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STRUCTURE OF THE SELF-STUDY

The university chose the Selected Topics Option I model for its institutional self-study and focused on eight topics that we believe are representative of the broad accomplishments, stature, ambitions, and areas of limitation and concern in our complex and multifaceted institution. The centerpiece of these selected topics is undergraduate education, chosen both because it is our historic and most pervasive mission as a university and, also, as detailed below, because for the past four years the improvement of undergraduate education and its better integration with the two other principal missions, research and service, has been a primary goal on all three of our campuses. In this self-study, we also have addressed one topic carried over from the MSCHE Periodic Review Report of 2003, Intercampus Governance and Devolution.

The university has been actively engaged in the reaccreditation process for two years. In March 2006, President McCormick submitted to MSCHE a Preliminary Proposal for Self-Study using the Selected Topics with Documentation Model. This proposal was accepted and formed the basis for our subsequent universitywide efforts.

Following the September 28, 2006, visit of our MSCHE liaison, Dr. Michael Kiphart, the final version of our Design for Institutional Self-Study was submitted to MSCHE on November 1, 2006, and approved by Dr. Kiphart on November 6, 2006. By focusing on undergraduate education, the self-study is intended to provide the Rutgers community with a document that offers perspective on the educational change occurring on all our campuses since our last full MSCHE reaccreditation. It has particular relevance to President McCormick’s inaugural challenge to all three of the university’s campuses to reconsider the structure and curriculum of undergraduate education in the context of the major research university that Rutgers has become. The self-study’s utility is also intended to last beyond the present, a time marked by intense activity intended to transform undergraduate education and its organizational structure, to serve as a guide for institutional planning, change, and growth over the course of the next 10 years.

In accord with Option I, we assembled pertinent materials and created roadmaps through the documents to demonstrate compliance with those MSCHE Standards for Accreditation that were not directly addressed in the self-study. All these materials were made available to the chair of the review team and two MSCHE generalist reviewers before and during their visit to Rutgers on October 29, 2007. At that time, the documentation roadmaps were assessed by Provost James V. Maher, Senior Vice Chancellor and Provost, University of Pittsburgh and external team chair, and the two generalists, David E. Hollowell, Executive Vice President, University of Delaware; and Deborah Leather, Acting Director, Associate Professor, Family Studies and Community Development, Human Resource Development, Towson University. The format chosen for the documentation roadmap was designed to be as user-friendly as possible for the generalist reviewers. Coincidently, it was designed to help the university community understand how the distinct components and functions of the university cohere and mutually support the mission of Rutgers in its pursuit of excellence. Many offices and individuals from across the university aided the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning in assembling these documents, which along with their roadmaps were reviewed by members of the Steering Committee.
PARTICIPATION IN THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS

Our self-study narrative was developed in draft reports by working groups and in some cases subgroups and then thematically unified and further developed by a self-study drafting committee. Reports prepared at the request of the Steering Committee by the faculty of Rutgers University Libraries and by the Office of Information Technology, among many others, served as additional valuable resources for the working groups. To ensure that the document was internally consistent and to finalize the report’s recommendations, the final report was edited by a subgroup of the executive committee.

In the process of developing the draft self-study, the steering committee and working groups formally involved individuals from units throughout the university, as the chart below indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Librarians</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Administrators</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Governing Boards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 153 members

Approximately 800 individuals provided additional input to the draft self-study report, expressing their views at meetings, through emails, in written correspondence, and in conversations with members of the formal committees.

More input was sought after the draft self-study was sent to Middle States in October 2007; at least 50 individuals participated in community forums and meetings from late fall through the beginning of January 2008, when the report was finalized and sent to Middle States on January 25, 2008. Thus, over 200 members of the Rutgers community contributed directly to the development of the university’s self-study document.
TIMETABLE: MIDDLE STATES REACREDITATION 2008

March 2006  President McCormick submits to MSCHE a Preliminary Proposal for Self-Study using the Selected Topics with Documentation Model. The proposal is accepted.

June – July 2006  Steering Committee and working groups are formed.

Summer 2006  Office of Institutional Research collects and prepares support documents and web site for use by the self-study working groups. Other logistical preparations made.

August 23, 2006  First meeting of the Steering Committee takes place.

August 25, 2006  Draft Design for Institutional Self-Study, including charge questions for working groups, is finalized and sent to MSCHE.

September 5, 2006 – December 23, 2006  Fall term begins – Fall term ends.

September 11, 2006  President inaugurates the self-study. Self-study working groups commence work.

September 2006  Rutgers’ Middle States Reaccreditation website goes live.

September 28, 2006  A staff liaison from MSCHE visits the campus. The liaison discusses the Draft Design for Self-Study with President McCormick, the Steering Committee, and groups representative of the university community.

Fall 2006 – Spring 2007  The working groups conduct research and write preliminary reports. (First drafts due to Steering Committee ~ March 2007; comments returned ~ April 2007; final working group reports due to Steering Committee ~ May 2007.)


Summer 2007  The Steering Committee continues preparing the draft Self-Study Report.

September 4, 2007 – Fall term begins – Fall term ends.
December 22, 2007

September 5, 2007  Update on Middle States given to New Brunswick Deans’ Council

September 7, 2007  President’s Welcome Back Breakfast for Academic Leaders and Department Chairs in New Brunswick including MSCHE discussion.

September 20, 2007  President’s Welcome Back Breakfast for Academic Leaders in Newark including MSCHE discussion.

September 25, 2007  Rutgers Cooperative Extension Statewide Annual Conference. Faculty and staff from county offices and off-site research stations and farms are informed of the reaccreditation process and asked for their input.

September 26, 2007  A presentation on the Middle States reaccreditation process is provided to Rutgers’ New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station Board of Managers.

September 28, 2007  University Senate Faculty, Student, and Staff Caucuses are briefed on the reaccreditation process and invited to provide input.

October 3, 2007  A draft of the Preliminary Executive Summary is sent to the Chair of the Site Visit Committee.

October 1, 2007  Update on self-study given to New Brunswick Deans’ Council

October 5, 2007  Board of Governors hears an update on reaccreditation and Self-Study progress.

October 10, 2007  Draft of the Self-Study Report is sent to Team Chair and Document Generalists.

October 11, 2007  Steering Committee meets to discuss input regarding the draft Self-Study Report.

October 12, 2007  University Senate Executive Committee is asked to review and comment on draft Self-Study Report.

October 10, 2007  The draft Self-Study Report is submitted to MSCHE and sent to the chair of the MSCHE External Review Team.

October 26, 2007  University Senate Executive Committee convenes to hear a presentation on the reaccreditation process and offer input regarding the draft Self-Study Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 29, 2007</td>
<td>Chair of MSCHE External Review Team makes a preliminary visit to the university. Document generalists visit the university to review document roadmap for standards not covered by Self-Study Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 31, 2007</td>
<td>Student Leadership in New Brunswick is provided with an update and overview of the reaccreditation process and asked for their comments and questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2007</td>
<td>Presentation to Committee on Education Planning and Policy, Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2007</td>
<td>Camden Community Forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5, 2007</td>
<td>New Brunswick Deans’ Council is briefed on visit by chair of MSCHE Review Team and document generalists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6, 2007</td>
<td>Newark Working Groups, Councils, and Department Chairs meet with Executive Vice President and Chair of Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6, 2007</td>
<td>Newark Community Forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7, 2007</td>
<td>RU Alumni event at EcoComplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9, 2007</td>
<td>University Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28, 2007</td>
<td>Cook Campus Student Leadership Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4, 2007</td>
<td>Academic Leadership Program for Department Chairs and Deans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 6, 2007</td>
<td>Board of Governors discussion on Self-Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7, 2007</td>
<td>Executive Leadership Forum for Administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 13, 2007</td>
<td>Board of Trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 14, 2007</td>
<td>New Brunswick Faculty Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 22, 2008 – May 21, 2008</td>
<td>Spring term begins – University Commencement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 18, 2008  Presentation on Middle States reaccreditation to New Brunswick residence hall advisors.

January 22, 2008  School of Environmental and Biological Sciences – Joint Chairs’ and Center and Institute Directors’ Meeting.

January 25, 2008  Final Self-Study Report sent to evaluation team and to MSCHE.

January 31, 2008  Presentation to University Relations and Communicators’ Network.

February 4, 2008  New Brunswick Deans’ Council is given update and preliminary information about the MSCHE site visit.

February 12, 2008  Administrative Luncheon.

February 19, 2008  Academic Leadership Program.

March 9 – 12, 2008  The MSCHE External Review Team visits the university, reviews the self-study, and writes its report.

Early Summer 2008  MSCHE takes action on reaccreditation.

Note: Brief updates on the Middle States reaccreditation process have also been provided by Philip Furmanski, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Robert Goodman, Executive Dean, School of Environmental and Biological Sciences and Chair of the Steering Committee, at numerous smaller meetings with faculty, staff, students, and other stakeholders.
COMMITTEES

Executive Working Group

CHAIR
Robert Goodman, Executive Dean, School of Environmental and Biological Sciences

MEMBERS
Barbara Bender, Associate Dean, Academic Support and Graduate Student Services, Graduate School–New Brunswick
Richard DeLisi, Professor of Educational Psychology and Dean, Graduate School of Education
Philip Furmanski, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Gary Gigliotti, Professor of Economics, School of Arts and Sciences; Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs-Teaching and Assessment Research; Director of the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research; Member, Rutgers University Senate (2005-2006)
Carol S. Goldin, Director of Special Projects, Office of Academic Affairs – Serving from November, 2007
Robert Heffernan, Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Brent Ruben, Professor of Communication, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies; Executive Director of the Center for Organizational Development and Leadership
Gerry Warshaver, Director of Special Projects, Office of Academic Affairs - Serving until November, 2007

Steering Committee

CHAIR
Robert M. Goodman, Executive Dean, School of Environmental and Biological Sciences; member of Agriculture and Natural Resources

MEMBERS
Joseph Barone, Professor of Pharmacy Practice, Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy; Member, Budget and Finance Committee, Rutgers University Senate
Barbara Bender, Associate Dean, Academic Support and Graduate Student Services, Graduate School–New Brunswick - Serving from July 1, 2007
Gregory Blimling, Vice President for Student Affairs
Raphael Caprio, Vice President of Continuous Education and Outreach
Martha Cotter, Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, School of Arts and Sciences; Chair, Rutgers University Senate (2004–2007); Executive Committee Member, Rutgers University Senate 2007-2008; Faculty Representative to Board of Governors 2007-2008
Richard DeLisi, Professor of Educational Psychology and Dean, Graduate School of Education - Serving from August, 2007
Christine Esposito, Douglass College (2009)
Gary Gigliotti, Professor of Economics, School of Arts and Sciences; Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs-Teaching and Assessment Research; Director of the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research; Member, Rutgers University Senate (2005-2006) - Serving from April 2007

M. William Howard, Jr., Public Member, Board of Governors; Member, Education Planning and Policy Committee; Chair, Board of Governors 2007-2008

Maurice T. Ingram, School of Arts and Sciences (2008)

Sybil M. James, Ombudsperson for Students

Jane Junn, Associate Professor of Political Science, School of Arts and Sciences

Michael T. Klein, Dean, School of Engineering

Asela Laguna-Diaz, Professor and Chair, Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark; Member, Committee on Academic Planning and Review; Member, Rutgers University Senate (2005–2006); At Large Member, Rutgers University Senate 2007-2008

Margaret Marsh, Interim Provost Camden Campus - Serving until March 20, 2007

Michael P. McClain, Camden College of Arts and Sciences (2008)

Michael Palis, Professor of Computer Science; Interim Dean, Faculty of Arts and Sciences-Camden; Interim Dean, Graduate School, Camden - Serving from March 20, 2007

Barry Qualls, Professor of English, School of Arts and Sciences; Interim Vice President for Undergraduate Education

George Rears, B.A., 1989, Rutgers College; M.B.A., 1995, Rutgers Business School: Graduate Programs–Newark and New Brunswick; Member, Board of Trustees

Gary Roth, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Services, Rutgers–Newark

Brent D. Ruben, Professor of Communication, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies; Executive Director, Center for Organizational Development and Leadership

Kathleen M. Scott, Professor of Cell Biology and Neuroscience, School of Arts and Sciences; Director, Math and Science Learning Center; Member, Faculty Council Teaching Committee; Assistant Vice President Instructional Support

George Stauffer, Dean, Mason Gross School of the Arts

Wally Torian, Assistant Dean and Director, Rutgers College Educational Opportunity Fund

Nancy Winterbauer, Vice President for University Budgeting

**STAFF**

Robert Heffernan, Director, Office of Institutional Research and Planning

Carol S Goldin, Director of Special Projects, Office of Academic Affairs – Serving from November, 2007

Isabel O'Donovan-Keeley, Business Specialist, Office of Institutional Research and Planning

Gerry Warshaver, Director of Special Projects, Office of Academic Affairs – Serving until November, 2007
Working Group I: Undergraduate Admissions and Retention and Student Support Services

COCHAIRS
Carl Kirschner, Professor of Spanish, School of Arts and Sciences; Dean of Rutgers College
Nancy Winterbauer, Vice President for University Budgeting; Member, Executive Committee of the Steering Committee

Subworking Group 1: Enrollment Management

COCHAIRS
Jonathan Alger, Vice President and General Counsel
Courtney McAnuff, Vice President for Enrollment Management

MEMBERS
Joseph Barone, Professor of Pharmacy Practice, Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy; Member, Budget and Finance Committee, Rutgers University Senate; Member, Steering Committee
Deborah E. Bowles, Associate Provost, Enrollment Management, Rutgers–Camden
Martha Cotter, Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, School of Arts and Sciences; Chair, Rutgers University Senate (2004–2007); Executive Committee Member Rutgers University Senate 2007-2008; Faculty Representative to Board of Governors 2007-2008; Member, Steering Committee
Jean McDonald-Rash, Deputy University Director, Financial Aid
Tamara Remedios, B.S., 1997, Rutgers College; B.S., 1997, Rutgers Business School: Undergraduate–New Brunswick
Sanjana Rimal, Director of Business Services, Rutgers–Newark

Subworking Group 2: Curricular, Cocurricular, Extracurricular Services

COCHAIRS
Gregory Blimling, Vice President for Student Affairs; Member, Steering Committee
Peter D. Klein, Professor of Philosophy, School of Arts and Sciences; Acting Executive Vice Dean, School of Arts and Sciences

MEMBERS
Stuart Z. Charme, Professor and Chair, Philosophy and Religion, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Camden
Mary Beth Daisey, Associate Provost for Student Affairs, Rutgers–Camden
Carlos Fernandez, Director, Center for Latino Arts and Culture
Jennifer Jones, Associate Professor of History, School of Arts and Sciences
Marie T. Logue, Assistant Vice President for Academic Engagement and Programming
Herbert Lowndes, Professor of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy
Gerald Massenburg, Assistant Provost for Student Life, Rutgers–Newark
Whitney Muse, School of Engineering (2008)
Lenore Neigeborn, Associate Dean of Academic Services, School of Arts and Sciences
Francoise Puniello, Associate Director, New Brunswick Libraries; Member, Rutgers University Senate (2005–2006); Executive Committee Member, Rutgers University Senate (2007-2008)
Brent D. Ruben, Professor of Communication, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies; Executive Director, Center for Organizational Development and Leadership; Member, Steering Committee; Member, Steering Committee
Gregory Transue, Director, Gateway Program, Division of Life Sciences, School of Arts and Sciences

**Subworking Group 3: Activities to Improve Access**

**COCHAIRS**
Richard DeLisi, Professor of Educational Psychology and Dean, Graduate School of Education; Member, Steering Committee
Wally Torian, Assistant Dean and Director, Rutgers College Educational Opportunity Fund; Member, Steering Committee

**MEMBERS**
Holly Crawford, Associate Dean for Continuing Education, School of Engineering
Christopher Dougherty, Associate Dean, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Camden
Barbara V. Fiorella, Assistant Vice President, Distributed Program Access, Contracts and Support
Karen H. Novick, Associate Dean, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies
Kathleen M. Scott, Professor of Cell Biology and Neuroscience, School of Arts and Sciences;
  Director, Math and Science Learning Center; Member, Faculty Council Teaching Committee;
  Assistant Vice President Instructional Support; Member, Steering Committee
Concepcion Wibrowski, Dean of Student Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark

**STAFF**
Subworking Group 1: Paul Johnson, Director of Information Technology, Undergraduate Admissions
Subworking Group 2: Brian T. Rose, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
Subworking Group 3: Martin S. Grogan, Executive Associate, University Budgeting

**Working Group II: Undergraduate Education and Related Educational Activities**

**COCHAIRS**
Michael Beals, Professor of Mathematics, School of Arts and Sciences; Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education, School of Arts and Sciences
Ann Fabian, Professor and Chair, American Studies, School of Arts and Sciences; Dean of Humanities, School of Arts and Sciences
Subworking Group 1: Educational Offerings and General Education

COCHAIRS
Jane Junn, Associate Professor of Political Science, School of Arts and Sciences; Member, Steering Committee
Richard D. Ludescher, Professor of Food Science, School of Environmental and Biological Sciences

