

JL3yEM0rID0 >>BDC3 0 0 0 r11.6782 6311.678Tm 599eEiz[(Jl3a[(Jl3b)-0 0e)6 (t)-3 (h Mc)3 (Co)1 0 [(6 (ma)6 (c)-8l3k))TJ 0

8l3yJl3.506 0W[(500 eR)]TJ EM0 r/ID 0 >>BDC3 0 0 0 r11.6782 6311.678Tm 599eEiz[(Jl3a[(Jl3b)-0 0e)6 (t)-3 (h Mc)3 (Co)1 0 [(6 (ma)6 (c)-8l3k))TJ 0
programmatic innovations? Third, what authority do the Faculty and the Administration each have over program innovations? And fourth, what is the relationship between CAP and the Faculty as a body as provided in the Plan of Governance and the By-Laws of the General Faculty? I take these up in order:

1. What would be required to implement to proposed integration of GSSWSR and GSAS?

The proposed integration would require changing the provision of the Plan of Governance straightforward, while others would require working out some details.

Under the proposed restructuring, the positions of Dean of GSAS and GSSWSR would be replaced by the position of Graduate Dean, while a new position of Director of GSSWSR

overlap between these; and the question of how to do this in a way that respects the authority of each is one of the most important responsibilities that the Plan imposes jointly on Faculty and Administration. In the case of program innovation, however, the Plan of Governance explicitly gives the Faculty and the Administration mutual responsibility for program innovations (III.1(a), 2; IV.1).¹

Although the Plan of Governance leaves no doubt about the joint role of Administration and Faculty in program innovations in general, it is possible for disputes to arise as to what counts as a program innovation. The Board of Trustees has retained general authority over the number and amount of scholarships and fellowships, the Faculties of Arts and Sciences and GSSWSR have authority over curriculum and admissions policies in GSAS and GSSWSR, respectively (PG III(1)(b)(i) and (ii); PG III (1)(c)(i) and (ii), and the President (or by delegation, the Provost) has authority over interim academic staffing. (PG

Faculty as a body (Plan of Governance, (III.3(f)).

The Plan of Governance establishes that with respect to those institutional priorities that are not directly concerned with academic matters, but that have an impact on them, CAP exercises the Faculty's advisory function to the Administration. But with respect to academic matters, over which the Faculty has direct authority, CAP's role is advisory to the Faculty. This is clearly indicated by the By-laws, which provide that "representatives of the General Faculty are responsible to the Faculty as a whole" (I) and that, on matters of general policy, CAP may only issue recommendations to the Faculty for its review. (V.D(2)(c)). It is also indicated in the Plan of Governance, III. 3 (a), which states that "The General Faculty shall establish a committee with responsibility for recommending academic priorities (including priorities concerning staffing allocations, department and program facilities and resources, and restructuring or terminating existing departments and programs) in accordance with Article III, section 1(a)(ii) and Article IV, section 1.A§ these provision refer to the Faculty's joint authority with the Administration over program innovations, the advisory function referred to here could only be to the Faculty itself.

Thus, before the Faculty chose to delegate its authority over academic priorities in individual programs to CAP (that is, prior to the By-Laws), CAP possessed a double advisory function: to the Faculty with respect to the Faculty's jurisdiction and to the Administration on questions of institutional priorities that are only indirectly related to academic matters and which thus fall principally within the jurisdiction of the Administration. However, through its By-laws, the General Faculty delegated to CAP the Faculty's portion of the joint authority to determine academic priorities (including program innovations) for individual programs. (V.D(2)(b)) CAP, then, now holds the Faculty's authority to determine, jointly with the Administration, program innovations. Any program innovations should thus be approved by CAP and the President or Provost.

I hope you find this helpful.

Yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jeremy Elkins".

Jeremy Elkins
Assistant Professor
General Faculty Parliamentarian