

 DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY Senate Policy for Academic Unit Consolidation, Renaming, Establishment, Termination and Transfer	<i>Policy Sponsor:</i> <i>Senate</i>	<i>Approval Date:</i> <i>Senate: May 10, 2021</i> <i>Board of Governors: February 15, 2022</i>
	<i>Responsible Unit:</i> <i>Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic and University Secretariat</i>	<i>Amendments:</i>

A. Background & Purpose

This policy establishes a framework for guiding the organizational evolution of academic units at Dalhousie University. Specifically, it addresses academic unit consolidation, renaming, establishment, termination and transfer (AU-CRETT).

Modifications to our organizational structure can achieve desirable outcomes in advancing Dalhousie’s academic mission. Such organizational changes are the responsibility of Senate as part of its oversight of Academic and Research units, subject to the approval of the Board. The Senate Planning and Governance Committee (SPGC) recommends to Senate the adoption of policies, procedures, and guidelines regarding the establishment and termination of academic units. It also provides recommendations to Senate on academic priorities guiding the deployment of resources. Senate’s role is to focus on the academic dimensions that arise from the change, whereas the operational, financial, human resource and other such elements are clearly in the purview of the Board. Academic unit (Departments, Schools, Faculties) governance bodies and leaders are responsible for considering all these factors.

This policy is a guide for those submitting proposals for AU-CRETT (proponents) and for the relevant assessment and approval bodies. It outlines the process and information requirements for AU-CRETT. Proposals shall be assessed in accordance with the statements in Section D. of this policy and the principle of inclusive excellence. ¹

B. Application

This policy applies where a concept paper or full proposal for AU-CRETT has been initiated and prepared in accordance with the Procedures in Appendix A. Proposals not prepared in accordance with the Procedures will not be considered by the Senate Planning and Governance Committee.

1. Concept papers and full proposals shall normally be initiated within a Department, School or Faculty and should be brought forward to the Deans of the relevant Faculty(ies) for endorsement, typically with

¹ See [Making Excellence Inclusive: A Framework for Embedding Diversity and Inclusion into Colleges and Universities’ Academic Excellence Mission](#)

support from faculty members, Chairs/Directors/Heads and students ('proponents'). Please see instructions for **pathway A** (Appendix A: AUCRETT Procedures).

2. In the absence of endorsement by the academic unit lead (Director, Chair, Dean), or a lower-level governing body, proponents of concept papers may approach the governing body of the relevant academic unit. Please see instructions for the petition and reconciliation pathway B (Appendix A: AUCRETT Procedures).
3. Concept papers and Full Proposals shall normally be initiated within a Department, School or Faculty but may also be brought forward by the Provost and Vice-President Academic on behalf of other stakeholder groups of students and faculty members within the Faculty. In cases where there is no pre-existing Department, School or Faculty, the Provost and VPA may be the sole proponent.
4. Proposals shall be processed in a timely manner, and all parties shall be heard. Emphasis is placed on transparency and accountability in decision-making.
5. This policy excludes proposals for philanthropic or honorific naming or renaming (see C. Definitions and [Dalhousie Naming Policy](#)).

C. Definitions

1. **Academic Unit:** Any unit of activity within the University which has authority over academic programs and student progression, characterized by a common purpose and normally associated with distinctive degrees or other academic credentials. Includes, but is not limited to, Faculties, Colleges, Schools and Departments
2. **Consolidation:** Combining two or more academic units to form a new unified unit
3. **Renaming:** Renaming an academic unit to reflect its primary functional purpose
4. **Establishment:** Creating a new academic unit (includes an existing academic sub-unit becoming a new Faculty or other standalone academic unit).
5. **Termination:** Eliminating an academic unit
6. **Transfer:** Moving an academic unit **intact** into another one that subsumes it.

D. Policy

Proposals for AU-CRETT shall be assessed in accordance with the statements in this policy. The most compelling arguments for AU-CRETT will be based on [Dalhousie's strategic directions and values](#) at the time of the proposal and [Senate's Principles and Values](#) and be supported by administrative and operational arguments. Policy statements are grouped into three logical categories based on the change being sought: (i) Establishment, Transfer or Consolidation, (ii) Renaming and (iii) Termination.

1. Establishment, Transfer or Consolidation of an Academic Unit (as applicable):
 - a. **Alignment with Dalhousie's strategic directions and values:** New or modified academic units must have an appropriate fit with the academic mission and strategic goals of the university. A compelling argument will demonstrate an increased potential for the proposed academic unit to deliver on the

academic mission, reinforce strategic goals and support external engagement through a clearer narrative about Dalhousie's value proposition and/or specialization.