MEMBERS
Emily Bartels, Associate Professor of English, School of Arts and Sciences
Jeris Cassel, Instructional Services Librarian, Kilmer Library
Douglas H. Jones, Associate Professor of Management Science and Information, Associate Dean for Academic Programs, Rutgers Business School–Newark and New Brunswick
Susan Lawrence, Associate Professor of Political Science, School of Arts and Sciences; Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, School of Arts and Sciences
Martin S. Markowitz, Associate Dean, Rutgers Business School
Patricia A. Mayer, Professor and Chair, Dance, Mason Gross School of the Arts
Michael Palis, Professor of Computer Science; Interim Dean, Faculty of Arts and Sciences-Camden; Interim Dean, Graduate School, Camden; Member, Steering Committee- Serving until March 2007
Jamshid Rabii, Professor of Cell Biology and Neuroscience; Director, Office of Undergraduate Instruction, Division of Life Sciences, School of Arts and Sciences
Samuel Rabinowitz, Associate Professor of Management and Associate Dean, School of Business–Camden; Vice Chair, Rutgers University Senate (2005–2007); Chair, Rutgers University Senate (2007-2010)
Dona Schneider, Professor and Director of Undergraduate Programs, Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy
Allen Woll, Associate Dean Faculty of Arts and Sciences-Camden, Director of the Honors College - Serving from March 2007

Subworking Group 2: Related Educational Activities

COCHAIRS
James R. Morris, Associate Director, Continuing Professional Education, School of Environmental and Biological Sciences
Richard Joseph Novak, Associate Vice President, Continuous Education and Distance Learning

MEMBERS
Emmet Dennis, Dean, University College Community
Robert C. Evans, Associate Professor of Biology, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Camden
Carol Martin Rutgers, Director, Cooperative Education Program, School of Environmental and Biological Sciences
Mary Ann Scoloveno, Associate Professor, College of Nursing
Michael D. Shafer, Professor of Political Science, School of Arts and Sciences; Director, Rutgers Center for Global Security and Democracy
Marion E. Yudow, Director, Rutgers Language Institute, School of Arts and Sciences
STAFF
Subworking Group 1: Linda G. Schulze, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
Subworking Group 2: Robert B. Nolan, Associate Dean, School of Social Work

Working Group III: Using the Research and Graduate Context to Enhance Undergraduate Education

COCHAIRS
Daniel J. Tichenor, Associate Professor of Political Science, School of Arts and Sciences
Lily Y. Young, Professor of Environmental Science, School of Environmental and Biological Sciences

MEMBERS
Barbara Balliet, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Department of Women’s and Gender Studies, School of Arts and Sciences
John Gunkel, Director, Honors College, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Michael Hayoun, Rutgers College (2008)
Justine Hernandez Levine, Administrative Director, Aresty Research Center for Undergraduates
Nancy Rosoff, Associate Dean, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Camden
Jeffrey Rubin, Professor of Economics, School of Arts and Sciences
Andrew Vershon, Professor of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, School of Arts and Sciences
Gerben J. Zylstra, Director, Biotechnology Center for Agriculture and the Environment, School of Environmental and Biological Sciences

STAFF
Roberta Leslie, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

Working Group IV: Assessment of Undergraduate Student Learning

COCHAIRS
Fred R. Bernath, Professor of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, School of Engineering
Angela M. O’Donnell, Professor of Educational Psychology, Graduate School of Education

MEMBERS
Barbara Bender, Associate Dean, Academic Support and Graduate Student Services, Graduate School–New Brunswick; Member, Steering Committee
William Berz, Professor of Music, Mason Gross School of the Arts
Jeanne Boyle, Associate University Librarian for Public Services
Gregory Camilli, Professor of Educational Psychology, Graduate School of Education
Gary Gigliotti, Professor of Economics, School of Arts and Sciences; Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs-Teaching and Assessment Research; Director of the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research; Member, Rutgers University Senate (2005-2006); Member, Steering Committee
Arnold L. Glass, Professor of Psychology, School of Arts and Sciences
Lewis R. Hirsch, Director, Precalculus Instruction, Department of Mathematics, School of Arts and Sciences
Annette Juliano, Professor of Visual and Performing Arts, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
John Krenos, Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, School of Arts and Sciences; Member, Rutgers University Senate (2005–2006)
Kurt Spellmeyer, Professor of English and Director of the English Writing Program, School of Arts and Sciences
Paula Voos, Professor of Labor Studies and Employment Relations, School of Management and Labor Relations
Robert E. Wood, Professor and Chair, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminal Justice, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Camden

STAFF
Robert Leslie, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
Gayle Coryell, Research Project Manager, Office of Institutional Research and Planning

**Working Group V: Education and Research in an Urban Setting**

**CHAIR**
Gary Roth, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Services, Rutgers–Newark; Member, Steering Committee

**Subworking Group 1: Admission, Diversity, Student Services, and Special Academic Programs**

**COCHAIRS**
Cary Booker, Director and Associate Dean, Academic Foundations Center, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark - Serving until September, 2007
John Graham, Professor and Chair of Economics, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark

**MEMBERS**
Claudia Beckman, Associate Professor, College of Nursing
Kyle Farmbry, Assistant Professor, School of Public Affairs and Administration
Gary Farney, Assistant Professor of History, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Suresh Govindaraj, Associate Professor of Accounting and Information Studies, Rutgers Business School–Newark and New Brunswick
John Gunkel, Director, Honors College, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Jason Hand, Director of Admissions–Newark
Phillip Huskey, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Veer Patel, University College–Newark
Arthur Powell, Associate Professor of Urban Education, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Alan Sadovnik, Professor of Urban Education, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
James M. Schlegel, Professor of Chemistry, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Mara Sidney, Associate Professor of Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Bonita M. Veysey, Associate Professor, School of Criminal Justice
Deborah Walker-McCall, Director, Equal Opportunity Fund, College of Nursing

Subworking Group 2: Undergraduate Education and the Urban Location

COCHAIRS
John Gunkel, Director, Honors College, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
John Sheridan, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark

MEMBERS
Issa A. Abbasi, B.A., 2007, Newark College of Arts and Sciences
Frances Bartkowski, Associate Professor of English, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Chao Chen, Professor of Organizational Management, Rutgers Business School–Newark and New Brunswick
Lucille Eller, Associate Professor, College of Nursing
Darryl Holloman, Associate Dean, Robeson Campus Center - Serving until June, 2007
Thomas J. Hopkins, Assistant Dean, Director, Career Development and Placement Services–Newark
David Hosford, University Professor, Dean Emeritus, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Elizabeth Hull, Professor of Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Kevin Kolben, Assistant Professor of Accounting and Information Studies, Rutgers Business School–Newark and New Brunswick
William Leipold, Associate Dean, School of Criminal Justice
Jamie Lew, Assistant Professor of Urban Education, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Gretchen Van de Walle, Associate Professor of Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Edin Velez, Associate Professor of Visual and Performing Arts, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark

Subworking Group 3: Faculty, Research, and Graduate Professional Education

COCHAIRS
Nancy DiTomaso, Professor and Chair of Organization Management, Rutgers Business School
Leslie Kennedy, University Professor, Dean Emeritus, School of Criminal Justice

MEMBERS
Darshan Desai, B.S., 1997, Newark College of Arts and Sciences; Graduate School–Newark
Wilma Friedman, Associate Professor of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Carlos E. Gonzalez, Professor, School of Law–Newark
Simi Kedia, Assistant Professor of Finance and Economics, Rutgers Business School
Guenther Knoblich, Associate Professor of Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Barry Komisaruk, Professor of Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Gabriela Kutting, Associate Professor of Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
John Lynch, Associate Professor of English, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Sara Markowitz, Associate Professor of Economics, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Joan I. Morrell, Professor, Center for Molecular and Behavioral Neuroscience
Lynn Mullins, Librarian Director, Dana Library - Serving until June, 2007
Wendy Nehring, Associate Dean, College of Nursing
Byron Price, Assistant Professor, School of Public Affairs and Administration
Lynn Schneemeyer, Vice Provost for Research
Lee Slater, Associate Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Sciences–Newark
Danielle Warren, Assistant Professor of Accounting and Information Studies, Rutgers Business School–Newark and New Brunswick

STAFF
Lisa J. Condobery, Senior Administrative Assistant, Newark Provost Office

_Working Group VI: The Community Context of the New Brunswick/Piscataway and Camden Campuses_

**CHAIR**
Richard Edwards, Dean, School of Social Work

_Subworking Group 1: The Community Context of the New Brunswick/Piscataway Campus_

**CHAIR**
Richard Edwards, Dean, School of Social Work

**MEMBERS**
Clinton J. Andrews, Associate Professor, Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy
Nakeeafa C. Bernard, B.S., 2007, Cook College
Claudia Burzichelli, Executive Director, Center for Effective School Practices, Graduate School of Education
Jon Carnegie, Executive Director, Alan M. Voorhees Transportation Center, Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy - Serving from January 1, 2007
Michael J. Green, Director, Office of Communications, Office of the Executive Dean of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Jeffrey Perlman, B.S., 1996, Cook College; M.C.R.P., 2005, Edward J. Bloustein School of
Planning and Public Policy
Martin E. Robbins, Director, Alan M. Voorhees Transportation Center, Edward J. Bloustein
School of Planning and Public Policy - Serving until December 30, 2006

Subworking Group 2: The Community Context of the Camden Campus

Members
Gloria Bonilla-Santiago, Board of Governors Distinguished Service Professor, Public Policy and Administration, Graduate School–Camden
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DOCUMENTATION ROADMAPS

The university has used the Selected Topics Option 1 model for its institutional self-study, focusing on undergraduate education. In accord with this choice, we addressed a number of Middle States Standards by assembling documents and creating “roadmaps” to show the reviewers where specific standards are addressed in the collected documents. This section provides documentation that Rutgers meets Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and parts of 8, 9, 11. The self-study, Educational Change at Rutgers, does not address these standards directly. The documentation for the standards covered in the roadmaps includes the following:

- Standard 1: Mission and Goals
- Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
- Standard 3: Institutional Resources
- Standard 4: Leadership and Governance
- Standard 5: Administration
- Standard 6: Integrity
- Standard 7: Institutional Assessment
- Standard 8: Student Admissions (partially addressed for graduate education)
- Standard 9: Student Support Services (partially addressed for graduate education)
- Standard 10: Faculty
- Standard 11: Educational Offerings (partially addressed for graduate education)

The narrative provided in this volume introduces and provides the context for the documents that were provided for the documentation review of the standards not covered in the self-study. Rutgers’ Middle States documentation review website (http://oirap.rutgers.edu/rsa/roadmap.htm) and Rutgers’ Self-Study CD contain live links to the approximately 800 referenced documents.

The Generalists’ Report and University Response to the report follow the roadmap narratives.
**Standard 1: Mission and Goals**

The institution’s mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. Clearly defined mission and goals that:

   1a. guide faculty, administration, staff and governing bodies in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development, and definition of program outcomes;

   The institution’s understanding of its mission of instruction, research and service emanates from its long historical development (full historical sketch; a brief history) and its transformation into New Jersey’s sole public comprehensive university with the enactment of the "Rutgers, The State University Law" (NJSA 18A:65-1 et seq) in 1956. President McCormick in his remarks to the New Jersey State Senate at the start of his third week in office in December 2002, reaffirmed that the three-fold mission of the university is to teach students of every age and from every walk of life, conduct research to discover and apply new knowledge, and to provide service to the state’s citizens.

   The manner in which the university pursues its tripartite mission is set out in the President’s statement on the Goals and Values of the Administration at Rutgers. The strategic goals of the university, established in 2004 jointly by the President and the Board of Governors, evolve from this interpretation of the university’s tripartite mission and broadly guide the university and its constituent components in their planning, resource allocation, and educational activities.

   These university strategic goals and concomitant areas of emphasis also provide the context for each campus and unit to set and pursue their own individual goals and objectives. Reflecting the regional and decentralized structure of the university, interpretations and additions to campus goals and objectives are often explicitly defined at the provostial level.

   In addition to institutional and campus goals and objectives, many different academic and administrative units have implemented a strategic planning process to set goals
and strategies that have come about through self-study and evaluation. These plans have helped their specific units or areas of operation achieve specified goals and aided their planning and resource allocation decisions. See the list of strategic plans under standard 2 element 2.

1b. include support of scholarly and creative activity, at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution’s purposes and character;

A fundamental university goal is to enhance academic excellence through the improvement of “the quality of Rutgers' academic programs, especially in areas where there are comparative advantages and opportunities.” The pursuit of academic excellence has resulted in providing broad support of scholarly and creative activity at Rutgers over the recent years. Activities and accomplishments of the past years are listed in the annual reports on the strategic goals of the university under “Academic Excellence” (see 1d below).

1c. are developed through collaborative participation by those who facilitate or are otherwise responsible for institutional improvement and developments;

Each year, specific areas of emphasis are developed and associated with each university goal. These areas of emphasis are highlighted by President McCormick in his annual address to the University Senate and the larger university community at the beginning of each academic year. The goals are developed in close collaboration with the President’s Cabinet and other key members of the university’s leadership.

1d. are periodically evaluated and formally approved;

The areas of emphasis under each university goal are designed to yield measurable outcomes and are reported by the President in annual progress reports: Report on Progress Toward 2006-2007 Strategic Goals; Report on Progress Toward 2005–06 Strategic Goals; Report on Progress Toward 2004–05 Strategic Goals to the Board of Governors and the university community. Each annual report reiterates the broad goals of the university and recounts the progress made in achieving them within the selected areas of emphasis and effort for the current year.

In addition, the President reports to the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees on various topics at each Board meeting, including progress on university goals. Minutes from Board meetings provide a snapshot of the topics and assessments offered by the university president.

1e. are publicized and widely known by the institution’s members;
The mission, goals and objectives of the university are regularly projected in many of President McCormick’s speeches and addresses, with his annual address to the university, serving as a vehicle for assessing the overall state of the university and the future plans for moving the university ahead in the coming year. The mission of the university is prominently displayed and accessible on the university’s web page.

1f. mission and goals that relate to external as well as internal contexts and constituencies;

University goals focus directly on both internal and external contexts and constituencies (see 1d above). The strategic goals of improving “. . . the quality of Rutgers’ academic programs and enhancing “. . . the effectiveness of student services, the livability of our residence halls, and the attractiveness and accessibility of our campuses” directly address internal audiences and through institutional improvement efforts indirectly address the concerns of external constituencies such as prospective students, their parents, and the citizens of New Jersey. The university goal of “service and constituent relations” seeks to improve the university’s service and reputation to both internal and external constituencies. The remaining two goals of “resources for Rutgers,” and “leadership and administration” provide support for the achievement of the previous three strategic goals of the university.

1g. institutional goals that are consistent with mission; and

As noted in 1a above, goals necessarily follow from the university’s mission and both are inherently consistent with each other.

1h. goals that focus on student learning, other outcomes, and institutional improvement.

Fundamental to the goal of “academic excellence” is the focus on improving student learning and other general educational outcomes. Perhaps the most tangible outcome of the pursuit of this goal has been the Transforming Undergraduate Education Initiative that the New Brunswick campus is currently undergoing. This initiative is discussed more fully in the self-study itself and its history and evolution are documented in standard 2, element 2.
Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Because Rutgers is a public research institution, and New Jersey’s flagship university, all planning and resource allocation processes at Rutgers are affected by how the state of New Jersey funds its institutions of higher education. The reality of this situation for Rutgers is that planning and resource allocation decisions are often driven by external funding and political exigencies.

New Jersey for years has been plagued by an unstable funding stream for its higher education system that has severely hampered the university’s planning and resource allocation processes. Not only has funding from the state over the years been inconsistent (see budget facts (at p.3)), but there has also been a persistent decline in the proportion of funding received from the state to Rutgers (see budget facts).

Contributing to this uncertain environment has been the continued discussions about the restructuring of the research sector of higher education in the state. An original proposal to restructure this sector, Report of the New Jersey Commission on Health Science, Education, and Training, was considered too expensive to implement and was subsequently shelved. However, continued concern over the health of medical education in the state and the recent financial and management problems associated with the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ), as indicated by recent newspaper articles chronicling its problems, has kept alive the possibility that UMDNJ will merge in some fashion with Rutgers. For example, a review by the New Jersey Legislature on the options for the restructuring of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, the New Jersey Institute of Technology, and Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey continues.

