

Revisions and Rationale of proposed amendment to the Senate Charter for the creation of an Initial Review Committee for Academic Proposals (IRCAP)

John Delano (Chair, 2007-2008 Governance Council)

Rationale

Proposals from academic units within the University undergo a stringent, multi-level review process within the department, college/school, and University-level governance (UAC; GAC; full Senate). In contrast, under current provisions, academic proposals originating from units within the University that do *not* offer degree programs undergo their initial academic review by either the Undergraduate Academic Council (UAC) or the Graduate Academic Council (GAC). The results of those reviews are reported to the Senate Executive Committee, and can be then forwarded to the full Senate for a formal vote. The proposal from the Governance Council calling for the creation of IRCAP has been done in the interest of creating a parallel, multi-level review process for academic proposals originating from units that do not offer degree programs. IRCAP, although a creation of the University Senate, would be an independent review committee that would report its deliberations to the UAC and/or GAC, not to the Senate Executive Committee.

Revisions

At the Senate meeting of 10 March 2008, the Governance Council introduced the proposed IRCAP amendment to the Senate Charter. Following Senate discussion of that proposal at the 10 March meeting, and the receipt of written comments on 12 March from Marjorie Pryse, Dean of Graduate Studies, the Governance Council (the source of the original proposal) met on April 4, April 11, and April 18 to discuss whether it would make friendly revisions to the original proposal. Four revisions to the proposed amendment were agreed upon by the Governance Council.

- (a) IRCAP would report to either the Undergraduate Academic Council (UAC) and/or Graduate Academic Council (GAC), as appropriate, rather than to the Senate Executive Committee. This revision to the March 10 draft would be consistent with IRCAP serving as the initial stage of the academic review process.
- (b) Since IRCAP would not report to the Senate Executive Committee, its relationship to the governance structure would not be analogous to that of CAFFECOR and CERS. Consequently, the proposed amendment would be located in a new subsection of Article VII, instead being included in Article VII.7.1 of the Senate Charter.
- (c) The *ex officio* members of IRCAP would be voting members. The Governance Council noted that IRCAP members, whether *ex officio* or not, would be expected to recuse themselves from voting on any proposal originating in whole or part from their respective units.
- (d) If IRCAP was considered as having not performed its review responsibly, then the authors of a proposal could request a formal enquiry based on their concerns to the Committee on Mediation of the Governance Council (Article X.1.6 of the Senate Charter).