- b. Impacts on Programs and Students:** There must be a well justified plan for academic program continuity and student support, particularly for students from underrepresented and marginalized groups.
- c. Impacts on Unit Staff and Faculty:** The implications for the working conditions of staff and faculty must be addressed. It may be advisable to consult with Dalhousie Human Resources as well as relevant labour groups, including relevant union and employee groups representing employees of the university (Dalhousie Faculty Association, Dalhousie Professional Management Group, Canadian Union of Public Employees, Nova Scotia Government Employees Union, Public Service Alliance of Canada).
- d. Impacts on Other Stakeholders:** The implications of modifying an academic unit for alumni, past and potential donors, community partners, and other stakeholders must be considered.
- e. Inclusive Excellence and Core Values:** The new or modified academic unit should remain committed to enhancing the equity, diversity and inclusion goals of the Faculty and University, particularly in relation to engagement with communities.
- f. Unit Cohesion:** Academic units share similar or common educational goals, and at least to some extent are inter-dependent and mutually reinforcing in the achievement of their respective goals, as well as the overall goals and academic mission of the university. Establishing or modifying an academic unit should not create duplications, inefficiencies, or a lack of organizational clarity.
- g. Governance:** Academic units should be of a size and complexity that permit efficiency and effectiveness in collegial governance—academic units should be involved in a meaningful way in governance through transparent decision-making. The effectiveness and equity of an academic unit's participation at the institutional level is also an important consideration.
- h. Financial Viability:** The budgetary implications of establishing or modifying an academic unit must be carefully considered and estimated. Any new or reconstituted academic unit must be demonstrably financially viable for the foreseeable future.
- i. Decisional Balance:** Proposals should clearly articulate how the proposed model will address or resolve any precipitating factors and consider the benefits and drawbacks of various approaches (i.e., retaining the status quo versus the proposed model or potential alternatives).

2. Renaming an Academic Unit

- a. Rationale:** The names of academic units will normally be reflective of the primary functional purpose of the academic unit. Well-justified name changes will typically reflect accepted changes in the nomenclature of an academic field or discipline, updated terminology, or changes to the organizational makeup or membership of an academic unit.
- b. Impacts:** The implications of renaming an academic unit for the Department, Faculty and/or university must be carefully considered (e.g., academic, budgetary, reputational, community relations and partnership legal, donor relations, etc.).

3. Termination of an Academic Unit

- a. **Rationale:** The termination of an academic unit may be related to the termination of one or more academic programs or the transfer/consolidation of interrelated or constituent academic units. Financial viability or efficiency can also be a potential reason for considering termination of a unit.
- b. **Impact on Programs and Students:** There must be a well-justified plan for academic program continuity and student support, particularly for students from underrepresented and marginalized groups, where programs are not being terminated.
- c. **Impacts on Unit Staff and Faculty:** The implications for the working conditions of staff and faculty must be addressed. It may be advisable to consult with Dalhousie Human Resources as well as relevant union and employee groups representing employees of the university (Dalhousie Faculty Association, Dalhousie Professional Management Group, Canadian Union of Public Employees, Nova Scotia Government Employees Union, Public Service Alliance of Canada).
- d. **Impacts on Other Stakeholders:** The implications of modifying an academic unit for alumni, past and potential donors, community partners, and other external stakeholders must be considered.
- e. **Decisional Balance:** Proposals should clearly articulate how the proposed model will address or resolve any precipitating factors and consider the benefits and drawbacks of various approaches (i.e., retaining the status quo versus the proposed model or potential alternatives).

Administrative Structure

1. **Authority:** this Policy falls under the authority of Senate and is administered by the Provost and Vice-President Academic and the University Secretariat. The Provost may designate any responsibilities under this Policy to the Associate Vice President Academic.
2. **SPGC:** The SPGC shall be responsible for:
 - a. Considering and making decisions on Concept Papers concerning consolidation, renaming, establishment, termination and transfer of academic units
 - b. Considering and making recommendations to Senate concerning proposals for consolidation, renaming, establishment, termination and transfer of academic units
3. **Record Keeping:** The record keeping pertaining to this Policy will be the responsibility of the University Secretariat and will follow the Secretariat's Records Management Policy.
4. **Reporting:** The SPGC will provide an annual summary report to Senate concerning the consolidation, renaming, establishment, termination and transfer of academic units.
5. **Review:** This policy shall be reviewed every 5 years, or earlier as required, in keeping with the Policy on Policies

Appendix A: Procedures

For Senate Policy for Academic Unit Consolidation, Renaming, Establishment, Termination and Transfer

A. Concept Paper Phase

Development and presentation of a Concept Paper is a way for proponents of AU-CRETT to obtain feedback and endorsement prior to preparing a full proposal. For academic unit consolidation, establishment, transfer or termination, a Concept paper must be approved by the Senate Planning and Governance Committee (SPGC) prior to the development of a full proposal. Stand-alone proposals for renaming may proceed directly to the full proposal stage under (2.)