It is within this larger context that the university undertakes its strategic planning process. Over the last few years, strategic planning by the university has been tied to the broader systemwide efforts of the Commission on Higher Education (CHE), New Jersey’s planning agency for higher education in the state. Through CHE’s A Blueprint for Excellence - New Jersey’s Long-Range Plan for Higher Education Update 2005, the university has developed specific planning items that coincide with the state’s long range goals. The state’s LRP consists of broad goals ranging from the achievement of greater levels of academic and research excellence, to improving outreach efforts and enhancing partnerships and collaborations between institutions of higher education and other sectors of society. Each institution contributes to the goals of the LRP through the selection of areas of emphasis that each feels is consonant with its mission and traditions. Progress toward the achievement of these goals is measured for both the system and individual institutions through selected outcome indicators. With the decline in state funding, achievement of these objectives has been complicated, but the university has moved forward on a number of planning fronts that are critical in its effort to contribute positively to the long range goals of the state. These include the Transforming Undergraduate Education Initiative, the Rutgers Communications Plan, as well as ongoing planning for the imminent Rutgers Capital Campaign. These and other planning activities are described in element 2 below.
Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. Goals and objectives or strategies, both institution-wide and for individual units that are clearly stated, reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results, are linked to mission and goal achievement, and are used for planning and resource allocation at the institutional and unit levels;

   Goals and objectives of the university and its constituent units devolve from Rutgers’ tripartite mission of instruction, research, and service. The use of goals and objectives as guides in planning and resource allocation, and how the institutional renewal process as informed by assessment process, is broadly discussed in standard 1.

2. Planning and improvement processes that are clearly communicated, provide for constituent participation, and incorporate the use of assessment results;

   Broad direction for planning and improvement processes come from the President’s annual areas of emphasis for university strategic goals. (See standard 1, element 1)

   The state’s Long Range Plan, A Blueprint for Excellence - New Jersey’s Long-Range Plan for Higher Education Update 2005, provides the broader context through which the university pursues its planning and improvement processes.

   A significant and unique strategic planning process recently engulfed the university with the issuance of the Report of the New Jersey Commission on Health Science, Education, and Training (sometimes referred to as the Vagelos Report, named after the lead author) in fall 2002. The Commission, a specially appointed task force by then Governor James McGreevy, recommended establishing a single research university system encompassing three largely autonomous universities based in Newark, New Brunswick-Piscataway, and Camden-Stratford. The current campuses of Rutgers University, the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ), and the New Jersey Institute of Technology (NJIT) would be included in the new system. In response to the report, a 15-month planning process ensued at the university, with the Rutgers administration and faculty heavily engaged in planning for the restructuring of the university into North/Central/South Universities, as recommended by the report. This planning process also consisted of elements of a counter- restructuring approach so that a full assessment of the benefits and disadvantages of restructuring could be derived. This planning process included:

   - a universitywide discussion and deliberation of the effect of the merger proposal. The following articles provides an overview of what took place during this time:
     - Status Report on Proposal to Restructure Higher Education in New Jersey - April 1, 2003
     - Status Report #2 on Proposal to Restructure Higher Education in New Jersey - June 5, 2003
     - Status Report #3 on Proposal to Restructure Higher Education in New Jersey -
October 31, 2003

- Studies by statewide planning committees that included Rutgers representatives evaluating the feasibility of the Commission’s proposal. The following Rutgers Focus article provides a synopsis of each region’s report: Committees weigh in on restructuring, Rutgers Focus, November 3, 2003
- Studies by the Pappas Group, an external higher education consulting firm

While the restructuring proposal was taken off the table in December 2003, largely because of cost and governance concerns, the benefits that emerged from such an intense and broad strategic planning process have helped guide the university’s planning and resource allocation processes through the current difficult financial period, which was brought about by the state’s dire fiscal situation.

Though the merger of Rutgers, UMDNJ, and NJIT did not take place, there remains a strong desire to continue to build collaborations among the three universities. The success of the two joint Rutgers-UMDNJ research centers, the Center for Advanced Biotechnology and Medicine (CABM) and the Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Institute (EOHSI), serve as models for future efforts at collaboration between UMDNJ and Rutgers short of total merger. Both centers engage in a strategic planning process that is focused on not only improving the educational research and service functions of each institution, but how to leverage their joint interests for the benefits of the citizens of New Jersey (e.g., see EOHSI report).

All planning and resource allocation processes necessarily begin with the state budget. Each year the university develops an asking budget that is shared with the Governor’s office. In addition, the New Jersey Presidents’ Council, which consists of all presidents of colleges and universities in New Jersey, prepares a budget policy statement for all of higher education in the state. After a series of discussions between the university, state higher education policy members, and various members of the governor’s staff and offices, the Governor presents his proposed budget for the coming fiscal year. The Governor’s proposed budget is the basis for legislative review and the presidents of New Jersey’s colleges and universities provide input during budget hearings through the NJ Presidents’ Council as well as the NJ Commission on Higher Education. The President of Rutgers is often called upon to appear before legislative task forces and committees to answer questions. An example of one such appearance is President McCormick’s appearance before the Legislative Task Force on Higher Education.

An appropriations bill is subsequently passed by the legislature and signed by the governor, who has line item veto authority, provides the basis for the university to set institutional priorities within the context of stated institutional goals and available resources. The above annual budget process usually begins in October and ends in June or July.

To better deal with the unstable long term funding support from the state and the vagaries of the annual budget process steep in political uncertainties, Rutgers over the last three years has enacted an all funds budgeting (AFB) process which is consistent with the university’s tradition of a decentralized academic structure. Under the direction of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), AFB...
supports the transparent distribution of institutional resources and provides decanal units with enhanced managerial tools that effectively integrate planning, resource allocation, and assessment. Unit plans are developed, discussed and assessed through regular meetings between the EVPAA and unit deans.

The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) has been an integral component of planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal at Rutgers. The purpose of CAPR is to help determine how university resources can be most effectively used in supporting a specific disciplinary area. CAPR reviews and evaluates academic programs, either singularly or as part of a broader cluster review of departments/units that have some connection in their missions, from a strategic rather than perfunctory approach. CAPR evolved from a previous committee of faculty, known as the Committee on Standards and Priorities in Academic Development (CSPAD), which undertook periodic departmental reviews on a rotating basis and relied upon external peer site visits and departmental self-study. The committee is comprised of distinguished senior faculty from across the university and from disciplines in the arts and sciences and professional fields. Recent examples of the strategic planning process by CAPR include the Computer and Information Science and Engineering and the Psychology cluster reviews.

Another large scale planning process that has been occurring and which carries broad resource allocation and institutional renewal implications for the university is the effort being invested in Rutgers’ nascent capital campaign. The Rutgers University Foundation asked Martz & Lundy, a nationally recognized development-consulting group in 2004, to undertake a self-study of the university’s internal fund-raising capabilities. This evaluative and benchmarking study provided insights for the present strategic planning process in the preparation of a campaign vision statement and in planning for the upcoming capital campaign. This planning process involves the setting of campaign priorities from all academic units that are consistent with institutional goals and objectives and review by a university-wide priorities committee according to a prescribed timetable. The committee will submit a list of preferred campaign objectives to President McCormick in September, 2007.

Other planning and improvement processes at Rutgers include:

- The Committee on Efficiency and Entrepreneurship Initiative - a long-term effort that seeks to optimize the use of university resources and cultivate a proactive approach to expanding revenues
- The Academic Excellence Fund – an ongoing process of providing seed money for forward-thinking interdisciplinary proposals that enhance Rutgers’ primary missions of teaching, research, and service
- The Rutgers New Program Approval Process - a transparent and rational approach for the development, consideration and approval of academic programs. Recent revisions to the process require the inclusion of information concerning student learning outcomes. The New Program Approval Process (at page 5) includes statements about both learning goals and outcomes as well as the measures and strategies that will be used to assess them, must be demonstrated in the program approval process. The approval of new programs involves both internal processes as set out in the new program approval manual and an external approval process that
involves open review and approval by each institution in the state and a final approval by the Commission on Higher Education

- The Faculty Diversity Initiative - a continuing effort to assist unit deans with limited financial resources in the recruitment of a diversified faculty
- The Promote Women in Science and Engineering Initiative - an evaluative program that seeks to understand and improve the status of women in STEM disciplines at Rutgers
- The Student Services Initiative - an ongoing endeavor to improve student services at Rutgers
- Individual units of the university have also engaged in very specific, clearly communicated, well-participated, and assessment-driven improvement processes through strategic planning efforts. At the academic level, examples of unit strategic planning are found on all three Rutgers campuses. These include:
  - The Transforming Undergraduate Education (TUE) Initiative that began with a two-year planning phase that included a campus-wide study by a New Brunswick-wide task force of faculty, staff, students and alumni, a set of recommendations by the President to the Board of Governors, and the subsequent acceptance by the Board of Governors of the President’s goals for implementing the transformation. The present phase involves a multi-year implementation effort of planning and resource allocation. It involves a steering committee [pdf] and various subcommittees [pdf] to deal with the vast range of questions and issues involved in the transformation of undergraduate education at the New Brunswick campus.
  - Strategic Planning for Cook College and the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station – 2001
  - Planning by the Graduate School-NB for increasing student support with the involvement of the Committee for Academic Planning and Review.
  - The Case to Increase the Support of Doctoral Students Across the New Brunswick-Piscataway Campus of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey – submitted by Jolie A. Cizewski, Holly Smith and Harvey Waterman on behalf of the Graduate School – New Brunswick - July 7, 2005
  - Critical Analysis of the Graduate School NB Report: The Case to Increase the Support of Doctoral Students Across the New-Brunswick-Piscataway Campuses of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey by The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) – June, 2006
  - On the Camden campus, planning has included the creation of a dean’s task force, whose report sets out the goals that would enhance the arts and sciences so that Rutgers-Camden can become a top-ranked small urban public research university.
  - On the Newark campus, a task force report on undergraduate education has been issued. This report follows two important assessment efforts: a comprehensive review of undergraduate admissions and an external evaluation of basic instruction in writing and mathematics followed by a restructured unified Faculty of Arts and Sciences Writing Program.

Other units of the university have also been actively engaged in the strategic planning process. Examples include:

The Rutgers University Libraries began a strategic planning process in 2006 that will last through 2011. The Rutgers University Libraries Strategic Plan, 2006-2011 describes five strategic goals, modeled after university goals and objectives developed
after substantial information gathered from the university community. During this period, the Rutgers University Libraries will seek to establish “a physical and virtual library environment that enriches the academic life of the university for student learning, that advances faculty and graduate student research, and that supports the university’s mission of service and outreach.”

The Rutgers Information Technology Strategic Plan, developed by a universitywide team of faculty and staff through an extensive fact finding effort, outlines a series of goals that identifies the direction that Rutgers will be pursuing in the area of informational technology in the coming years.

The Rutgers Communications Plan, developed by the communications firm Lipman Hearne, through a series of focus groups with faculty, students, staff, alumni, employers and the public, has led to the redesign of the university’s identity system as outlined in the Rutgers Visual Identity Manual and the development of a “brand book” that will provide the basis for a universitywide strategy for improving internal and external communications. A previous study of Rutgers’ varied constituencies by the marketing research firm of Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc. provided hard empirical data for informing the development of the present communications plan.

The Rutgers Physical Master Plan is the result of an intensive three-year planning process that systematically assessed the university’s physical development and facility needs in the context of its academic mission. The plan provides a comprehensive guide for the use of the university’s limited resources to meet its academic, research, and service commitments to the citizens of New Jersey. The plan was greatly aided by the space analysis and benchmarking study undertaken by the consulting firm, Paulien Associates (Report and Addendum). The physical master plan is the basis for the Vision for College Avenue, individual campus plans and many present development and construction projects occurring on all three Rutgers campuses.

- Rutgers Environmental, Health and Safety Planning
- Rutgers University Alumni Federation Long Range Plan of 2005

3. Well defined decision-making processes and authority that facilitates planning and renewal;

Rutgers authority to pursue planning and renewal policies are also evident in the 1994 Higher Education Restructuring Act of New Jersey that provided increased autonomy for individual public institutions and a more consultative and cooperative planning and policy process for higher education.

The authority to plan, allocate resources and work for institutional renewal emanate from the New Jersey legislative act of 1956 that made Rutgers an instrumentality of the state.

The governing boards of the university include the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees. The Board of Governors has general supervision over the conduct of the university and is responsible for determining the programs and degree levels to be
offered by the university, but final administrative decisions over new academic programs that go beyond the university’s programmatic mission ultimately rests with the state’s oversight coordinating agency, the Commission on Higher Education. The Board of Trustees of the university is designated under Rutgers Law to serve in an overall advisory capacity to the Board of Governors and the university.

Within the Board of Governors are three standing committees that closely oversee the planning and resource allocation processes of the university. These include the Committees on Budget and Finance, Buildings and Grounds, and Educational Planning and Policy. Their responsibilities are set out in the Bylaws of the Board of Governors (at p. 5).

The university President reports directly to the Board of Governors, which annually reviews his performance.

The President’s Cabinet, which is a universitywide body of the President’s senior level advisors, meets regularly with the university President throughout the year and is an important component of the decision-making process at Rutgers.

The Rutgers University Senate provides an advisory role to the university President on a broad range of educational policy and considers all matters related to the university mission. Members of the senate consist of representatives of Rutgers faculty, students, administrators, and alumni and meet regularly through the academic year to discuss matters of general university interest and to make recommendations to the university administration on those matters as outlined in the Handbook of the Rutgers University Senate.

Campuswide faculty councils also provide an advisory role to the President and the senior administration of the university. (See standard 4, element 1.)

4. The assignment of responsibility for improvements and assurance of accountability;

The university officers overseeing the main administrative areas of the university have the authority over and are responsible for all activities in their administrative domain. Reflecting the university’s complex yet decentralized structure, each of these administrative areas has both unique and shared responsibility for the many and varied planning and resource allocation processes at the university. A brief synopsis of each area follows:

- Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs is the chief academic and budget officer for the university. The EVPAA is responsible for academic programs and policies across the university, including degree program development, faculty appointments and promotions, and academic program review. He has particular responsibility for the New Brunswick campus.
- Camden Provost is the principal university officer for the Camden campus and oversees all academic and administrative functions for the 5,400 student campus.
- Newark Provost is the principal university officer for the Newark campus and oversees all academic and administrative functions for the 10,500 student campus.
• Senior Vice President for Administrative Affairs is the university’s Chief Financial Officer and oversees a broad range of university areas including business services, public safety, parking and transportation, facilities and capital planning, human resources, and information technology. This officer also is responsible for oversight of the financial and treasury operations, risk management and insurance, and internal audit.

• Vice President for University Relations supports and promotes the image and mission of university and oversees the functional areas that provide services and programs for the university community, the news media, and the public.

5. A record of institutional and unit improvement efforts and their results;

The following documents provide broad reviews of recent improvement efforts for both the institutional and unit levels.

• Annual presidential reports to the university community, delivered at the University Senate’s first meeting of the academic year, include overviews of significant major accomplishments of institutional renewal as set out by the President’s previous year’s areas of emphasis in the pursuit of the university’s strategic goals.

• Annual campus/provostial reports

• A sampling of unit annual or periodic reports
  - Newark Arts and Sciences
  - Camden Arts and Sciences
  - Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and Appendix
  - Camden College of Arts and Sciences, Graduate School-Camden, University College – Camden –Annual Report 2005
  - NJAES Annual Reports 2004-2005 and 2003-2004
  - REHS Annual Report
  - Waksman Institute of Microbiology Annual Report
  - DIMACS Annual Special Focus Reports
  - The Department of Health Education (DHE) –Annual Report
  - EPA Self-Disclosure Audit submitted by Rutgers Environmental Health and Safety
  - Center for Advanced Biotechnology and Medicine
  - Office of Corporate Liaison and Technology Transfer, FY 2005 Annual Report
  - Graduate School of Education Annual Report, 2005-2006

• Additional accounts of institutional improvement efforts and their results include
  - Red Tape Revisited Report
  - Student Services Initiative has produced improvements in the area of student services
  - Campus Computing Services Reports – New Brunswick and Newark


The state of New Jersey requires Rutgers to prepare and provide an annual Accountability Report. This report provides important evaluative data for both university administrators and state policy makers. In addition, the state’s Long Range
Plan contains evaluative data on selected outcome indicators for each of the state’s public colleges and universities that is regularly updated and reported.

As noted in element 1, each year the success of the university’s effort in achieving its strategic goals is evaluated and reported on by the President: Report on Progress Toward 2006-2007 Strategic Goals; Report on Progress Toward 2005–06 Strategic Goals; Report on Progress Toward 2004–05 Strategic Goals. This assessment is reinforced by ongoing review by the Board of Governors through its standing committees on policy and planning, finances and facilities review.

The all fund budgeting process requires the annual assessment of each academic unit’s performance in reaching its goals.

The annual collection and evaluation of benchmark data such as the peer comparisons published in the Rutgers Fact Book, dashboard indicators, and assorted AAUDE data and reports provide a critical comparative context for gauging how the university is doing in its planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal efforts.

The University Relations Constituency Study has yielded important insights about what Rutgers is doing well and not so well in the area of external relations. The report has contributed to an ongoing process of evaluating the way Rutgers is presenting itself to its varied external constituencies, including the Rutgers Visual Identity Manual.

