

## TCNJ GOVERNANCE MEMORANDUM

To: Committee on Academic Programs

From: Steering Committee

Date: December 7, 2022

Re: **Undergraduates Enrolling in and Double-Counting Graduate Courses Policy**

**Background:** In light of The College's 2022-2027 strategic plan and based on their experiences in managing and launching graduate programs, leaders from the Office of Graduate Studies and the faculty coordinators of three graduate programs have requested the following revisions to the [Undergraduates Enrolling in and Double-Counting Graduate Courses](#) policy:

1. Increase (from two to three) the maximum number of courses in which undergraduates may enroll and double count.
2. Lower the eligibility threshold from 24 units to 16 units, so that interested juniors as well as seniors can explore graduate courses/programs as soon as they, their advisors, and faculty/staff representatives of the graduate program feel they are ready.
3. Expand the eligibility criteria so that a recommendation to enroll may come not only from a "coordinator of the graduate program" but also from "a faculty or staff representative of the graduate program."
4. Raise the "petition the Provost" threshold from two to three courses for a 12+ credit graduate certificate and from three to five courses for a 36+ credit graduate degree program.

**Charge:** Steering asks CAP to review the Undergraduates Enrolling in and Double - Counting Graduate Courses policy in light of the requested revisions ([memo](#), proposed [redlined version](#)). CAP should communicate with the GSC for their review of the proposal. GSC should create a preliminary recommendation regarding changes to the policy.

The preliminary recommendation should then be made available to and testimony should be solicited in the form of written feedback (through a survey and or e-mail) from the relevant stakeholder groups, including Dean of Graduate and Continuing Education, Academic Leaders, Deans/Assistant Deans, Graduate Program Coordinators, Student Government Executive Committee (lead by Student Government VP for Academic Affairs), and Office of Records and Registration. Additionally, CAP/GSC should consider benchmarking from other institutions of comparable size and scope. GSC will then create a final recommendation with feedback. GSC will send its recommendation to CAP to forward to Steering. CAP will then forward a final recommendation to the Steering Committee. In the final recommendation, CAP should note the stakeholder groups, number of persons responding, and summary of testimony collected.

**Testimony Tier: Tier I:** The issue requires minimal testimony from the campus community. The assigned council or committee should consult with relevant stakeholders before preparing the final recommendation, but there is no need for surveys or open fora.

**Timeline:** CAP should make a Final Recommendation to Steering by **March 15, 2023**.

---

## 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, 2019 Revision](#), pages 23–27.*