Two or more interrelated changes may be captured as part of a single Concept Paper (e.g., renaming and transfer/consolidation) where it is logical and results in clarity in the documentation/proposal to do so.

1. Access appropriate **AU-CRETT Concept Paper Form** [Word] for complete information requirements:

Appendix B - Concept Paper for Academic Unit Establishment, Transfer or Consolidation [Word]

Appendix C - Concept Paper for Academic Unit Termination [Word]

2. **Department/School and Faculty-level Review**

- a. Evidence of review by all appropriate governance bodies is required. In the case of academic unit transfer or consolidation, the Concept Paper must be reviewed by all impacted academic units (i.e., current host department/faculty and proposed host department/faculty). All feedback and previous decisions, including rationale, should be documented and included with the Concept Paper package as it proceeds through the steps outlined in (c.)
- b. Departments/Schools/Faculties should use the following tools as part of their review process (to be included in the package):

Appendix D - Decisional Balance Matrix [Word]

Appendix E - Policy Statement Assessment Grid [Word]

- c. **Approval and submission pathway (A):**

- i. Concept Paper is recommended by School/Department(s)
- ii. Concept Paper is recommended by Faculty(ies)¹
- iii. Concept Paper package (as per 1. and 2.) is submitted to University Secretariat for consideration by SPGC
- iv. The proponent, Dean(s) and/or representatives of all impacted units will be invited to meet and submit written documentation to SPGC to discuss the Concept Paper.
- v. SPGC makes decision (endorsement to proceed to full proposal stage).
- vi. SPGC reports to Senate

¹ In lieu of steps A.2.c.i and ii, a Concept Paper may be recommended by the Provost and Vice-President Academic on behalf of other stakeholder groups or as the sole proponent, where there is no pre-existing Department, School or Faculty (Policy B.1).

vii. Proponent proceeds to Full Proposal Development

d. Approval and Submission Pathway (B): Petition and Reconciliation

In order to ensure transparency in decision-making and in keeping with the principle that all parties shall be heard, there is an additional avenue available to those submitting Concept papers through AU-CRETT, a petition and reconciliation process.

As stipulated in Section B.3 of the Policy, Concept papers shall normally be initiated within a Department, School or Faculty, by academic leaders, but also by other stakeholder groups of students and faculty members within the affected Departments(s), School(s) and Faculty(ies). Proponents from equity deserving stakeholder groups of students or faculty members identified under the university’s employment equity policies shall normally be provided with administrative support through the office of the Provost.

(i) Petition

- a. A proponent must submit their intent to petition in writing within 14 days of the original decision, to the appropriate governance body (see scenarios below).
- b. A proponent may request a petition for any reason but must stipulate the rationale in their notice of petition, referencing the relevant part of the AU-CRETT policy upon which the petition is based.
- c. A proponent can only petition one level up, under scenario A, B or C.

Scenarios:

Scenario	If:	Then:
A	Concept Paper not recommended by the School(s)/Department(s) governance body	The proponent may approach the appropriate Faculty-level governance body for a decision
B	Concept Paper not recommended by appropriate Faculty-level governance body	The proponent may approach the SPGC for a decision
C	Concept paper not recommended by SPGC	The proponent may approach the Senate for a decision

(ii) Reconciliation

- a. The committee being approached will meet within 30 days of receiving the petition to consider the case.

- b. If, after considering the case outlined in the petition, the relevant committee agrees to move forward with an attempt at reconciliation, the committee shall establish an ad hoc reconciliation committee, appointed according to the terms of reference outlined in 2c and 2d, to conduct the reconciliation process.
- c. The ad hoc reconciliation committee membership excludes anyone impacted directly by the change and has the same expectations to hear all stakeholders and to avoid conflicts of interest. The committee should have members who have expertise on the primary source of disagreement, whether it be financial, human resources, discipline, etc..
- d. The ad hoc reconciliation committee shall have a membership which includes:
 - a. Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Accessibility representation
 - b. Those with expertise (financial, etc.) on the primary source of disagreement
 - c. At least 1-academic unit senator
 - d. At least 1 faculty member
 - e. At least 1 student currently enrolled in the affected academic unit or alumni member
 - f. A Dean
 - g. A senior leader with expertise in organizational change similar to that under consideration.
- e. The petitioned committee shall invite the proponent(s) to provide input on the members appointed to the ad hoc reconciliation committee, respecting any reasonable objection.
- f. To ensure equitable decision making, the ad hoc reconciliation committee will have diverse representation.
- g. The ad hoc reconciliation committee will review the package; meet with or obtain written submissions from the proponent, impacted units and their senior leaders; consult or engage external reviewers if deemed necessary, and with any others who would provide an informed perspective.