The President’s Student Services Initiative involves the assessment of student services targeted at improving the student experience at Rutgers. The Center for Organizational Development and Leadership (ODL) hosted three retreats to further develop the President’s Initiative. ODL has also been responsible for the development of the Excellence in Higher Education (EHE) model, which uses the Michael Baldrige model of organizational assessment in a higher education setting with an emphasis on assessment, improvement and planning. At Rutgers, approximately 40 units have participated in the EHE process since its inception, including 22 university academic units. (See also EHE at Rutgers.)
Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution’s mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution’s mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution’s resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Rutgers, like public universities across the nation, is faced with severe constraints on state dollars for higher education as well as increasing concerns about affordability that place real as well as political limits on increases in tuition and fees. While many states have seen economic upturns that have resulted in new investments in higher education, New Jersey’s structural budget deficits are likely to mean continuing pressure on state support for Rutgers and the other New Jersey colleges and universities. Given this fiscal reality, the university’s regular assessment of the level and efficient utilization of its resources becomes all the more critical. The need to

- invest in current and new academic programs that will promote academic distinction,
- maintain reasonable costs to students consistent with the university’s mission,
- increase the effectiveness and efficiency of administrative operations,
- integrate costly but essential technology into academic and administrative operations,
- fund critical capital needs within a state system that provides only episodic capital funding, and
- ensure that all revenue sources are being considered, maximized and leveraged

are all components of annual budget considerations.

The university’s recent introduction of an All Funds Budgeting (AFB) system provides a comprehensive framework to identify academic goals and a concomitant fiscal strategy for accomplishing those that advance the university’s overall vision. AFB is designed to promote greater understanding of all revenue sources that support unit budgets and to encourage more attention to increasing revenue sources that units have more control over. With a more transparent allocation of revenues (for example, a direct allocation of tuition revenues to generating units) and greater incentives to increase certain revenues by an equitable and more aggressive allocation to the generating units (for example, an increased F&A return to units), AFB seeks to foster a clearer understanding of the effects of unit actions on revenues and the trade-offs involved in expenditure decisions. AFB stresses making priority decisions within available resources and leveraging multiple revenues to advance strategic objectives. In addition, AFB provides units with more flexibility in the use of limited resources to encourage the best possible use of them. For example, revised budget rules that permit the carryover of unexpended funds with a plan for the use of those funds encourage more careful and more strategic planning for the longer term use of funds. And AFB provides for a clear process for making budget choices among all needs rather than a first come, first funded or the squeaky wheel gets the dollars approach to allocating scarce funds.

A critical component of the AFB process is annual budget meetings that the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief Budget Officer have with all deans and the provosts of the Newark and Camden campuses. These meetings focus on academic plans for the coming years, successes and challenges of the past year, as well as strategies to generate the resources
needed to achieve mutually agreed upon goals. This linking of setting academic priorities and laying out plans to generate resources necessary for their accomplishment is critical to ensuring that there is a match between aspirations and the resources to support them.

To inform its planning and resource decisions the university regularly considers comparative data that benchmarks its standing relative to the other American Association of Universities public universities or other appropriate peers. (See standard 7, element 1.) For example, staffing, tuition/fee, and grant comparisons are important measures in assessing both the outcomes of university expenditures and the university’s relative reliance on particular revenues.

In addition, the university submits outcomes data to the Commission on Higher Education to demonstrate its progress in advancing state goals within, or despite, the constraints of limited and unpredictable state resources. These data are also measures of the effectiveness of the university’s resource allocation decisions and provide a public accountability component to the university’s own internal assessments.

An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. Strategies to measure and assess the level of, and efficient utilization of, institutional resources required to support the institution’s mission and goals;

   - The university sets its operating budget for the following fiscal year by estimating expected changes in mandatory expenditures (e.g., salary increases) and any newly expected spending additions and matches it to expected revenues from all sources. Because Rutgers is a public institution, a critical revenue source is state appropriations. Through the Office of the University Vice President for Budgeting, the university develops an asking budget that is provided to the governor’s office, the state legislature and the Commission on Higher Education (CHE).

   - The New Jersey budget process timeline involves the governor presenting his proposed budget to the state legislature, the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education developing a coordinated policy statement on funding for higher education in New Jersey, and the state legislature holding public hearings that include testimony from college and university presidents. Once the budget is approved by the state legislature, the university sets tuition and fee schedules, which are formally approved by the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors’ authority to set tuition and fees is derived from the “Rutgers, The State University Law” and the “Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994” (at NJSA 18A:3B-6). As part of the process, the Board of Governors holds an open public hearing on budget, tuition, fees, and housing and dining charges.

   - The resulting operating budget does not necessarily provide the level of support that the university deems critical to adequately pursue its goals and objectives - in recent years state funding, at best, has been unstable, with some years reflecting severe reductions in state aid. However, the final university operating budget in any one year reflects the annual institutional resources available to support its mission and goals.

   - Given the state’s inconsistent and insufficient funding patterns, the university has
been actively looking for innovative strategies to make better use of resources, improve the management of debt, and enhance revenues. The university created a Budget Advisory Committee to plan for the budgetary shortfall that was the direct result of the state slashing $66 million from the university’s budget for the 2007 fiscal year. In addition to guiding the university in making difficult budget decisions during FY 2007, the work of the budget advisory group also led to the formation of the Committee on Efficiency and Entrepreneurship Initiative (CEEI). The CEEI is comprised of a standing universitywide committee and subcommittees that have been involved in developing strategies for improving the efficiency of university operations and expanding revenue streams. Areas that the committee has already identified since its inception in September 2006 for short-term savings include energy and information technology. Recent efforts to conserve energy will save $30 million over 10 years and a new site license agreement with Microsoft will save departments money.

- The Academic Excellence Fund is a component of the University’s budget designed to fund special initiatives including: (1) responding to significant opportunities for Rutgers based on existing academic strengths, comparative advantages, the needs of undergraduate or graduate students, or the needs and interests of the citizens of the state; (2) cutting across the boundaries of schools, colleges, and disciplines and advancing novel multidisciplinary interactions and ways of thinking; and (3) leveraging other resources committed to furthering academic excellence at Rutgers. In 2004, the university awarded more than $3 million in grants to sponsors of 37 original academic initiatives selected for the university’s first Academic Excellence Funds awards. The initiatives selected for funding represent a broad array of academic disciplines on all three campuses at the university. The program has finished its fourth year in 2006-07, by awarding $1.5 million in grants. For 2007-08, a grants budget of another $1.5 million is planned. The maximum that may be requested from the Academic Excellence Fund for any one project is $250,000.

- In June 2006, the Board of Governors and Board of Trustees of the university approved a comprehensive debt policy for the university. The Debt Management Policy is intended to provide an internal tactical framework for capital planning and overall debt management. The Boards of Governors and Trustees approved the Commercial Paper program, which is anticipated to be used with respect to the financing of capital projects, implementation of cash optimization strategies and to provide financing for the costs of the acquisition and/or leasing of equipment.

- Recognizing the constraints on both state funding and student tuition and fees, the university is also planning for a major capital campaign to generate additional resources to advance its overall mission and goals. Planning for the capital campaign has also entailed the process of measuring and assessing the level of institutional resources required to support the mission and goals of the institution.

2. Rational and consistent policies and procedures in place to determine allocation of assets;

   As noted in the prior item, the university recently introduced an All Funds Budgeting (AFB) system. AFB includes an allocation of tuition to generating units in recognition of both the responsibilities of the school of matriculation and also the unit providing
instruction. The allocation of tuition also recognizes the administrative and support costs that are funded with tuition revenues.

In addition, returns to the generating units for F&A, summer and winter session profits and continuing education profits are all clearly delineated. To encourage greater focus on these revenue streams in a period of extremely volatile state support, the returns have been increased significantly.

Similarly, increases in state appropriations are allocated both to foster universitywide strategic objectives and to units in accordance with principles to advance the university’s overall goals.

This transparent allocation of resources and a clear explication of the costs that must be covered are designed to promote greater understanding of resource choices and to facilitate more strategic thinking.

On the capital side, the choice of capital projects for inclusion in the university’s capital program was made only after discussion among the Chief Academic Officer, the campus provosts, and the Vice President for Administration and Finance so that all campus and administrative needs were fully vetted and the allocation of scarce capital resources was fair and equitable.

The university relies on a variety of policies and procedures to aid in the allocation of institutional assets. These include the following:

- Responsibilities and duties for universitywide budget planning and implementation procedures are clearly stated in the Rutgers University Policy Library
- Procedures for the disbursement of extramural awards are documented by the Division of Grant and Cost Accounting. These documents include policies and procedures on cost sharing, facilities and administrative costs, fringe benefit rates, human subject rates, etc.
- Policies of the Office of Continuous Education ensure the proper distribution of assets derived from Summer and Winter sessions. The Office of Continuous Education also has established requirements regarding its operation within individual units of the university
- Policies are in place to distribute endowments held by each academic unit of the university (e.g., how much is available each year and how much is reinvested against inflation) (Rutgers Policy 40.2.14.C)
- The negotiation of contracts with unions that represent various groupings of faculty and staff. The labor bargaining process results in collective bargaining agreements that determine how a substantial portion of the university’s operational budget is distributed
- The process for distributing merit pay awards among faculty and staff, as stipulated in Faculty Academic Increment Service Program (FASIP) and Pay for Performance guidelines
- The use of information technology resources in support of the university’s mission of research, teaching and service. The IT Project Governance Committee is a universitywide group of faculty and staff that is charged with establishing priorities for allocating central administrative computing resources
• The Rutgers University Libraries allocates its budgeted resources in accordance with its strategic plan (at pages 1 and 7) and the academic priorities of its constituents

3. An allocation approach that ensures adequate faculty, staff, and administration to support the institution’s mission and outcomes expectations;

• One of the key attributes of All Funds Budgeting is that it clearly links planning and budgeting. Through All Funds Budgeting, academic units set annual operational budgets that determine levels of faculty, staff and administrative support needed are carefully considered. AFB requires that choices be made within existing or planned for resources. This focuses planning on the trade offs of various ambitions and needs and encourages strategic and long range thinking but with a clear knowledge of the likely resources that will be available.

• Faculty Utilization Reports are produced every year to assist deans and senior administrators in the planning for and process of hiring faculty.

• The hiring of faculty and staff is strongly influenced by Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Guidelines for Recruitment and Selection (Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Guidelines for Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Guidelines for Recruitment and Selection of Staff), and by the university’s firm commitment to diversity. Various university studies and initiatives reflect this support for pursuing diversity and excellence in the workforce:

  • A Study of Gender Equity in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Rutgers University-New Brunswick (Report Summary; Full Report)
  • Actions Taken to Implement the Gender Equity Report
  • As the Workplace Turns: Affirmative Action in Employment
  • Office of Faculty Diversity
  • President’s Report on Progress Toward 2006-2007 Strategic Goals (at pages 5, 6, and 13)
  • President’s Report On Progress Toward 2005–06 Strategic Goals (at pages 3, 12, and 13)
  • Office for the Promotion of Women in Science, Engineering, and Mathematics website

In addition, the most recent agreement between the university and the AAUP-AFT includes a provision for the establishment of a Faculty Development Fund which will assist in the hiring of additional full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty.

4. A financial planning and budgeting process aligned with the institution’s mission, goals, and plan that provides for an annual budget and multi-year budget projections, both institution-wide and among departments; utilizes planning and assessment documents; and addresses resource acquisition and allocation for the institution and any subsidiary, affiliated, or contracted educational organizations as well as for institutional systems as appropriate;
As noted in the prior items, the university’s All Funds Budgeting system is designed to align the goals of the university with budget planning. While one of the goals of AFB is to promote longer term planning and budgeting, the extreme volatility of state funding, especially in recent years, coupled with several years of legislative tuition caps has made long term budgeting difficult. Indeed, the pattern of recent state support has been described as a roller coaster, encompassing the largest shortfall in state funding in the university’s history amidst a pattern of ups and downs. While this instability of a major revenue stream has made planning difficult, it has also emphasized the importance of the AFB system with its attention on aligning plans with resources and on increasing other sources of funds to reduce the university’s reliance on state appropriation.

The university is also highly unionized being one of the few AAU publics with a faculty union. The university’s preparation for negotiations with the various bargaining units representing faculty and staff at Rutgers is illustrative of the multi-year financial planning and budgeting that occurs. These bargaining efforts involve the designation of a group of senior administrators that comprise a universitywide advisory group that engages in a planning process that entails the multi-year allocation of resources such as salaries, salary increases, benefits, etc. The financial modeling done in preparation for negotiations is critical not only to the success of the negotiating process, but also to the success of the university in meeting its mission and goals.

Recent agreements with faculty unions show how these negotiations are closely aligned with broader institutional goals by example of agreement to establish a multi-year fund for recruitment and hire of new faculty that will enable Rutgers to pursue excellence while being fiscally responsible.

In order to provide guidance in the area of debt management, the Board of Governors adopted a debt management policy in June 2006. The debt policy formalizes the link between the university’s strategic planning process and the issuance and management of debt, and relates to all forms of debt financing including long-term, short-term, fixed rate, and variable rate debt. The policy relates to other forms of financing including both on-balance and off-balance sheet structures such as leases, and other structured products that impact the credit of the university. The policy also contemplates the use of financial derivatives that may be used in managing the university’s debt portfolio and in structuring transactions to best meet the university’s financial objectives within an acceptable risk tolerance.

Although it is a public institution, Rutgers manages and is responsible for its own debt, and therefore must make decisions about debt capacity in light of real market pressures. The institution’s bond rating is monitored carefully and is higher than that of the state of New Jersey. The university has a well-developed internal capacity to manage debt, as well as professional financial advisors who also advise other leading research universities. The existence of a debt policy, coupled with the realities of the market pressures described above, serve as strong checks on excessive institutional leveraging.
5. A comprehensive infrastructure or facilities master plan and facilities/infrastructure life-cycle management plan, as appropriate to mission, and evidence of implementation;

Unlike in many other states where capital funding is provided on a regular basis, New Jersey’s public colleges have been forced to borrow for most capital projects. This funding situation recently led Moody’s to report that “the most significant financial challenge facing Rutgers will be managing its growing capital needs with limited state capital funding.” While none of its policy recommendations have been adopted by the state, CHE has issued a set of principles to help guide state support for the capital needs of institutions of higher education in the state. In the effort to provide adequate funding for capital projects, the higher education sector has developed a “Proposal for Capital Bond Projects.” This proposal, seen as critical to the university’s ability to undertake future capital development projects, has been on the drawing board for many years and remains a top priority for Rutgers.

Though direct state support for capital development projects in the higher education sector has been limited, the university does submit an annual request for funding of capital projects to the New Jersey Commission on Capital Budgeting and Planning, the statewide agency charged with capital planning. This annual request is developed through the Rutgers Capital Planning Program, which enables the university to plan, prioritize and organize future capital expenditures. A record of physical planning activities over the last ten years is presented here. In addition, the university uses the facility condition analysis system to help guide the process of life cycle management. Guiding all of the university planning for capital projects is its Facilities Master Plan.

And the university has developed a list of highest need capital projects that will be funded with university bonding. The first phase of this plan calls for $350m in projects including $75m in deferred maintenance to offset at least some of the backlog of maintenance. Planning for the use of university funds for capital is being done within the debt policy that was recently adopted by the Board of Governors.

6. Recognition in the comprehensive plan that facilities, such as learning resources fundamental to all educational and research programs and the library, are adequately supported and staffed to accomplish the institution’s objectives for student learning, both on campuses and at a distance;

As noted above, All Funds Budgeting is designed to align the university’s goals with its resources. Plans must demonstrate that adequate support is available in order to be approved. In addition, the university regularly reviews its standing relative to its AAU public peers on such measures as library collections. These analyses help to shape the relative priorities of various needs. It is important to note that both the allocation of resources and the significant cuts that the university absorbed in FY2006-07 placed highest priority on instructional units in recognition of the university’s primary academic mission. Academic support units like the library and research centers are in a second priority tier with administrative units bearing larger proportional cuts and smaller proportional allocation of funds.

Comprehensive plans for universitywide support and staffing, undertaken by central
divisions, such as the Office of Informational Technology and University Libraries are complemented at the decanal level through various funding and planning mechanisms including all funds budgeting, capital campaign planning and individual unit planning and allocation processes.

7. An educational and other equipment acquisition and replacement process and plan, including provision for current and future technology, as appropriate to the educational programs and support services, and evidence of implementation;

Educational and other acquisition and replacement processes operate on two levels: a central process of acquisition and replacement occurs through the Office of Institutional Technology, and units and departments pursue their respective processes as needed. Information on these central activities since the last decennial middle states self-study is found in the report titled Information Technology Support for Activities Examined as Part of the 2008 Middle States Commission Accreditation at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. The report presents a breakdown of central Educational Technology (ET) funding sources and describes various replacement strategies and budgeting maneuvers that have occurred during this period. The following annual reports provide evidence of implementing upgrades and improvements to the university’s ET infrastructure: New Brunswick Computing Services, 2005-2006 Annual Report and Newark Computing Services - Annual Report - Fiscal Year 2005/2006.

Rutgers also has a strong decentralized culture for equipment acquisition and replacement practiced by its many units and departments. Through the all funds budgeting process, units are able to assess the revenues it has to purchase and replace educational and other equipment. Through all funds budgeting, central funds such as computing fees are now part of funds local units receive and allocate for their educational technology inventory. Other resources that assist units and departments in this process include internal grant programs, the Academic Excellence Fund, and external grants. A breakdown of costs associated with educational technology acquisitions by educational units is listed in the following table.

