

MEMORANDUM

To: Steering

From: Steering Committee

Date: November 20, 2024

Re: Review of Options Regarding GSC's role in governance and in the School of Graduate, Global, and Online Education

Background: On August 21, 2024, Steering received a request from Linda Mayger, Interim Dean of Graduate, Global, and Online Education (GGOE) regarding “needed policy changes related to graduate education, the Arlotto Family Center for Global Engagement, and the development of a new school.” The memo outlines areas that need to be reviewed, as well as a rationale for the proposed changes.

Charge: Steering charges Steering to review the first and third items on the memo regarding 1) the proposed elevation of GSC to a Standing Committee and 2) the change in CAP's charge to focus exclusively on undergraduate academic programming. We ask that Steering outline the advantages and disadvantages that might emerge should GSC be elevated to a standing committee, and seek testimony from both CAP and GSC on how both of these committees may best serve both The College as a whole and the recently-created School of Graduate, Global, and Online Education.

Steering should keep in mind the following concerns (note that this list is not exhaustive):

- Workload of faculty and staff in governance;
- Representation of graduate faculty in governance;
- Priorities of both CAP and GSC and how they can be best met;
- Current and anticipated pain points with the various options proposed;
- How this division may complicate programming and curriculum for 4+1 and 3+1 programming;
- Programmatic and policy relationships between GGOE and undergraduate programs that own graduate programs (certificates and degrees);
- Ways to reduce redundancy and work either by elevating GSC to a standing committee or through creating more efficient relationships and communications between CAP and GSC;
- Parity across schools regarding the roles and responsibilities of Standing Committees and Councils;
- What would be the scope of GSC as a standing committee and would GSC cover non-academic policies as well (which would be an important distinction between GSC and CAP as standing committees)? In other words, how would non-academic graduate policies and procedures be handled;
- Setting a precedent for school-specific Standing Committees and Councils (both pros and cons of such a move), as well as how the needs of GGOE may differ from other academic schools across campus;

- The purpose, role, and charges of Standing Committees and Councils (both in general, and to these CAP and GSC specifically) outlined in the [Governance Document](#).

If testimony is needed, the testimony tier and timeline are outlined below. In particular, at Step 2, in considering the need for reviewing the consequences/pain points of the options as well as in creating alternatives, Steering should consult with CAP, GSC, Interim Dean Mayger and other relevant stakeholders to create the preliminary recommendations.

- **Testimony Tier: Tier II**
- 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).

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).

Based on these recommendations, If Steering determines a substantive change should be made to the charge or status of either CAP or GSC, they should seek Tier III Testimony. For Tier III Testimony, Steering should consult the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, academic leaders, and other relevant stakeholders.

- **Testimony Tier: Tier III**
- The issue requires a high degree of 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. Testimony should be solicited in the form of both written and oral feedback, as well as approval by the appropriate representative bodies.

Written feedback should take the form of a survey and/or email feedback. Oral feedback should take the form of public testimony at a meeting of the appropriate representative body or bodies (as identified by Steering). These meetings should be open to the general public, and publicized so that individuals not represented by that group but interested in the issue may attend. Following that meeting, the representative body may, at its discretion, issue a formal response to the preliminary recommendation, which should be sent to the relevant council or committee as well as Steering. On the completion of a final recommendation, this response should accompany the final recommendation to Steering, and it should be considered as part of Steering's final review.

Timeline: Steering should make a Written Recommendation on next steps to Steering by **February 15, 2025**. If testimony is sought, in the submission of the final recommendation Steering should note the stakeholder groups, number of persons responding, and summary of testimony collected. If Tier III Testimony is found necessary, Steering should make a Final Recommendation to Steering by **April 15, 2025**.

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.