The ad hoc reconciliation committee shall submit its recommendation within 16 weeks to the body that created it, which will approve, or not, the concept paper to move forward to the full proposal stage.

B. Full Proposal phase

Once a Concept Paper has been recommended to proceed by SPGC, proponents may proceed to developing a Full Proposal for AU-CRETT. Stand-alone proposals for renaming may proceed directly to a Full Proposal.

Two or more interrelated changes may be captured as part of a single Proposal (e.g., renaming and transfer/consolidation) where it is logical and results in clarity in the documentation/proposal to do so.

1. Access appropriate AU-CRETT **Proposal Form** [Word] for complete information requirements:

Appendix F - *Proposal for Academic Unit Establishment, Transfer or Consolidation* [Word]
Appendix G - *Proposal for Academic Unit Renaming* [Word]
Appendix H - *Proposal for Academic Unit Termination* [Word]

2. Department/School and Faculty-level Review

- a. Evidence of review by appropriate governance bodies is required. In the case of academic unit transfer or consolidation, the Proposal must be reviewed by all impacted academic units (i.e., current host department/faculty and proposed host department/faculty) and relevant administrative units (Financial, Legal, Infrastructure, Human and other resources) and applicable academic unit leaders. All feedback and previous decisions, including rationale, should be documented and included with the Proposal package as it proceeds through the steps outlined in (c.)

- b. Departments/faculties should use the following appendices as part of their review process:

Appendix D - *Decisional Change Matrix* [Word]
Appendix E - *Policy Statement Assessment Grid* [Word]

c. Approval and Submission Pathway

- i. Proposal is recommended by School(s)/Department(s) and academic leaders;
- ii. Proposal is recommended by Faculty and corresponding academic leaders;²
- iii. Proposal package (as per 1. and 2.) is submitted to University Secretariat for consideration by SPGC;
- iv. The proponent, Dean(s) and representatives of all impacted academic and administrative units will be invited to meet and submit written documentation to SPGC to discuss the proposal;
- v. SPGC makes recommendation to Senate;
- vi. Senate makes recommendation to the Board of Governors;
- vii. Board of Governors approves proposal;
- viii. Provost and Dean(s) are accountable for implementation, delegating where necessary.

² In lieu of steps B. 2. c. i and ii, a full proposal may be recommended by the Provost and Vice-President Academic on behalf of other stakeholder groups or as the sole proponent, where there is no pre-existing Department, School or Faculty (Policy B.1).

Appendix B – Concept Paper for Academic Unit Establishment, Consolidation and Transfer

For Senate Policy for Academic Unit Consolidation, Renaming, Establishment, Termination and Transfer (AUCRETT) [[LINK to policy repository](#)]

All concept papers for academic unit establishment, consolidation and transfer should follow the complete Procedures in Appendix A of AUCRETT (A. Concept Paper Phase), including use of this form. Proposals not submitted according to the Procedures may not be considered by the Senate Planning and Governance Committee.

For the purposes of AUCRETT, establishment, consolidation and transfer refer to academic units. Establishing a new academic program is a separate process (see: [Program Proposal Process](#)).

Proposal: New Academic Unit Academic Unit Transfer Academic Unit Consolidation

Current Academic Unit Name/Host Faculty (if applicable):

Proposed Academic Unit Name/Host Faculty: *name of the new or transferred/consolidated academic unit*

Proposal Contact: *name, relationship to academic unit (see Policy B.2. and 3. for discussion of who may initiate a Concept Paper), and contact information.*

Structure (suggest 200 words):

Please outline the proposed governance and administrative structure of the new or transferred/consolidated academic unit.

Rationale (suggest 200 words each):

Briefly justify why the new or transferred/consolidated academic unit is being proposed. What are the objectives of the unit? You may wish to include discussion of the Policy statements [[LINK to policy](#)] below, as applicable.

Alignment with Dalhousie's strategic direction and values

New or modified academic units must have an appropriate fit with the academic mission and strategic goals of the university. A compelling argument will demonstrate an increased potential for the proposed academic unit to deliver on the academic mission, reinforce strategic goals and support external engagement through a clearer narrative about Dalhousie's value proposition and/or specialization.