Under the direction of interim Vice President for Information Technology and interim Chief Information Officer, Donald Smith, the university is presently conducting a comprehensive self-study of the university's IT resources, services, and working relationships, building on the university-wide IT Strategic Plan completed in August 2006. The goal of the self-study is to ensure that Rutgers' IT resources are used to their full potential in serving administrative, instructional, and research needs across the university.

The state has in place a revolving fund for the replacement of academic equipment called the Equipment Leasing Fund. This has provided critically needed support for equipment at colleges and universities across the state. Recent difficult budget years in New Jersey have prevented this fund from being increased enough to recognize the escalating costs of essential education equipment or to revolve frequently enough.
8. Adequate institutional controls to deal with financial, administrative and auxiliary operations, and rational and consistent policies and procedures in place to determine allocation of assets;

Having reviewed the provisions of the Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX) Act to assess its own controls and to determine if there were additional best practices the university should adopt, the university operates under what might be termed a SOX model adapted for public higher education and its mission. For example, the university created a Committee on Audit several decades ago. The committee, whose membership is drawn from Rutgers’ Boards of Governors and Trustees, contains no members of the administration—thereby ensuring its objective oversight of university operations. The committee meets several times a year to review the scope and outcomes of the external audit firm’s and internal audit department’s work, as well as management’s actions on pending issues. The committee holds executive sessions with the external and internal auditors to invite the auditors into a private, open and direct dialogue without members of management present. The committee operates under a formal charter which was enacted in 2001 and reviewed and updated in March 2007 to incorporate additional best practices implemented in response to SOX.

The university’s internal audit department reports functionally to the Audit Committee. This reporting line ensures a high degree of auditor independence and authority.

In addition to the Audit Committee, the university also has several other committees with substantial oversight responsibilities in areas related to finance (e.g., Budget and Finance, Buildings and Grounds, Executive Compensation and Nominations, and Investments.)

An overview of some of the institutional controls that deal with financial, administrative and auxiliary operations is found in President McCormick’s testimony to the New Jersey Legislative Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy. In addition, President McCormick recently expressed the university’s commitment to responsible business practices in a letter to the Rutgers faculty and staff.

The Office of the Controller plays a major role in ensuring that adequate financial controls are in place. Some of these controls or processes overseen by the controller’s office include:

- Financial Audit statements for the University.
  - 2006
  - 2005
  - 2004
- Audit Reports for post-awards federal grants
- Audit Reports for post-awards state grants

Oversight of controls on purchasing – Rutgers Integrated Administrative System (RIAS), which is Rutgers’ online purchasing system (RIAS Training Manual) and the
Rutgers University Purchasing Policy.

Because the research enterprise is a critical component of the university’s identity and mission, it is paramount that Rutgers has in place specific controls for grants and contracts won by its faculty. Some of these controls include:

- Policies and Procedures Concerning Grant and Contract Accounting
- Policies and Procedures for Cost Sharing on Sponsored Programs
- Travel, Travel Incidentals, and Meal Expense Policy
- Consulting or Other Personal Services, Intellectual Property, Honoraria and Other Miscellaneous activities – Policies and Procedures for Payment
- Equipment Inventory and Property Management

The Internal Audit Department provides another layer of oversight to university operations through promoting modern internal control concepts for departments and offices to use. Internal Audit serves as the arm of the Board of Governors so its audits are independent of the Office of the Senior Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer, to which it reports only for administration oversight. Internal audit provides services that include system assessment, departmental audits and follow-ups, audit investigations, advisory services, etc.

9. An annual independent audit confirming financial responsibility, with evidence of follow-up on any concerns cited in the audit’s accompanying management letter; and

- Rutgers University Financial Report 2004-2005

10. Periodic assessment of the effective and efficient use of institutional resources.

As described in the prior items, one of the critical components of the AFB system is the annual meetings between the Executive Vice President and Chief Budget Officer and the campus provosts and deans. These meetings not only review plans and associated budgets but they also consider the effective use of resources previously allocated. This continuous loop between planning, budgeting and accountability for the use of resources is at the heart of AFB.

Assessment of institutional resources at Rutgers occurs on many levels, beginning with state oversight. As indicated above, the state annually reviews the university’s budget request and seeks to determine if the university is efficiently and effectively utilizing its resources in the context of its mission of teaching, research and service.

Through the New Jersey President’s Council and the state’s program approval process, requests for new programs must not only meet criteria for need, but must also
demonstrate that they are not duplicative of other existing academic programs and are not unduly expensive.

Beyond the budget review process, the state legislature through the Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy has been actively involved in evaluating how state colleges and universities can contribute to state economic development. A particular concern of the Task Force has been over how the research sector of the state’s higher education system is currently structured. It has continued to examine if and how Rutgers along with the other public research institutions in the state should be merged or reorganized.

State assessment of institutional resources also occurs through the New Jersey Commission of Higher Education (CHE). CHE reviews budget requests from individual state public colleges and universities and approves capital projects financed by various higher education bond acts. In addition, the Commission on Higher Education annually reviews the university’s progress relative to statewide goals, thereby providing a public accounting for its use of its funds.

As noted in standard 1, element 1(d) the President of the university regularly reports to the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees on progress made in achieving university goals and objectives, which necessarily includes the effective and efficient use of institutional resources.

The University Senate also plays an important role in ensuring that the university successfully exploits its institutional resources. While advisory, the senate undertakes many important studies that help guide the university administration in making policy that affect how institutional resources are used. A selection of these studies include:

- Report and Recommendations on the Status of Full-time, Non-tenure-track, Non-clinical Faculty
- Report on the Use of Course Management Systems
- Report and Recommendations in Response to Charge S-0311, Electronic Applications for Admission
- Report and Resolution on Proposed Reduction in State Funding
- Report of the Senate Equal Opportunity Committee on Charge S-0209, Status of Hispanic/Latino Faculty and Administrators

Over the last few years, the university moved from perfunctory reviews of individual departments and/or programs to more strategic reviews of either specific areas of study or interdisciplinary clusters. Through the Committee on Academic Planning and Review, the aim of these evaluations is to determine how University resources can be most effectively used in supporting a specific disciplinary area and in the case of a cluster review to consider how the contribution of related units taken together can be greater than the sum of their individual contributions. Beginning in 2007-2008, CAPR will also assess policies and practices connected with Rutgers broad array of centers, bureaus and institutes.

The Center for Organizational Development and Leadership seeks to advance organizational effectiveness through assessment, planning, and service improvement.
As part of this effort, the office often undertakes studies that contribute to the university’s utilization of institutional resources. These evaluations have included assessments of the university’s progress in reducing “red tape” ten years after an initial university study and of the university’s continuing effort to improve student services.

Another important source of review of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services occurs through the Center for Organizational Development and Leadership (ODL) at Rutgers. ODL has been active in the development and implementation of a self-assessment and improvement program based on the Malcolm Baldrige framework. See standard 2, element 6.

The Committee on Efficiency and Entrepreneurship is a universitywide committee that has been actively engaged in the review of all university processes in the effort to make the best use of Rutgers’ resources and take a proactive, long-term approach to expanding revenues.

The Task Force on Transforming Undergraduate Education and subsequent implementation process is an effort that is geared not only to enhancing the academic and student life experience of undergraduates at Rutgers-New Brunswick but to improve how the university uses its resources in delivering a high quality undergraduate education to its students.

A Matrix of Education Support Technology provides an overview of goals for education support technology at Rutgers and a summary of assessment methods and plans across the university community.
Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

The institution’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. A well-defined system of collegial governance including written policies outlining governance responsibilities of administration and faculty and readily available to the campus community;

   The Board of Governors’ University Policy Library includes policies and procedures for the establishment of shared governance as an essential component of the university’s operation.

   The principal shared governance body is the University Senate, a university-wide body of elected faculty, students, alumni, and staff and ex officio administrators. Procedures and qualifications for membership in the University Senate are clearly delineated as are its procedures of operation. The Senate’s duties and powers include being concerned “with all academic and non-academic matters pertaining to the mission of the university” and advising “the President on matters of broad educational and research policy.”

   The administrative governance section of the University Policy Library outlines the governance structure and responsibilities for each academic unit and the role that faculty play in their operation.

   The New Brunswick Faculty Council, the Newark Faculty Council, and the Camden Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate are the principal faculty governance bodies on the regional campuses of the university and play an important role in advising the campus leadership on academic and administrative matters. For example, the New Brunswick Faculty Council’s Bylaws state that the council is “the principal faculty body from which the administration will seek advice and to which the administration will be accountable on campus-wide academic policy issues.”

2. Written governing documents, such as a constitution, by-laws, enabling legislation, charter or other similar documents, that:

   a. delineate the governance structure and provide for collegial governance, and the structure’s composition, duties and responsibilities. In proprietary, corporate and similar types of institutions, a separate document may establish the duties and
responsibilities of the governing body as well as the selection process;

b. assign authority and accountability for policy development and decision making, including a process for the involvement of appropriate institutional constituencies in policy development and decision making;

c. provide for the selection process for governing body members;

The leadership and governance structure of Rutgers, The State University is as unique as the history and evolution of the university (full historical sketch; a brief history) itself.

From its colonial inception as Queen’s College in 1766, the institution grew to become Rutgers College in 1825. In 1864 it was designated the state’s land-grant institution. Assuming university status in 1924, it was further transformed by legislative acts in 1945, and in 1956 the institution became Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey through "Rutgers, The State University Law" (NJSA 18A:65-1 et seq). Rutgers maintains three main campuses in strategic regions of the state: Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick. In addition, through the extension agents of its agricultural experiment station, Rutgers has a presence in all 21 counties of New Jersey.

The law establishing Rutgers as the state university also created the Rutgers Board of Governors and reorganized the Board of Trustees: “The 1956 law created a new governing board, to be known as the Board of Governors, and provided for the continuation of the Board of Trustees in an advisory capacity with certain fiduciary responsibilities over assets of the university in existence before 1956.”

The responsibilities of the Board of Governors are delineated in the Bylaws of the Board of Governors: The Board of Governors has “general supervision over and is vested generally with the government, control, conduct, management and administration of Rutgers, The State University.” The Board selects the President of the university; the President and his or her administration have the specific responsibility of managing and administering the policies of the Board including how the university is organized, administered, and developed.

The Board of Governors is composed of eleven voting members. Five Board members are appointed by the Governor of the State with the consent of the state Senate. The other six members are elected from the Board of Trustees. The President of the university is an ex officio, non-voting member. Other non-voting members of the Board include two faculty representatives and one student representative; both are appointed by the University Senate annually. Except for the five gubernatorial appointees, all members of the Board of Governors and Trustees serve for six-year terms. Each may succeed themselves for one additional term. The five public trustees serve five-year terms and may succeed themselves indefinitely (Board of Governors and Trustees Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey – Handbook).

The institutional governance structure is delineated in the Administrative Governance section of the Board of Governors’ University Regulations and Policies and Bylaws of
the Board of Governors. The central officers of the university and their responsibilities are disseminated in section 50.1.3 of the University Policy Library; these officers include President; the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Senior Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer; the Provost-Newark; the Provost-Camden; the Secretary of the University; and the Vice President and General Counsel.

The President is the Chief Executive Officer of the university and reports directly to the Board of Governors.

The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs is the university’s chief academic and budget officer (see section 50.1.3 of the University Policy Library). The Provost-Camden and Provost-Newark are the principal university officers for their campus (section 50.1.5). The academic unit organizational and reporting structure is delineated in section 50.1.6 of the University Policy Library, and the departmental and program structure of each school is delineated in section 50.1.7. Sections 50.1.8 and 50.1.9 of the library describe the membership and organization structure for the schools of the university, with the duties and powers of the schools set forth in section 50.1.10.

The University Senate (see also element 1 above) is an elective body whose membership includes faculty, students, administrators, alumni and staff. The Senate’s duties and powers are referenced under element 1.

Faculty Councils on regional campuses of the university also play an advisory role on policy matters to the campus leadership (see also element 1 above).

3. Appropriate opportunity for student input regarding decisions that affect them;

The University Senate and all committees of this body include significant student representation. (See section 2.2.1.D of the Handbook of the Rutgers University Senate.) Students are also represented in student governing associations of the various Rutgers campuses and schools. Other student organizations such as the Interfraternity Council and the Council of Student Representatives carry important voices. The latter was established by the SAS Bylaws Article VI, Section 4 “to advise the Executive Dean on matters pertaining to undergraduate education and student interests.” The university has recently created the Office of the Ombudsperson for Students to assist students in mediating unresolved issues that they may have with the university.

Students also sit on various universitywide and campuswide committees with faculty and staff that are charged with working on a particular academic or administrative matter. Recent examples where students have been important committee members include The Committee to Advance our Common Purposes, Committee to Review Policy on Academic Integrity, Communications Advisory Committee, the Student Services Initiative, etc.
4. A governing body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest and of an appropriate size to fulfill all its responsibilities, and which includes members with sufficient expertise to assure that the body’s fiduciary responsibilities can be fulfilled;

The membership list of the Board of Governors and Trustees includes brief biographies.

5. A governing body not chaired by the chief executive officer;

The Board of Governors is composed of eleven voting members and appoints the President of the university. The officers of the Board include a Chair, a Vice Chair, a Secretary, an Assistant Secretary, and a Treasurer. The Chair and Vice Chair are voting governors; the President of the university is an ex officio, non-voting member (NJSA 18A:65-14).

6. A governing body that certifies to the Commission that the institution is in compliance with the eligibility requirements, accreditation standards and policies of the Commission; describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting and regulatory agencies; communicates any changes in its accredited status; and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities, including levels of governing body compensation, if any;

The Board of Governors is the governing body that addresses these requirements. (The new certification will be completed prior to the final Self-Study Report.)

7. A conflict of interest policy for the governing body (and fiduciary body members, if such a body exists), which addresses matters such as remuneration, contractual relationships, employment, family, financial or other interests that could pose conflicts of interest, and that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution;

The Boards of Governors and Trustees have adopted a specific Conflict of Interest Policy. The policy reaffirms that the members of the Boards are already governed by New Jersey Conflicts of Interest Law (NJSA 52:13D-12 et seq.); identifies potential conflict of interest situations; requires the submission of annual financial disclosure forms; and describes the procedures for disclosure and management of conflicts of interests.

8. A governing body that assists in generating resources needed to sustain and improve the institution;

Through its various subcommittees the Boards of Governors and Trustees assist in generating resources needed to sustain and improve the university. For example, the Committee on Budget and Finance of the Board of Governors advises the Board in
preparing the annual budget and “its submission to the Governor, the Legislature and the Commission on Higher Education, on the administration of the budget, and on the financial affairs of the University generally, including the university's need for public and private funds.” The Joint Committee on Investments oversees “the investment of funds and monetary assets under the control and management of the respective Boards and advises each on the policy and procedure with respect thereto, including retention of investment advisers and oversight of the adviser’s function.”

Through a recent Board of Governor’s resolution, a gift of $6 million was transferred from the Board of Governors’ Consolidated Reserve Account to the Rutgers University Foundation for the “sole purpose of supporting the administrative work necessary to prepare for and carry out a successful capital campaign for the benefit of the University.”

The Board of Overseers of the Rutgers University Foundation has the power, authority, and responsibility to set fundraising policies and to oversee the operation of the Rutgers University Foundation.

The Board of Managers of the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station facilitates communication to and from the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station and the County Boards of Agriculture and serves as an advocate for the experiment station.

9. A process for orienting new members and providing continuing updates for current members of the governing body on the institution’s mission, organization, and academic programs and objectives;

The Board of Governor’s Handbook provides orientation information for new Board members. The Handbook is updated as needed so that current members of the Board are informed about the institution’s mission, organization, and academic programs and objectives.

10. A procedure in place for the periodic objective assessment of the governing body in meeting stated governing body objectives;

The university is under the continuous scrutiny of its external constituencies including the press, civic and business groups, and the public, all of whom consider Rutgers to be a vital state asset that provides essential services to the community. Real or perceived failure to meet important objectives results in strong pressures on the Governor and Legislature for corrective action. The recent difficulties at the University of Medicine and Dentistry illustrate how such pressures can build and bring about substantial institutional change on the governing board. The statutory independence of the Rutgers Board, however, provides an appropriate and effective counterbalance to these pressures.

The process by which Board of Governors is selected (see element 2) for membership provide both internal and external modes of assessment.
11. A chief executive officer, appointed by the governing board, with primary responsibility to the institution; and

The President is the chief executive officer of the university and is appointed by the Board of Governors.

12. Periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance.

See the Bylaws of the Board of Governors clearly for institutional accountability to the Board. The recent review of President McCormick’s performance by the Board of Governors underscores the Board’s role in assessing the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance.
Standard 5: Administration

The institution’s administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution’s organization and governance.

The administrative officers of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey includes the President; the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Senior Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer; the Newark Provost; the Camden Provost; the Secretary of the University; and the Vice President and General Counsel.

The Rutgers University Senate consists of representatives of Rutgers faculty, students, administrators, and alumni.

