

MEMORANDUM

TO: CAP

FROM: Steering Committee

RE: Revised Double-Counting Policy

DATE: April 3, 2019

Background

On January 2, 2019, Steering received a [memo from Janet Gray](#), Chair of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies asking for clarification as to whether the Policy on Undergraduates Enrolling in and Double Counting Graduate Courses applies to Graduate Certificate Programs. On February 5, 2019, Steering received a [memo from the Public Health Department](#), which also raised a question about the Double-Counting Policy. The Department of Public Health's concern was focused on the number of courses which could be double-counted in graduate programs which exceed the [state requirement of a minimum of 30 credits for a master's degree](#).

Charges

In keeping with the timeline below, Steering has two charges for CAP related to the [Undergraduates Enrolling in and Double-Counting Policy](#):

1. Steering asks CAP to review the [Policy on Undergraduates Enrolling in and Double Counting Graduate Courses](#) as well as the [Policy on Graduate Certificate Programs](#) to determine whether or not the double counting policy should apply to Graduate Certificate Programs. If CAP determines that it is in the best interest of students and the College to permit double counting for Certificate Programs then CAP should recommend to Steering a specific amendment to or revision of the Double Counting Policy. CAP should ensure that the language of the amendment or revised policy is clear and unambiguous.
2. Steering asks CAP to review the maximum number of courses that may be double-counted toward graduate degrees programs. The policy currently states "Academic Units with graduate programs requiring more than 36 credits may petition the Provost to allow undergraduate students to enroll in and double-count more than two graduate courses, up to no more than four graduate courses." In conducting this review, CAP should consider the competitiveness of TCNJ graduate programs. If CAP determines that it is in the best interest of students and the College to permit more than 4 courses to be double-counted in graduate programs that require more than the 36 credits then CAP should recommend to Steering a specific amendment to or revision of the

Double Counting Policy. CAP should ensure that the language of an amendment or revised policy is clear and unambiguous.

As the Double-Counting policy was revised in February 2018, Steering hopes that CAP can refer back to the testimony it collected previously at Step 2 to inform addressing the two questions raised now and to write a preliminary recommendation. Steering suggests CAP seek testimony on its preliminary recommendation from GSC, department chairs and graduate coordinators in departments with graduate programs as well as any other stakeholders deemed appropriate by CAP.

Timeline: CAP should begin work immediately on the charges with the goal of making a final recommendations to Steering by the end of the Spring 2019 term.

Testimony Tier: Tier II from Faculty, Staff, and Students

The issue requires moderate testimony from the campus community. The assigned council or committee should consult with relevant individuals and groups in developing a preliminary recommendation. The completed preliminary recommendation should then be made available to the relevant stakeholder groups, and testimony should be solicited in the form of written feedback (through a survey and or e-mail).

TCNJ Governance Processes

Step 1–Steering issues a charge

Step 2–Governance prepares a Preliminary Recommendation

Once the appropriate standing committee or council has received the charge, it should start by collecting data needed to make a preliminary recommendation. It should receive input from affected individuals and all relevant stakeholder groups prior to making a preliminary recommendation. For issues that have broad implications or that affect a large number of individuals, initial testimony should be solicited from the campus community at large. For some issues, sufficient initial testimony may come from input through committee membership or solicitation from targeted constituent groups. When, in the best judgment of the committee, adequate clarity of the principles contributing to the problem are known, a preliminary recommendation should be drafted and disseminated to the campus community.

Step 3–The Relevant Stakeholders provide Testimony

Once a preliminary recommendation has been completed, the standing committee or council should seek testimony from the campus community. The testimony should be gathered in accordance with the Testimony Tier (see below) assigned to the issue by Steering.

For issues that require public testimony from the campus community, the chair of the standing committee or council should approach the president of the appropriate representative bodies to schedule the next available time slot at a meeting of that body.

Testimony should be gathered in a way that allows stakeholders to weigh in fully on the issue. Members of the standing committee or council that wrote the preliminary recommendation should be present to hear and record the testimony.

Step 4–Governance prepares a Final Recommendation

Once the standing committee or council has received appropriate testimony, it should revise the preliminary recommendation into a final recommendation. Once the final recommendation is complete, the standing committee or council should use sound judgment to determine whether or not more public testimony is required. If, in its feedback to the original preliminary recommendation, a stakeholder representative body requests to review an issue again, the committee or council is bound to bring it back to that body. If a full calendar year has passed since the formal announcement of the preliminary recommendation, the committee must re-submit a preliminary recommendation to the campus community. When the committee or council has completed the final recommendation, it should forward it to the Steering Committee. The final recommendation should be accompanied by a cover memo that summarizes the initial charge, how testimony was gathered and the nature of that testimony, and how the committee responded to that testimony, including a description of how the preliminary recommendation evolved as a result of testimony.

Step 5–Steering considers the Final Recommendation

Step 6–The Provost and/or President and Board consider the Final Recommendation

Step 7–Steering notifies the Campus Community Testimony

For a complete description of all steps and of the testimony tiers, see Governance Structures and Processes, 2017 Revision, pages 21–24.