Inclusive Excellence and Core Values

The new or modified academic unit should remain committed to enhancing the equity, diversity and inclusion goals of the Faculty and University, particularly in relation to engagement with communities.

Unit Cohesion

Academic units share similar or common educational goals, and at least to some extent are inter-dependent and mutually reinforcing in the achievement of their respective goals, as well as the overall goals and academic mission of the university. Establishing or modifying an academic unit should not create duplications, inefficiencies, or a lack of organizational clarity.

Governance

Academic units should be of a size and complexity that permit efficiency and effectiveness in collegial governance—academic units should be involved in a meaningful way in governance through transparent decision-making. The effectiveness and equity of an academic unit’s participation at the institutional level is also an important consideration.

Financial Viability

The budgetary implications of establishing or modifying an academic unit must be carefully considered and estimated. Any new or reconstituted academic unit must be demonstrably financially viable for the foreseeable future.

Decisional Balance

Proposals should clearly articulate how the proposed model will address or resolve any precipitating factors and consider the benefits and drawbacks of various approaches or options.

Summary of Impacts: (suggest 100 words each):

Please discuss the impacts of establishing, consolidating or transferring the academic unit, as well as plans being considered to address the needs of, each of the following groups, where applicable.

Programs and Students

There must be a well-justified plan for academic program continuity and student support, particularly for students from underrepresented and marginalized groups, where programs are not being terminated.

Unit Staff and Faculty

The implications for the working conditions of staff and faculty must be addressed. It may be advisable to consult with Dalhousie Human Resources as well as relevant union and employee groups representing employees of the university (Dalhousie Faculty Association, Dalhousie Professional Management Group, Canadian Union of Public Employees, Nova Scotia Government Employees Union, Public Service Alliance of Canada).

Impacts on Other Stakeholders

The implications of terminating an academic unit for alumni, past and potential donors, community partners, and other external stakeholders must be considered.

Resources (suggest 200-300 words):

Please provide a rough estimate of the resources required for the new or transferred/reconstituted academic unit, including identification of required full-time and possibly part-time academic and support staff and space for the new or reconstituted unit. Note: specific budget projections are not required at this stage.

In the case of academic unit transfer or consolidation, the Concept Paper must be reviewed by all impacted academic units (i.e. current host department/faculty and proposed host department/faculty).

Date of Review by Department/School:

- Supporting documents: Appendices D, E and other documentation of discussion/decision

Date of Review by Faculty:

- Supporting documents: Appendices D, E and other documentation of discussion/decision

Date of Submission to University Secretariat:

- *Please specify Pathway A or B*

Attachments:

1. Motions and supporting documents for decision making bodies (Appendices D and E are required for each)
- 2.
- 3.

Appendix C – Concept Paper for Academic Unit Termination

For Senate Policy for Academic Unit Consolidation, Renaming, Establishment, Termination and Transfer (AUCRETT) [LINK to policy repository]

All concept papers for academic unit termination should follow the complete Procedures in Appendix A of AUCRETT (A. Concept Paper Phase), including use of this form. Proposals not submitted according to the Procedures may not be considered by the Senate Planning and Governance Committee.

For the purposes of AUCRETT, termination refers to eliminating an academic unit. Suspending or terminating any academic programs therein is a separate process that should be undertaken first (see: [Program Proposal Process](#)).

Academic Unit Name/Host Faculty: *name of the academic unit to be terminated.*

Proposal Contact: *name, relationship to academic unit (see Policy B.3. for discussion of who may initiate a Concept Paper), and contact information.*

See Policy D.3. for full description of policy statements [LINK to policy repository]

Rationale (suggest 200 words each):

Briefly justify why the academic unit should be terminated.

The termination of an academic unit may be related to the termination of one or more academic programs or the transfer/consolidation of interrelated or constituent academic units. Financial viability or efficiency can also be a potential reason for considering termination of a unit.

Decisional Balance (*Appendix D – Decisional Change Matrix will be helpful when considering the potential impacts and possible alternatives*):

Proposals should clearly articulate how the proposed model will address or resolve any precipitating factors and consider the benefits and drawbacks of various approaches or options.

Summary of Impacts (suggest 200 words each):

Please discuss the impacts of terminating the academic unit, as well as plans being considered to address the needs of, each of the following groups, where applicable.

Programs and Students

There must be a well-justified plan for academic program continuity and student support, particularly for students from underrepresented and marginalized groups, where programs are not being terminated.

Unit Staff and Faculty

The implications for the working conditions of staff and faculty must be addressed. It may be advisable to consult with Dalhousie Human Resources as well as relevant union and employee groups representing employees of the university (Dalhousie Faculty Association, Dalhousie Professional Management Group, Canadian Union of Public Employees, Nova Scotia Government Employees Union, Public Service Alliance of Canada).