Each of the university’s schools and colleges is headed by a Dean. On the Camden and Newark campuses, Deans report to their respective Provost; on the New Brunswick campus, Deans report to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA).

In addition, the Vice Presidents for Budgeting, Continuous Education and Outreach, Enrollment Management, Health Science Partnerships, Research, Student Affairs, Undergraduate Education, as well as the Rutgers University Librarian report to the EVPAA. Vice Presidents for Facilities and Information Technology and the Controller report to the Senior Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer. On the Camden and Newark campuses, various administrative areas are overseen by Associate Provosts. The Vice President for University Relations reports directly to the President.

Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. A chief executive whose primary responsibility is to lead the institution toward the achievement of its goals and with responsibility for the administration of the institution;

   The responsibilities of the President are delineated in Section 50.1.3 of the University Policy Library.

2. A chief executive with the combination of academic background, professional training, and/or other qualities appropriate to the institution’s mission;

   President’s McCormick’s Curriculum Vitae lists his academic and professional accomplishments.

3. Administrative leaders with appropriate skills, degrees and training to carry out their responsibilities and functions;

   The qualifications and experience of the Vice Presidents, Deans and other senior level
administrators are shown in their biographies and/or curricula vitas. The senior administration and academic leaders of the university’s schools and colleges are all highly qualified to carry out their specific responsibilities and functions. In particular, each Academic Dean is an outstanding scholar and/or practitioner in an appropriate discipline. Each Vice President is a well respected leader in their field of work.

4. Qualified staffing appropriate to the goals, type size, and complexity of the institution;

Organizational charts show the major institutional units of the university. These organizational charts show staffing structures appropriate for the responsibilities and functions indicated.

5. Adequate information and decision-making systems to support the work of administrative leaders;

Various decision-making systems to aid administrative leaders are found here (Core Services Web Services).

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRAP) is the central source for information used in decision making at the university. See standard 7 for a review of its activities and how it provides information and decision-making systems to support the work of administrative leaders.

6. Clear documentation of the lines of organization and authority;

The organizational structure of the university is widely available on the university President’s website where both the administrative structure and key governing boards and administrators are presented. More detailed organizational charts of individual units are published on the website of the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning.

7. Periodic assessment of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services.

Reviews of academic units are conducted by the Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR). CAPR reviews of academic departments occur either individually or as part of a broader interdisciplinary evaluation. These reviews seek to strategically plan for how university resources are best used in supporting specific academic areas. Recent examples of these assessments by CAPR include the Computer and Information Science and Engineering and the Psychology cluster reviews. Previous to CAPR, the Committee on Standards and Priorities in Academic Development (CSPAD) reviewed departments on a rotating basis.

Another important source of review of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services occurs through the Center for Organizational Development and
Leadership (ODL) at Rutgers. ODL has been active in the development and implementation of a self-assessment and improvement program based on the Malcolm Baldrige framework. (See standard 2, element 6.)
**Standard 6: Integrity**

*In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.*

Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. Fair and impartial processes, published and widely available, to address student grievances, such as alleged violations of institutional policies. The institution assures that student grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably;

   - Processes for addressing student grievances including violations of institutional policies, are described in the University Policies and Procedures section of the university’s student catalogs. These include procedures for student complaints about grades, the university’s policy for prohibiting harassment, its policy against verbal assault, defamation, and harassment, and its nondiscrimination policy.
   - Specific policies on academic standing for graduate students are published in the graduate catalogs; these include policies on student review, due process, and student academic appeals.
   - The Office of the Ombudsperson for Students is a recently created position – a direct result of the President’s student services initiative (see standard 2 element 6). The mission of the office is to provide students with a high level of assistance in dealing with various academic and student life issues.

2. Fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation and dismissal of employees;

   - For faculty recruitment, evaluation, and dismissal procedures see standard 10, element 6. For review of Deans, see standard 10, element 7.
   - Collective Bargaining Agreements between the university and unions representing various segments of university staff describe the conditions for hiring as well as the dismissal of unionized staff employees.
   - University Human Resources provide guidelines and information for the hiring of staff employees. Information on disciplinary actions is also provided by University Human Resources (see also Employee Discipline - Information for Supervisors).
   - For appraisal of Administrative/Professional/Supervisory (A/P/S) employees, see the Pay for Performance guideline.
   - The Office of Employment Equity is a universitywide resource for information on laws, regulations, and university policies regarding equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, harassment and disability matters.

3. Sound ethical practices and respect for individuals through its teaching, scholarship/research, service, and administrative practice, including the avoidance of conflict of interest or the
appearance of such conflict in all its activities and among all its constituents;

- The Rutgers Policy on Academic Freedom includes a statement of professional ethics.
- For Conflict of Interest-Faculty - Professional Activities Outside the University and Outside Employment for Academic Personnel, see section 60.5.8 of the University Policy Library; section 60.5.9 presents guidelines for Faculty or Staff Involvement with Commercial Enterprise – Contracts with the University.
- For ethical behavior in research and scholarship, see the Rutgers policy on Human Subject Research. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs ORSP oversees the university’s institutional review process of human subjects. As part of the IRB Quality Assurance Program, ORSP has developed an assessment initiative that is geared to providing researchers with the tools to review their ongoing protocols. ORSP provides additional information and support to ensure the ethical conduct of human subject research online.

the Rutgers policy on Animal Care and Use. The policy for reviewing protocols on live vertebrate animals is available here. ORSP provides additional information and support to ensure the ethical conduct of animal research online.

For considerate and ethical use of university resources see the various information technology policies of the university. These policies include Rutgers Acceptable Use Policy for Computing and Information Technology Resources and its associated Guidelines for Interpretation and Administration of the Acceptable Use Policy for Computing and Information Technology Resources; Email and NetID Policy; Surplus Property Policy (section 20.1.12 of the UPL); and Wireless Lan Policy.

For the university’s policy on political activity using university resources, see Electoral Political Activities and the Use of University Resources (section 50.3.4 of the UPL).

4. Equitable and appropriately consistent treatment of constituencies, as evident in such areas as the application of academic requirements and policies, student discipline, student evaluation, grievance procedures, faculty promotion, tenure, retention and compensation, administrative review, curricular improvement, and institutional governance and management;

- For student discipline, see the Code of Student Conduct (section 10.2.11 for the UPL). Student catalogs also publish the University Code of Student Conduct Summary in the Academic Policies and Procedures section of each school catalog. The Code and its implementation are administered by the Office of Compliance, Student Policy and Judicial Affairs in the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Code is also available online. The Office of Compliance, Student Policy and Judicial Affairs also develops and applies student life policies including the University Policy on the Use of Alcoholic Beverages, Policy Against Verbal Assault, Defamation and Harassment, and Policy Prohibiting Harassment. The student catalogs also publish the Policy on Academic Integrity Summary. For student evaluation and grievances see the response to element 1 above.
• For faculty promotion, tenure, retention and compensation, see the response to element 2 above.
• Regarding administrative reviews, Deans, Chairs, and academic units are reviewed. See the response to standard 10, element 7.
• Institutional governance and management is discussed at length in the various elements and materials presented in standard 4. (see standard 4)
• For curricular improvement see the response to standard 10, element 2.

5. A climate of academic inquiry and engagement supported by widely disseminated policies regarding academic and intellectual freedom;

Rutgers University historically has maintained a climate of academic inquiry and intellectual freedom. A Policy on Academic Freedom was approved by the Board of Governors in support of this commitment, which states in part:

Since the very nature of a university and its value to society depend upon the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and free artistic expression, all members of the faculty of this university are expected, in the classroom, laboratory, and studio, in research and professional publication, freely to discuss subjects with which they are competent to deal, to pursue inquiry therein, and to present and endeavor to maintain their opinions and conclusions relevant thereto.

This Policy on Academic Freedom incorporates by reference the Statement on Professional Ethics as adopted by the American Association of University Professors in 1966 and revised in 1987 which proclaims that “As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. . . . They protect their academic freedom.”

The Preamble of another Board-approved policy, the Code of Student Conduct, opens with the affirmation that “A university in a free society must be devoted to the pursuit of truth and knowledge through reason and open communication among its members.”

Likewise, the Code of Ethics for Administrative and Professional Staff Members observes that “It is an administrator’s obligation to provide an environment in which each person has an opportunity to develop talents and broaden horizons, enhance personal and professional growth . . .”

The university’s vision of itself has been most recently reviewed by senior administrators and deans, and it is reflected in the vision statement of August, 2006 of the new capital campaign.

6. An institutional commitment to principles of protecting intellectual property rights;

The university’s Research Grant and Contract Administration, Support, and Management Policy establishes the commitment of the university to protecting
intellectual property rights through the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate & Professional Education. The ownership of as well as the rights to use and practice inventions and patents, and the respective responsibilities of personnel, students, and the university with regard to inventions and patents are set forth in the Rutgers Patent Policy. Section 50.3.6 of the UPL establishes the university policy for licensing and royalties of college music performances. The university’s copyright policy “sets forth the rights and responsibilities of the university, its faculty, students, and employees in their roles as members of the university community in creating and using copyrighted works”.

7. A climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration for a range of backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives;

Rutgers maintains an online index of university-wide diversity resources that includes the University Policy on Diversity and Mission Statement. In addition, the Newark Campus has a diversity website. The Campus Climate Report, published in 2006, provides survey results concerning the environment on each campus. The Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes has functioned since 1987 to foster intercultural relations while reducing acts of prejudice and bias. Human Dignity Awards honor individuals and groups who promote the value of diversity. The Erena Rae Bias Prevention Artistic Contest engages the community in multicultural awareness. The Office of Faculty Diversity Initiatives provides resources to enhance the diversity of Rutgers’ educational and scholarly activities.

The university offers related academic programs on the Camden Campus including the B.A. in African American Studies and other undergraduate programs in European Studies, Latin American Studies, Religion, and Women's Studies. Also offered at Camden are the B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in Childhood Studies. On the Newark Campus, B.A. programs are offered in African-American and African Studies, Central and Eastern European Studies, Portuguese and Lusophone World Studies, Puerto Rican Studies, and Women's Studies. Also offered at Newark are the B.A. in American Studies, M.A. and Ph.D. in American Studies and the M.S. and Ph.D. in Global Affairs. On the New Brunswick Campus, B.A. programs are offered in Africana Studies, American Studies, East Asian Languages and Area Studies, European Studies, Italian Studies, Jewish Studies, Latin American Studies, Latino and Hispanic Caribbean Studies, Middle Eastern Studies, and Religion. Also offered at New Brunswick are the B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in Women's and Gender Studies. Further, the Douglass Project for Rutgers Women in Math, Science and Engineering supports undergraduate women and students at the secondary level interested in studying math, sciences, engineering and technology.

Related research and service efforts are conducted by the Center for African Studies, the Center for American Women and Politics, the Douglass Developmental Disabilities Center, the Institute on Ethnicity, Culture, and the Modern Experience, the Institute for Hungarian Studies, the Center for Race and Ethnicity, the Institute for Research on Women, the Institute for Women and Art, the Center for Women and
Work, the Center for Women's Global Leadership, and the Institute for Women's Leadership.

Cultural centers at Rutgers include the Asian American Cultural Center, the Center for Latino Arts and Culture, and the Paul Robeson Cultural Center. The Office of Social Justice Education and LGBT Communities provides educational, social, and leadership development programs and activities for LGBT students and others.

A visit by the Dalai Lama was a major event for Rutgers in September 2005. Campus ministries serve a variety of faith communities, and student organizations offer a wide range of ideas and perspectives.

The Office of Employment Equity provides information about issues of harassment, discrimination, diversity, and disabilities in the workplace. It is a universitywide resource for all faculty and staff.

8. Honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements, advertisements, and recruiting and admissions materials and practices;

The university’s website provides links to information of all kinds concerning the institution. The About Rutgers webpage provides a universitywide gateway for all online Rutgers visitors and contains links to information about the university’s history, basic facts and figures, and administrative structure and units. The Office of Media Relations maintains a comprehensive and up-to-date webpage of Rutgers-related news stories.

The admissions web page provides links to a comprehensive set of materials concerning the admissions process and available financial aid.

As required under the Jeanne Clery Act of 1998, the university provides a comprehensive annual security report, titled Campus Matters. The report is published for each regional campus (Safety Matters – New Brunswick; Safety Matters – Newark; Safety Matters – Camden) The university also complies and publishes comprehensive crime statistics for each campus (New Brunswick; Newark; Camden).

The university discloses pertinent information as required by federal and state authorities.

9. Required and elective courses that are sufficiently available to allow students to graduate within the published program length;

The Office of Scheduling and Space Management publishes a complete listing of all courses available each semester. These listings are published in both hard copy and online. Each school and department is responsible for the courses that are offered by their faculty (see section 10.2.1 of the UPL for Academic Regulations Controlling the
Education Divisions of the University). Each unit makes every effort to have a comprehensive offering of courses each semester so that students can progress in their studies within a respective published program’s length. The degree requirements are published in the course catalogs for each school. In addition, the Policy on the Suspension or Discontinuance of Programs, Departments, and Centers (as approved by the Board of Governors on May 10, 1991) assures that when a program is discontinued, courses will be available for students to graduate.

While Rutgers is committed to offering a full schedule of courses each semester, recent state budget cuts has resulted in the university eliminating courses during the 2006-2007 academic year. With the modest increase in fiscal year 2008, the university has made every effort to restore the courses cut from the previous year’s course schedule.

10. Reasonable, continuing student access to paper or electronic catalogs;

11. When catalogs are available only electronically, the institution’s web page provides a guide or index to catalog information for each catalog available electronically;

12. When catalogs are available only electronically, the institution archives copies of the catalogs as sections or policies are updated;

All school catalogs for undergraduate and graduate students are updated and published on a biennial schedule. Each campus and or school of the university has its own published catalog and each is available online in a navigable format (Current Catalogs). As of July 2006, in an effort to reduce costs, the university's updated catalogs will not be available in print format. However, archives for past catalogs are available online in PDF format.

13. Changes and issues affecting institutional mission, goals, sites, programs, operations, and other material changes are disclosed accurately and in a timely manner to the institution’s community, to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, and to any other appropriate regulatory bodies;

President Richard L. McCormick frequently sends letters to the Rutgers community on important issues including the state budget, major appointments and initiatives, significant plans, and administrative changes. The institution’s community is further informed by Focus, the faculty and staff publication of Rutgers, as well as through news articles released by the media relations office.

Rutgers University regularly discloses its changes to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The Institutional Profile, which is filed during the spring of each year, includes a section providing early notice of significant developments and anticipated changes. Reported changes include plans for international degree
programs, implementation of a new academic unit, and initiation of planning for a capital campaign. In addition to the Institutional Profile, the university submits Substantive Change requests that may result in updates to the Statement of Accreditation Status. Recently reported substantive changes include the closing of inactive sites. Further, through its five-year Periodic Review Report and ten-year Self Study, Rutgers provides the Middle States Commission on Higher Education with in-depth information about long-range developments.

Rutgers University routinely reports relevant changes to appropriate bodies for the purposes of state coordination and federal regulation. In accordance with the New Jersey Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994, Rutgers University annually prepares an institutional profile report. Content requirements are specified in the statute and further determined by the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education. In the fall the report is shared with that agency. Rutgers University reports its new degree programs and certain changes to degree programs through a review process involving the New Jersey Presidents’ Council and its Academic Issues Committee. The New Jersey Commission on Higher Education uses this information to maintain an inventory of degree programs by institution. Rutgers University reports changes as necessary to the United States Department of Education. Every six years a complete application is submitted for recertification of the institution’s eligibility to participate in federal student financial aid programs, and changes are reported on an ongoing basis pending the next recertification.

14. Availability of factual information about the institution, such as the Middle States Commission on Higher Education annual data reporting, the self-study or periodic review report, the team report, and the Commission’s action, accurately reported and made publicly available to the institution’s community;

The Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning website provides links to a comprehensive set of factual information about the university. See, for example, the University Fact Book, the Common Data Set Survey, and the New Jersey State Accountability Report. Also included on the website are links to the most recent Periodic Review Report and Response (year 2003). Links to the last 1998 Self Study and the recommendations made by the Middle States Commission at that time are also provided.

15. Information on institution-wide assessments available to prospective students, including graduation, retention, certification and licensing pass rates, and other outcomes as appropriate to the programs offered;

Graduation Rates are published online and in the University Fact Book. Sites such as the NCAA and IPEDS Cool also contain graduation and retention rates of the university. The Common Data Set Survey also has data on the graduation and retention rates. Teacher education certification and Title II reports are also published online.
16. Institutional information provided in a manner that ensures student and public access, such as print, electronic, or video presentation;

The university’s homepage provides the main portal through which students and the public can access a variety of sources of information about the university.

The Office of the Vice President for University Relations is the central focal point of the dissemination of information about the university. This office’s news/media operation disseminates news in a variety of formats including newspapers, websites, search engines, email, directories, expert databases, etc.

Online catalogs and schedule of classes provide basic information about scheduling, academic rules and regulations, deadlines, and finance. Throughout the university’s website, information is presented about the university in a logical and navigational format.

