enacted by the UFC, relevant policies of the Trustees, and administrative policies and interpretations that affected faculty. According to former Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Tom Gieryn (BFC meeting Nov 3, 2009), the decisions what to include in this handbook (including whether to include these resolutions) were made almost exclusively by one person -- Mary Tilton, in the Office of the Dean of Faculties. When the Guide was converted from print to website, the contents of the Guide were simply transferred and assigned letters and numbers corresponding to where they appeared in the Guide.