Other Stakeholders

The implications of terminating an academic unit for alumni, past and potential donors, community partners, and other external stakeholders must be considered.

Date of Review by Department/School:

- Supporting documents: Appendices D, E and other documentation of discussion/decision

Date of Review by Faculty:

- Supporting documents: Appendices D, E and other documentation of discussion/decision

Date of Submission to University Secretariat:

- *Please specify Pathway A or B*

Attachments:

1. Motions and supporting documents for decision making bodies (Appendices D and E are required for each)
- 2.
- 3.

APPENDIX D – DECISIONAL BALANCE WORKSHEET

As per the policy statements, proponents should properly consider alternative approaches to AU-CRETT, and especially the impact of *not* creating, transferring or consolidating the academic unit(s) in question. For example, are there drawbacks of *not* making a change? Will the drivers of the change (i.e. the issue that precipitated the need for change) be properly addressed in the proposed model? The worksheet below may help you fully consider the advantages and drawbacks. **It is most effective to undertake this activity in a facilitated or group setting with a broad array of stakeholders.**

	Advantages	Drawbacks
AU-CRETT (Making a Change)		
Current Structure (No Change)		

APPENDIX E – POLICY STATEMENTS ASSESSMENT GRID

The policy statements are scored according to the following distribution:

Academic merit and inclusive excellence - Unit cohesion; Mission and Vision and Senate Principles and Values; Strategic priorities; Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (40%): the proposal articulates an appropriate fit with the academic mission and strategic goals of the university, increased potential for the proposed academic unit to deliver on the academic mission, support external engagement through a clearer narrative about Dalhousie's value proposition and/or specialization; enhance equity diversity and inclusion and engagement with communities; leads to Academic units which share similar or common educational goals, and at least to some extent are inter-dependent and mutually reinforcing in the achievement of their respective goals - as evidenced by overlaps in teaching and/or research; does not create duplications, inefficiencies, or a lack of organizational clarity.

Alternatives to AUCRETT (20%): proposal clearly articulates how the proposed model will address or resolve any precipitating factors and consider the benefits and drawbacks of various approaches (i.e. status quo, proposed model, alternatives).

Long-term financial viability (20%): Resource allocations are supported by VP Finance and Administration projections; appropriate justification is provided where EDI goals and academic merit outweigh financial viability arguments.

Impact on stakeholders (20%): the proponents provide a well justified plan for academic program continuity and student support, particularly for underrepresented and marginalized groups; the proponents have carefully considered and estimated (appropriate to the concept paper vs full proposal) the impact on faculty, alumni and external relations, community partners, staff, underrepresented and marginalized groups and revenue.

Scoring

- 1 - Does not address the policy statement(s).
- 3 - Addresses some of the elements of the policy statement(s).
- 5 - Adequately addresses most of the elements of the policy statement(s).
- 7 - Effectively addresses all elements of the policy statement(s).

Concept papers must score at least 6 (weighted average) to be approved by SPGC for development of a full proposal.

Full proposals must score at least 6 (weighted average) to be approved by SPGC for consideration by Senate.

Appendix F – For Proposals to Establish, Consolidate or Transfer an Academic Unit

For Senate Policy for Academic Unit Consolidation, Renaming, Establishment, Termination and Transfer (AUCRETT) [[LINK to policy repository](#)]

All proposals for academic unit establishment, consolidation and transfer should follow the complete Procedures in Appendix A of AUCRETT (B. Full Proposal phase), including use of this form. Proposals not submitted according to the Procedures may not be considered by the Senate Planning and Governance Committee.

For the purposes of AUCRETT, establishment, consolidation and transfer refer to academic units. Establishing a new academic program is a separate process (see: [Program Proposal Process](#)).

Proposal: New Academic Unit Academic Unit Transfer Academic Unit Consolidation

Current Academic Unit Name/Host Faculty (if applicable):

Proposed Academic Unit Name/Host Faculty: *name of the new or transferred/consolidated academic unit*

Proposal Contact: *name, relationship to academic unit (see Policy B.3. for discussion of who many initiate a Full Proposal), and contact information.*

Structure:

Please describe in detail, and attach documentation as appropriate (e.g. organizational charts, as per Attachment 10) the proposed governance and administrative structure of the new or transferred/consolidated academic unit.

Rationale:

Please describe why the new or reconstituted academic unit is being proposed. What are the objectives of the unit? Please include discussion of each of the Policy statements below [[LINK to policy](#)].