17. Fulfillment of all applicable standards and reporting and other requirements of the Commission; and

This documentation roadmap and the Self-Study report are meant to demonstrate this.

18. Periodic assessment of the integrity evidenced in institutional policies, processes, practices, and the manner in which these are implemented.

The University Senate and its committees are continually addressing the adequacies of these policies and procedures, and working with the senior administration to modify them as appropriate. Lists of Senate reports and resolutions regarding institutional processes and practices produced and passed by the Senate since 1999 are found here.
Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Rutgers’ long history, with campuses and individual academic units experiencing unique paths of development, has led to a strong decentralized structure in its administrative and academic organization. Equally powerful historical forces have contributed to Rutgers’ emergence as the sole public comprehensive university in the state of New Jersey. Rutgers’ development into a major public research university has been accompanied by a complex and multilayered organizational structure through which an active process of institutional assessment is pursued. This assessment does not occur in a vacuum and is guided and informed by issues and forces on both the national and state levels. The result is a broad-based and extensive process of institutional assessment.

Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. Documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services; achievement of institutional mission, goals, and plans; and compliance with accreditation standards that meets the following criteria:

   1a. a foundation in the institution’s mission and clearly articulated institutional, unit-level, and program-level goals that encompass all programs, services, and initiatives and are appropriately integrated with one another (see Standards 1: Mission and Goals and 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal);

   1b. systematic, sustained, and thorough use of multiple qualitative and/or quantitative measures that:

      1b1. maximize the use of existing data and information;

      1b2. clearly and purposefully relate to the goals they are assessing;

      1b3. are of sufficient quality that results can be used with confidence to inform decisions;

   1c. support and collaboration of faculty and administration;

   1d. clear realistic guidelines and a timetable, supported by appropriate investment of institutional resources;
1e. sufficient simplicity, practicality, detail, and ownership to be sustainable; 1f. periodic evaluation of the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the institution’s assessment process;

The state’s long range plan, A Blueprint for Excellence - New Jersey’s Long-Range Plan for Higher Education Update 2005, provides the broad parameters for New Jersey’s colleges and universities to pursue their respective goals in the context of their missions. The plan, developed by the state’s Commission on Higher Education (CHE) in cooperation with colleges and universities, sets systemwide objectives for higher education in the state; the pursuit of many of these objectives is measured with specific indicators that institutions have identified as consistent with their mission and own set of institutional goals and objectives. Institutions are individually measured on their selected indicators, which are evaluated on an annual basis and provide the basis for periodic assessment of the success to which the state is achieving its higher education objectives and the degree to which individual colleges and universities, including Rutgers, are contributing to that success.

As was documented in standard 2, Rutgers has worked closely with the state on other higher education planning activities. The most notable has been the extensive work over the proposal to restructure the research sector of New Jersey higher education. (see standard 2, element 2) This effort included an extensive assessment of the university’s functions and processes to determine the feasibility of merging and possibly realigning the state’s three research universities.

An important assessment function played by the state is through its review of the university’s annual budget request to ensure that the university is efficiently and effectively utilizing its resources (see standard 3, element 1). The university also submits an annual Accountability Report to the state that contains evaluative data on the university’s performance in areas such as student access, educational outcomes and instructional delivery.

At the university level, institutional assessment at Rutgers is guided by the institution’s mission and is operationalized through the President’s strategic goals for the university (see standard one, element one). Areas of emphasis are annually selected by the President and his senior administrators, which are put forth in his annual address and other speeches and addresses to the university community. These areas are annually assessed through progress reports (Report on Progress Toward 2006-2007 Strategic Goals; Report on Progress Toward 2005–06 Strategic Goals; Report on Progress Toward 2004–05 Strategic Goals). This assessment is reinforced by ongoing review by the Board of Governors through its standing committees on policy and planning, finances and facilities.

Assisting the President and his administration in the effort to evaluate the effectiveness of university policies and actions is the University Senate. The Senate’s duties and powers include being concerned “with all academic and non-academic matters pertaining to the mission of the university” and advising “the President on matters of broad educational and research policy.” (see section 50.2.2 of the UPL). In its role, the senate undertakes a wide range of studies that contribute to the ongoing
assessment of university policies and functions. A listing of many of the senate studies and reports can be found here.

Campuswide faculty councils also provide an advisory role to the President and the senior administration of the university. (See standard 4, element 1.)

While the President’s strategic goals provide a broad approach to institutional assessment at Rutgers, more specific assessment activities crucial to the effectiveness of the university in achieving its institutional goals are provided, through the President’s leadership, at the provostial, vice presidential and collegiate levels of organization.

A fundamental mechanism for moving the university along the road to achieving these goals is the All Funds Budgeting (AFB) process adopted by the university in 2004-05 academic year. Under the direction of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Budgeting, AFB supports the transparent distribution of institutional resources. It is consistent with Rutgers’ tradition of decentralized organization of its academic units and provides these decanal units with enhanced managerial tools that effectively relate planning, resource allocation and assessment. See the description of the AFB process under element 2 of standard 2.

Because AFB is a heavily tuition-driven model it is important for deans to have access to data that accurately tracks their enrollment and course credit data (see diagram of how tuition dollars are allocated). These data are critical planning elements for the units and are contained in the data warehouse maintained by Institutional Research. The following are examples of the data used (view1; view2). The Office of Budget and Resource Studies works with unit deans to provide relevant budget information that assists the units in the development of their unit priorities, revenue projections, and faculty hiring projections. These plans are developed, discussed and assessed in regular meetings with the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Center for Organizational Development and Leadership (ODL) provides a critical dimension to assessment activities at Rutgers. The center offers consulting services and workshops to assist academic, administrative, and service departments in organizational assessment, goal clarification, measures and effectiveness evaluation of their core programs and services (including focus groups and web-based surveys), and in using results in planning. As noted in standard 2, element 6 ODL has played a critical role in the development of the Excellence in Higher Education (EHE) model in higher education. This model of organizational assessment has been applied to institutions of higher education and stresses both assessment and the use of the assessment process for institutional improvement. Forty, or so administrative and academic units at Rutgers have participated in the EHE process (see also EHE at Rutgers).

Another major effort of institutional assessment has been the effort to assess and better understand the way the university is perceived by its many different constituencies. The first step in this process was the University Relations Constituency Study, which provided the basis for a process of continual assessment of
how Rutgers is presenting itself to its varied external constituencies, including the Rutgers Visual Identity Manual.

A Matrix of Education Support Technology provides an overview of goals for education support technology at Rutgers and a summary of assessment methods and plans across the university community.

The Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning (OIRAP) gathers, analyzes, and uses data to inform institutional planning, policy development and decision-making. The Office provides reporting, assessment, benchmarking, planning, and public information services to support institutional effectiveness and to respond to the needs of the university community and the citizens of New Jersey. See the office overview of its structure, mission, and the range of its activities. The office compiles and maintains the University Fact Book which provides a ready and comprehensive source of historical and current information on students, faculty, finances, facilities, and instruction. It also includes substantial benchmark data on Rutgers and its peer group, the public members of the Association of American Universities. OIRAP also has developed dashboard indicators that are used by senior administrators and the Board of Governors to assess how the university is meeting its institutional goals.

As an active member of the American Association of Universities Data Exchange, Institutional Research collaborates with respective offices of other member schools of the Association of American Universities (AAU) to develop a set of comparative indicators for both undergraduate and graduate education. The development of these indicators will be used by the AAU and its member schools to not only facilitate internal assessment of institutional effectiveness, but provide critical information about institutional performance to external stakeholders. Many of these indicators are planned to be ready for use by the individual AAU institutions in spring 2008.

A selection of regular and ad hoc reports used for institutional assessment and produced by OIRAP include studies on student economic and racial/ethnic diversity; student retention and graduation rates; periodic Economic Impact Statements; reports to the NCAA and Department of Education concerning athletics for each campus (New Brunswick, Newark, and Camden); Title II – Annual Questionnaire on Teacher Preparation Programs; and Legislative District Summaries.

When opportunity presents itself, the office works closely with outside organizations engaged in researching important topics in higher education. Two recent efforts have resulted in efforts to comparatively evaluate the success of Rutgers in recruiting, retaining, and graduating students. The first is a follow-up study by the Mellon Foundation to their original College and Beyond project to which Rutgers has agreed to participate. The second is a study by The Pell Institute titled, “Demography is Not Destiny: Increasing the Graduation Rates of Low-Income College Students at Large Public Universities.”

Through its data warehouse, OIRAP is able to provide information to central administrators and the many decanal units of the university and conduct special analytical studies on a need to know basis. The data warehouse contains diachronic and current information on students, faculty, and staff. The information included in
the data warehouse comes from various university legacy data systems, such as the Student Records Database (SRDB), Human Resources, Course Scheduling, and the Course Analysis System (CAS), as well as the state's Student Unit Record Enrollment (SURE) database. Other sources of data include student placement data from the College Assessment Research System (CARS) and faculty information from the Faculty Survey. Data from the new Student Financial Aid system and data from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs is also planned to be incorporated into the system. Entry into the data warehouse can occur through different access points (direct querying, On-Line Analytical Programming (OLAP), etc. – see linked diagram. Examples of the type, level and detail of the data that are available from the data warehouse can be found in the linked file of selected data views. The data warehouse also contains the source data for the all funds budgeting system (see standard 2, element 2).

OIRAP collects information on faculty activities through its management of the Rutgers Faculty Survey. The Faculty Survey provides faculty with a single point of data entry for all their required data reporting needs such as tenure and promotion forms and grant application forms. Reports of faculty activity are available to deans and other administrators (see link for an example of a report at a Dean’s level). In addition, OIRAP collects and produces reports on instructional workload activity at Rutgers. These reports are available to central and decanal administrators through data views produced by OIRAP staff and placed on the office’s reporting server.

OIRAP engages in an active survey research program, which provides a rich source of primary data on students’ assessment of their academic and student life experiences. The office regularly administers the Upper Division and Graduating Student Surveys. These and other surveys (see listing of undergraduate student surveys) have informed decision-making activities including the Transforming Undergraduate Education initiative, student services improvements, the proposed revision of the student code of honor, etc. Graduate student surveys including the Ph.D. exit survey are used by graduate programs as an essential assessment tool. Surveys of faculty and staff have also been administered to help inform decisions on a variety of topics including faculty service, undergraduate research and learning outcomes, global and international initiatives, academic integrity, and campus climate concerns. Other institutional assessment-related activities of the office include:

- overseeing the development of new programs, which has recently been revised to include specifications for assessing learning outcomes in the development of new programs
- providing staff support for the Committee on Academic Planning and Review (see standard 2, element 2)
- administering the testing and placement program of incoming students and reporting on the effectiveness of the program functioning as the university liaison to the Association of American Universities Data Exchange, an organization that collects and exchanges benchmark data on institutional effectiveness among member institutions (a description and list of data exchange items available to participating members can be found here)
- coordinating the university’s participation in national surveys such as the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) and the National Survey of
Student Engagement (NSSE)

- managing university reporting to national agencies such as the U.S. Department of Education (e.g., IPEDS); state agencies such as the Commission on Higher Education and the Department of Education; NCAA – athletic progress reports (New Brunswick, Newark); and college guides (e.g., U.S. News, CDS, Peterson’s)

2. Evidence that assessment results are shared and discussed with appropriate constituents and used in institutional planning, resource allocation, and renewal (see Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal) to improve and gain efficiencies in programs, services and processes, including activities specific to the institution’s mission (e.g., service, outreach, research); and

3. Written institutional (strategic) plan(s) that reflect(s) consideration of assessment results.

The incorporation of assessment results that reveal their discussion with constituents in written plans and improvement efforts can be found in standard 2, element 2.
Standard 8: Student Admissions (Graduate Education)

The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students’ educational goals.

An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. Admissions policies, developed and implemented, that support and reflect the mission of the institution;
   This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.
   For Graduate Education:
   Each of Rutgers three regional campuses includes graduate and professional units that offer a wide range of graduate and professional degree programs. The mission of each school is closely tied to the mission and goals of their campus and of the university.

2. Admissions policies and criteria available to assist the prospective student in making informed decisions;

3. Programs and services to ensure that admitted students who marginally meet or do not meet the institution’s qualifications achieve expected learning goals and higher education outcomes at appropriate points;
   This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.
   For Graduate Education: Does Not Apply

4. Accurate and comprehensive information regarding academic programs, including any required placement or diagnostic testing;
   This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.
   For Graduate Education, the online catalogs provide the necessary information for admissions and academic programs including general requirements, necessary testing, specific requirements for international students, as well as detailed information on programs, faculty and courses.

5. Statements of expected student learning outcomes and information on institution-wide assessment results, as appropriate to the program offered, available to prospective students;
6. Accurate and comprehensive information, and advice where appropriate, regarding financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds;

7. Published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit and credit for extra-institutional college level learning; and

These elements for undergraduate education are covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

Information about admissions policies, academic programs and expectations, financial aid programs, and policies and procedures regarding transfer credit in the graduate and professional units of the university is obtained by various constituencies including prospective and enrolled students from a variety of sources. These include

- Student Catalogs – each graduate and professional unit publishes a catalog that is easily assessable via the web
- An online central clearinghouse on graduate admissions – this site allows prospective students to apply online and provides descriptions and links to additional information on all graduate and professional programs offered at Rutgers.
- Websites of individual schools offering graduate and professional programs – each graduate and professional school has an online website that provides an assortment of information about the academic unit, its faculty, opportunities and expectations of students enrolled in its programs, admissions requirements and procedures, and financial aid opportunities.

8. Ongoing assessment of student success, including but not necessarily limited to retention, that evaluates the match between the attributes of admitted students and the institution’s mission and programs, and reflects its findings in its admissions, remediation, and other related policies.

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

Individual schools regularly assess the success of their students. For many schools, and especially the professional schools, these assessments often follow the requirements of their professional accrediting bodies. For additional information, see the list of schools that are accredited by professional accrediting organizations.

As it has been doing in the area of undergraduate education, the Association of American Universities (AAU) has been working with its individual member institutions to develop benchmarks that can be used to assess and to improve educational outcomes, including retention and time-to-degree, at the graduate program level. (See standard 7, element 1.)

The Graduate School-New Brunswick has been an active participant with a number of other AAU institutions in the development of a database to assess programs, including
comparative measures of student success. (see an example of data contained in this database.) The school has also been administering a Ph.D. exit survey to all students receiving their doctorate. The results of this survey have provided individual programs with valuable feedback information about their programs. (see an example of a program survey report.)

Rutgers Graduate Schools are also active participants in national data collection efforts such as the Survey of Graduate Enrollment by the Council of Graduate Schools and the Graduate Record Examination Board and the soon-to-be-released National Research Council’s assessment of U.S. research doctorate programs. (See an analysis of the last assessment by NRC of Rutgers’ doctoral programs.)
Standard 9: Student Support Services (Graduate Education)

The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution’s goals for students.

An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. A program of student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, consistent with student learning expectations, and available regardless of place or method of delivery;

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

Many of the student support services accessible to undergraduates are also available to graduate students at the university. These include essential student services such as the registrar, financial aid, dining, parking and transportation, libraries, and housing. The Graduate Admissions website provides a gateway to graduate and professional study at Rutgers. Each graduate and professional school has a student catalog that provides information on the range of student support services available to graduate students.

Career services provides specialized services for graduate students. In addition to the central office of career services, individual academic units also provide their students with more selected and focused services. Examples of these include the career planning service at the School of Law-Camden, the Office of Career Services at Rutgers School of Law-Newark, and the MBA Office of Career Management in the Rutgers Business School.

Other support programs specific to the Rutgers graduate student include:

- The Diversity Advantage for Graduate Students
- Rutgers School of Law-Newark Minority Student Program
- The Teaching Assistant Project
- The Resource Center for Graduate Student External Support (CHASER)

2. Qualified professionals to supervise and provide the student support services and programs;

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.
For Graduate Education:

All student support offices are professionally staffed by individuals who are hired through a rigorous search process based on specific job requirements. The University Human Resource Office provides guidance and assistance to offices in the hiring of qualified professionals to supervise student support services and programs. Most of these professional staffs include many members who have many years of service and experience.

3. Procedures to address the varied spectrum of student academic and other needs, in a manner that is equitable, supportive, and sensitive, through direct service or referral;

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

Procedures for equitably and sensitively addressing graduate students academic and other needs through direct service or referral are similar to those for undergraduate students. The Health Services website describes Patients Right and Responsibilities. Counseling and Psychological Services are offered for many different special communities and circumstances and include referrals as appropriate. The listing of services in the Graduate Catalogs and on various websites such as the gateway website for current students facilitates graduate student access to these services.

4. Appropriate student advisement procedures and processes;

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

Graduate student advising is the responsibility of each individual academic program.

5. If offered, athletic programs that are regulated by the same academic, fiscal, and administrative principles, norms, and procedures that govern other institutional programs;

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

Not Applicable.

6. Reasonable procedures, widely disseminated, for equitably addressing student complaints or grievances;
This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

See standard 6, element 1.