Alignment with Dalhousie’s strategic direction and values

New or modified academic units must have an appropriate fit with the academic mission and strategic goals of the university. A compelling argument will demonstrate an increased potential for the proposed academic unit to deliver on the academic mission, reinforce strategic goals and support external engagement through a clearer narrative about Dalhousie’s value proposition and/or specialization.

Inclusive Excellence and Core Values

The new or modified academic unit should remain committed to enhancing the equity, diversity and inclusion goals of the Faculty and University, particularly in relation to engagement with communities.

Unit Cohesion

Academic units share similar or common educational goals, and at least to some extent are inter-dependent and mutually reinforcing in the achievement of their respective goals, as well as the overall goals and academic mission of the university. Establishing or modifying an academic unit should not create duplications, inefficiencies, or a lack of organizational clarity.

Governance

Academic units should be of a size and complexity that permit efficiency and effectiveness in collegial governance—academic units should be involved in a meaningful way in governance through transparent decision-making. The effectiveness and equity of an academic unit’s participation at the institutional level is also an important consideration.

Financial Viability

The budgetary implications of establishing or modifying an academic unit must be carefully considered and estimated. Any new or reconstituted academic unit must be demonstrably financially viable for the foreseeable future.

Decisional Balance (Decisional Balance (Appendix D – Decisional Change Matrix will be helpful when considering the potential impacts and possible alternatives):

Proposals should clearly articulate how the proposed model will address or resolve any precipitating factors and consider the benefits and drawbacks of various approaches or options.

Proposals should clearly articulate how the proposed model will address or resolve any precipitating factors and consider the benefits and drawbacks of various approaches or options.

Impacts:

Please discuss the impacts of establishing, consolidating or transferring the academic unit on each of the following groups, as applicable. Include or attach evidence of consultation and plans to address the needs of each group (Attachment 6).

Programs and Students

There must be a well-justified plan for academic program continuity and student support, particularly for students from underrepresented and marginalized groups, where programs are not being terminated.

Unit Staff and Faculty

The implications for the working conditions of staff and faculty must be addressed. It may be advisable to consult with Dalhousie Human Resources as well as relevant union and employee groups representing employees of the university (Dalhousie Faculty Association, Dalhousie Professional Management Group, Canadian Union of Public Employees, Nova Scotia

Government Employees Union, Public Service Alliance of Canada).

Impacts on Other Stakeholders

The implications of terminating an academic unit for alumni, past and potential donors, community partners, and other external stakeholders must be considered.

Resources:

Please discuss the resources required for the new or transferred/reconstituted academic unit, including identification of required full-time and possibly part-time academic and support staff and space for the new or reconstituted unit. This should be accompanied by detailed budget estimate as per Attachment 9.

In the case of academic unit transfer or consolidation, the proposal must be reviewed by all impacted academic units (i.e. current host department/faculty and proposed host department/faculty). Please add entries below as applicable.

Date of Review by Department/School :

- Supporting documents: Appendices D, E and other documentation of discussion/decision

Date of Review by Faculty:

- Supporting documents: Appendices D, E and other documentation of discussion/decision

Date of Submission to University Secretariat:

-

Attachments: All attachments are required unless otherwise stated.

1. Motions and supporting documents for decision making bodies (Appendices D and E are required for each)
2. Most recent Senate Review of Faculty – to be provided by the University Secretariat
3. Most recent Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs (required for programs that are directly impacted by the proposal)
4. Evidence from Strategic Planning sessions (*optional*)
5. Reports by consultants or other **neutral, third parties** (*optional but highly recommended*)
6. Evidence of consultation/feedback from impacted internal stakeholders and equity groups, as per statements D.1. b-d
7. Assessments from external community-based organizations (*optional but highly recommended*)
8. Statements from Deans and Chair/Directors
9. Budget estimates by AVPA/VPP&A or Dean (as applicable), verified by Assistant Vice President Finance (required)
10. Organizational chart for new or transferred/consolidated unit

Other attachments:

- 11.

- 12.
- 13.
- 14.

Appendix G—For Proposals to Rename an Academic Unit

For Senate Policy for Academic Unit Consolidation, Renaming, Establishment, Termination and Transfer (AUCRETT) [\[LINK to policy repository\]](#)

All proposals for academic unit renaming should follow the complete Procedures in Appendix A of AUCRETT (B. Full Proposal phase), including use of this form. Proposals not submitted according to the Procedures may not be considered by the Senate Planning and Governance Committee.

For the purposes of AUCRETT, renaming refers to functional renaming of academic units. This form/process should not be used for honorific/philanthropic renaming or name changes to academic programs.

Current Academic Unit Name/Host Faculty:

Proposed Academic Unit Name:

Proposal Contact:

Background and Rationale: Please provide a detailed rationale, including perceived benefits, for the proposed renaming.

The names of academic units will normally be reflective of the primary functional purpose of the academic unit. Name changes may be sought to accommodate accepted changes in the nomenclature of an academic field or disciplines, updated terminology, or changes to the organizational makeup or membership of an academic unit.

Impacts: What are the implications of renaming the academic unit? Responses should be evidence based and supported by the outcome of consultations or additional documentation (Attachment 2).

The implications of renaming an academic unit for the Department, Faculty and/or university must be carefully considered (e.g., academic, budgetary, reputational, community relations and partnership legal, donor relations, etc.).

Date of Approval by Department/School (for department or school name changes only):

Date of Approval by Faculty Council:

Date of Submission to University Secretariat:

Attachments: All attachments are required unless otherwise stated.

1. Motions and supporting documents for decision making bodies (Appendix D is required for each)
2. Evidence of consultation/feedback from:

- a. Department/Faculty (students, faculty, staff, alumni)
- b. University (open forums for other departments/faculties to provide feedback as appropriate (e.g. Deans Council, Provost Committee, etc.) –only required for Faculty-level name change proposal)
- c. External stakeholders as appropriate
- d. Advancement (impacts on giving and reputation)
- e. Legal Counsel (legalities and implementation of change)

Appendix H-Proposal for Academic Unit Termination

For Senate Policy for Academic Unit Consolidation, Renaming, Establishment, Termination and Transfer (AUCRETT) [[LINK to policy repository](#)]

All proposals for academic unit termination should follow the complete Procedures in Appendix A of AUCRETT (B. Full Proposal stage), including use of this form. Proposals not submitted according to the Procedures may not be considered by the Senate Planning and Governance Committee.

For the purposes of AUCRETT, termination refers to eliminating an academic unit. Suspending or terminating any academic programs therein is a separate process that should be undertaken first (see: [Program Proposal Process](#)).

Academic Unit Name/Host Faculty: *name of the academic unit to be terminated.*

Proposal Contact: *name, relationship to academic unit (see Policy B.3. for discussion of who may initiate a Concept Paper), and contact information.*

Rationale:

Please explain why the academic unit should be terminated.

The termination of an academic unit may be related to the termination of one or more academic programs or the transfer/consolidation of interrelated or constituent academic units. Financial viability or efficiency can also be a potential reason for considering termination of a unit.

Decisional Balance (*Appendix D – Decisional Change Matrix will be helpful when considering the potential impacts and possible alternatives*):

Proposals should clearly articulate how the proposed model will address or resolve any precipitating factors and consider the benefits and drawbacks of various approaches or options.

Impacts:

Please discuss the impacts of terminating the academic unit on each of the following groups, as applicable. Include or attach evidence of consultation and plans to address the needs of each group (Attachment 6).

Programs and Students

There must be a well-justified plan for academic program continuity and student support, particularly for students from underrepresented and marginalized groups, where programs are not being terminated.

Unit Staff and Faculty

The implications for the working conditions of staff and faculty must be addressed. It may be advisable to consult with Dalhousie Human Resources as well as relevant union and employee groups representing employees of the university (Dalhousie Faculty Association, Dalhousie Professional Management Group, Canadian Union of Public Employees, Nova Scotia Government Employees Union, Public Service Alliance of Canada).

Impacts on Other Stakeholders

The implications of terminating an academic unit for alumni, past and potential donors, community partners, and other external stakeholders must be considered.

Financial Impact:

Please discuss the financial implications of termination the academic unit. To be accompanied by an assessment as per Attachment 9.

Date of Review by Department/School:

- Supporting documents: Appendices D, E and other documentation of discussion/decision

Date of Review by Faculty:

- Supporting documents: Appendices D, E and other documentation of discussion/decision

Date of Submission to University Secretariat:

Attachments: All attachments are required unless otherwise stated.

1. Motions and supporting documents for decision making bodies (Appendices D and E are required for each)
2. Most recent Senate Review of Faculty – to be provided by the University Secretariat
3. Most recent Faculty Reviews of Academic Programs (required for programs that are directly impacted by the proposal)
4. Evidence from Strategic Planning sessions (*optional*)
5. Reports by consultants or other **neutral, third parties** (*optional but highly recommended*)
6. Evidence of consultation with and feedback from impacted internal stakeholders and equity groups, as per D.3. b-d
7. Assessments from external community-based organizations (*optional but highly recommended*)
8. Statements from Deans and Chair/Directors
9. Financial impact assessment by AVPA/VPP&A or Dean (as applicable), verified by Assistant Vice President Finance

Other attachments:

- 10.
- 11.
- 12.