7. Records of student complaints or grievances;

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

Most complaints or grievances are handled and resolved at the office directly concerned. Records are not centrally kept. However, confidential records are kept for student complaints and grievances that are brought to the Office of the Ombudsperson for Students.

8. Policies and procedures, developed and implemented, for safe and secure maintenance of student records;

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

The university has implemented procedures to provide guidance to offices affected by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). It also has a compliance policy in support of the Financial Services Modernization Act of 1999, also known as the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. The university has implemented an Identity Theft Compliance Policy to ensure university compliance with the New Jersey Identity Theft Prevention Act, which went into effect January 1, 2006. The university also recently implemented a new procedure that no longer uses social security numbers as student identifiers and instead uses a randomly generated “Rutgers University Identification Number.” All students were issued new identification cards with this identification number.

9. Published and implemented policies for the release of student information; and

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

The university’s policy on the confidentiality of student records implements the requirement of the Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
10. Ongoing assessment of student support services and the utilization of assessment results for improvement.

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

The self-study discusses assessment of student support services. While the focus in the self-study is on undergraduates, many of the assessment and improvement activities for support services discussed also pertain to graduate students. More specifically, Section II of the Self-Study Report dealing with student services includes a presentation of assessment and improvement activities in fundamental support services such as dining and housing. Section V of the Self-Study Report examines undergraduate research opportunities and discusses and assesses the support environment for teaching and graduate assistants. The linked report summarizes the assessment of library support services for graduate education.
Standard 10: Faculty

The institution’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

1. Faculty and other professionals appropriately prepared and qualified for the positions they hold, with roles and responsibilities clearly defined, and sufficiently numerous to fulfill those roles appropriately;

   Standards for ensuring faculty quality are embedded in university policies for the appointment, promotion and review of faculty (section 60.5 of the University Policy Library (UPL) – see element 6 below). Faculty ranks/titles and their equivalencies are defined in section 60.5.2 and 60.5.3 of the UPL. The conditions of employment of faculty are set forth in section 60.5.4 of the UPL.

   The faculty survey provides each faculty member with the means to document their accomplishments and activities for required review in the tenure and promotion process. The faculty survey database provides fundamental data on the preparation and qualifications of Rutgers full-time faculty (see standard 7, element 1).

   Rutgers faculty compare well to faculty at other research universities in the receipt of nationally recognized awards. According to recent statistics supplied by The Center for Measuring University Performance, Rutgers ranks 22nd among public research universities in a collection of awards from prominent grant and fellowship programs in the arts, humanities, science, engineering, and health fields. Rutgers ranks in the top half of public AAU institutions in the number of memberships in the prestigious National Academies of Engineering and Sciences, the Institute of Health and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (Fact Book p. 130).

   The university employs over 2,900 full-time faculty and 1,750 part-time faculty. Of the full-time faculty, 2,360 are tenured/tenure-track faculty, 553 are non-tenured regular faculty, and 618 are research faculty. (Additional Faculty Data)

2. Educational curricula designed, maintained, and updated by faculty and other professionals who are academically prepared and qualified;

   Section 10.1.3 of the UPL designates the various schools of the university responsible for its instructional programs. School By-Laws describe the process for designing, maintaining, and revising curricular requirements and academic standards within each academic unit. The university senate is responsible for regularly reviewing and revising minimum standards of admission, scholarship and honors and provides an
advisory function on broad educational policy. (See section 50.2.2 of the UPL and the University Senate Handbook.)

3. Faculty and other professionals, including teaching assistants, who demonstrate excellence in teaching and other activities, and who demonstrate continued professional growth;

Rutgers faculty are regularly recognized for their teaching, research and service accomplishments. A sampling of these awards that recognize faculty achievements in teaching, research and service include: The Graduate School-New Brunswick “Awards for Excellence in Teaching and Graduate Research and Service”; SAS Awards for Distinguished Contributions to Undergraduate Education; SAS Faculty Awards; the Warren I. Susman Awards; and other University awards bestowed on faculty (2006 Awards; 2007 Awards). The annual commencement program (see page 63) recognizes faculty achievements during the past academic year.

4. Appropriate institutional support for the advancement and development of faculty, including teaching, research, scholarship, and service;

Institutional support for faculty comes from many quarters. The Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research provides critical resources to faculty. Graduate student instructors are assisted through the Teaching Assistant Project (TAP), which is an initiative that provides certificate programs, special issues seminars, web-based publications, and discipline-specific training. In addition, two mini-conferences (the Annual Teaching Assistant Workshop and the Annual Conference on Ethics in Teaching and Research) are offered to teaching assistants, graduate students, and faculty. Through the Faculty Academic Service Increment Program (FASIP), individual faculty are annually rewarded through compensatory increases for their contribution to teaching, research, scholarship, and service. The university has recently re-invigorated the position of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education and has undertaken steps to support faculty in their teaching of undergraduates. One sign of this support for undergraduate instruction is the inclusion of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education on the Promotion Review Committee (at page 13), a critical instrument in the appointment, reappointment and promotion of faculty.

The Academic Excellence Fund is a university initiative that provides seed funds for research, instructional and outreach initiatives of individual faculty.

Research activities of faculty are supported through the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate and Professional Education. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and the Office of Corporate Liaison and Technology Transfer provide a multitude of services and programs for faculty in support of their research and partnerships with industry and other third parties.

The President’s Research in Service to New Jersey includes two annual programs developed to support faculty in their research and outreach efforts to the state of New
Jersey. The President’s Program for Research in Service “provides seed funding for innovative proposals designed to apply the results of university research to serve New Jersey’s citizens and institutions.” The President’s Award for Research in Service to New Jersey “recognizes the exemplary work of a distinguished faculty member whose research has had a direct and demonstrable positive impact on the citizens of our state.” A list of past awards for both programs for 2006 can be found here and for 2005, here.

The university has implemented various initiatives over the years to support diversity in all areas of faculty work. These have included the Promotion of Women in Science, Engineering, and Math, and the establishment of the Office of Faculty Diversity Initiatives.

5. Recognition of appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, research, and service;

The fundamental method utilized by the university in recognizing the interrelationships among scholarship, pedagogic activities, learning, research, and service is through the Promotion Review Process (see Element 6 below).

6. Published and implemented standards and procedures for all faculty and other professionals, for actions such as appointment, promotion, tenure, grievance, discipline and dismissal, based on principles of fairness with due regard for the rights of all persons;

Responsibility for hiring and promoting faculty begins at the departmental level and proceeds through the Promotion Review Committee (PRC), which is chaired by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. See Sections 60.5.5, 60.5.10 and 60.5.11 of the UPL for procedures involved in the appointment of faculty.

Sections 60.5.5, 60.5.6, 60.5.7, and 60.5.13 set forth the procedures for the promotion of faculty to particular ranks and post-tenure review.

The criteria required for the appointment and promotion of faculty are described in section 60.5.14. Additional information about the evaluation of faculty in the tenure and promotion process is found in sections 60.5.15 through 60.5.18.

Collective Bargaining Agreements between the faculty union and the university set forth the conditions for operationalizing the above policies. Section XIV of the Agreement Between Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey and Rutgers Council of the American Association of University Professors Chapters July 1, 2003 - June 30, 2007 stipulates the specific steps to be implemented in the reappointment/promotion process. Sections IX and X of the AAUP – Rutgers contract articulates the steps to be carried out when handling faculty grievances. These CBAs establish pay scales for the various faculty ranks. In addition, the CBAs establish the Faculty Academic Service Increment Program (FASIP) as an additional method of evaluation and source of compensation for faculty.
In addition, the By-Laws of the faculty of the various schools at Rutgers establish advisory committees on appointments and promotions and describe the role each respective committee plays in the promotion and dismissal of faculty.

Instructions and forms for tenure and promotion are available online.

7. Carefully articulated, equitable, and implemented procedures and criteria for reviewing all individuals who have responsibility for the educational program of the institution;

Section 50.1.6 of the UPL specifies the responsibilities of unit deans. Dean vacancies are filled through an extensive and nationwide search process. Each unit dean meets annually with the Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs or their respective campus provost at which time their unit’s performance during the past year is evaluated and discussed. In addition, unit deans are evaluated on a five-year cycle in accordance with a process recommended by the University Senate. The process was first established in 2001 and then modified in 2004. For the current version of the process and its acceptance by the central administration see Report on Evaluation of Administrators by Faculty and Students and adoption by the central administration. The evaluation of the Dean is not a personnel evaluation, in the sense that it is not to be used as the basis for a personnel action. Rather, it is an opportunity to make a periodic assessment of the status of the Dean’s vision for the School, provide a balanced and constructive view of his/her Deanship, and make observations about where improvements could be made, noting things that work well and suggesting ways that some things might work better. The review is conducted by a special Dean’s Evaluation Committee (DEC) appointed by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Campus Provost with input from the University Senate Executive Committee. The majority of DEC members are faculty, but the group may include up to three administrators, students, and other constituents. See a schedule of decanal appointments and reviews.

Departmental chairs are evaluated by their faculty colleagues through the process of departmental faculty elections. A listing of department chairs and their starting dates can be found at this link.

Tenured and tenure track faculty are reviewed through the PRC process, which continues through post-tenure review (see element 6 above). Similarly there are regular procedures for review of full-time non-tenure track faculty (section 60.5.10 and 60.5.14).

Staff are annually reviewed through the Pay for Performance guidelines.

8. Criteria for the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness for part-time, adjunct, and other faculty consistent with those for full-time faculty;

The Agreement Between Rutgers the State University of New Jersey and Part-Time
9. Adherence to principles of academic freedom, within the context of institutional mission; and

Academic freedom is integral to the mission of the university. Its importance is put forth in the university policy statement on academic freedom and ethical behavior (section 60.5.1). The university senate advises the president on matters of academic freedom (see section 2.2.2 of University Senate Handbook).

See also standard 6, element 5.

9. Assessment of policies and procedures to ensure the use of qualified professionals to support the institution’s programs.

The University Senate conducts periodic studies about adequacy of faculty. Examples of these include:

- Review of Teaching Assistant Training February 2001
- Report and Resolution on Charge S-0308 “Procedures for Chair Appointments by Deans”
- Report on the proposals to make the Clinical Track available to the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology and to establish a new track of Professional Practice Faculty in both Business Schools and the Mason Gross School of the Arts
- Report and Recommendations on the Status of Full-time, Non-tenure-track, Non-clinical Faculty
Standard 11: Educational Offerings (Graduate Education)

The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities. These elements also apply to all other educational activities addressed within Standard 13.

1. Educational offerings congruent with its mission, which include appropriate areas of academic study of sufficient content, breadth and length, and conducted at levels of rigor appropriate to the programs or degrees offered;

   This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

As New Jersey’s only comprehensive public research university, Rutgers’ mission is to provide opportunities for both graduate and professional study in a wide range of fields on all three of its regional campuses. These programs are offered through 17 degree-granting units, and the faculties of three additional undergraduate professional units – College of Nursing, School of Engineering, and School of Environmental and Biological Sciences – teach graduate programs through arts and sciences graduate schools. The graduate programs annually enroll approximately 13,000 students. The programs offered within each school are designed to be consistent with the respective school’s mission. (see section 10.1.3 of the University Policy Library.)

Rutgers University offers several types of graduate and professional degree programs at different levels, including master’s degrees, first professional degrees, and doctoral degrees. Master’s degrees include the professional type which involves advanced study for practice in an applied field and the disciplinary type which involves advanced study in a particular discipline in the arts and sciences. First professional degrees are offered in law and pharmacy. Specific doctoral degrees are offered in education, musical arts, psychology, and public health. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy is offered in various arts and sciences disciplines. Scholastic requirements for students at different degree levels are determined by the Scholastic Standing Committee of the appropriate degree-granting unit. (section 10.2.1) Every degree-granting unit of the university utilizes a grading system for the appraisal of student work (section 10.2.2) and must establish policy and procedures for final examinations. (section 10.2.3) The credit value of each course (section 10.2.4) is determined by the respective unit that authorized the course on the basis of the time expected to be devoted to the course. Each degree-granting unit defines its quantitative requirements for graduation. (section 10.2.5) Each graduate and professional school may set residence requirements, or specify a minimum number of courses or credits which must be taken at Rutgers University toward its own advanced degrees.
2. Formal undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional programs—leading to a degree or other recognized higher education credential—designed to foster a coherent student learning experience and to promote synthesis of learning;

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

Each school has oversight of the programs they offer, with standards for curricular development and oversight and faculty involvement. (see standard 10, element 2) Graduate catalogs for each school provide listings of all courses offered and degree requirements.

All new programs go through an extensive internal planning phase and external review process that address issues of need, quality, student learning outcomes, assessment, and resources. (see Standard 2, Element 2)

Individual programs are largely responsible for fostering coherence and synthesis of graduate student learning. Some examples across the university include:

- Camden Biology
- Camden Business
- Camden Creative Writing
- Camden Liberal Studies
- Camden Psychology

- Newark American Studies
- Newark Nursing
- Newark Psychology
- Newark Public Administration
- Newark Urban Systems

- New Brunswick Classics
- New Brunswick English
- New Brunswick History
- New Brunswick Microbiology and Molecular Genetics
- New Brunswick Musical Arts
- New Brunswick Professional Psychology
- New Brunswick Social Work
- New Brunswick Statistics and Biostatistics
- New Brunswick Women’s and Gender Studies

- Newark and New Brunswick Accounting and Business
- Newark and New Brunswick Biological, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences (BioMaPS)
3. Program goals that are stated in terms of student learning outcomes;

   This is covered in Section VI of the Self-Study.

4. Periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of any curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences that the institution provides its students and utilization of evaluation results as a basis for improving its student development program and for enabling students to understand their own educational progress (see Standards 9: Student Support Services and 14: Assessment of Student Learning);

   Where undergraduate and graduate curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences are intertwined, these are covered in the Self-Study (section II, section VI). See also standard 9, element 10 for a discussion of assessment activities of student support services for graduate students.

5. Learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, library services, and professional library staff adequate to support the institution’s educational programs; and

6. Collaboration among professional library staff, faculty, and administrators in fostering information literacy and technological competency skills across the curriculum;

   This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

Educational offerings for graduate students at Rutgers are significantly enhanced by library services that support instruction and educational programs. The Rutgers University Libraries promote the use of information and learning resources and services accessible through its website, including point-of-need assistance for selecting and using appropriate resources and services. (For a complete listing of these features, see the report of the University Libraries.

Some University's twenty-six libraries and centers especially serve particular graduate units or programs. These include the Camden Law Library, the Don M. Gottfredson Library of Criminal Justice, the Institute of Jazz Studies collection, the Rutgers Law Library-Newark, and the Center of Alcohol Studies Library.

The Office of Informational Technology also plays an important role in supporting Rutgers educational programs for graduate students. Through providing instructional services to teaching faculty at Rutgers, OIT enables graduate faculty to incorporate the most advanced learning tools available into their curricula. OIT also provides support for computing labs throughout the university (Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick computing labs); and is responsible for many services that students, both undergraduate and graduate, use in their curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities (Computing services for students on the Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick campuses). In addition, individual graduate schools and programs at Rutgers offer their graduate students department-based facilities such as labs and other
learning resources that support the educational mission of their programs.

7. Programs that promote student use of a variety of information and learning resources;

This element for undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

For Graduate Education:

In addition to its libraries and the Office of Informational Technology, Rutgers promotes the use of a variety of information and learning resources, equipment, and facilities by graduate students. A brief sample of these resources includes:

- Research laboratories in Psychology
- Instrumentation Resources in Food Science
- The nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy on the Camden Campus
- The Marine Field Station
- The Center for Molecular and Behavioral Science
- The University Heights Center for Advanced Imaging
- The Southern African Large Telescope
- The Cell and DNA Repository
- The Keeck Center for Collaborative Neuroscience
- Microscopy Facilities
- Supercomputing Facilities
- Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum Collections
- Facilities for the creative and performing arts, including music, theater arts, and visual arts.

8. Provision of comparable quality of teaching/instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness of the institution’s courses and programs regardless of the location or delivery mode;

This element for graduate education is covered in Section IV of the Self-Study concerning Off-Campus and Distance Education.

9. Published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit. The consideration of transfer credit or recognition of degrees will not be determined exclusively on the basis of the accreditation of the sending institution or the mode of delivery but, rather, will consider course equivalencies, including expected learning outcomes, with those of the receiving institution’s curricula and standards. Such criteria will be fair, consistently applied, and publicly communicated;

At Rutgers, the transfer of credit and the recognition of degrees is not determined exclusively on the basis of the accreditation of the sending institution or the mode of delivery. Transfer credit and recognition of degrees considers course equivalencies, including expected learning outcomes, with the university’s curricula and standards. Policies and procedures regarding the transfer of credit are published in university
10. Policies and procedures to assure that the educational expectations, rigor, and student learning within any accelerated degree program are comparable to those that characterize more traditional program formats;

Accelerated dual-degree programs at Rutgers are carefully designed to assure that the educational expectations, rigor, and student learning are comparable to those in the regular formats. Admission standards for an accelerated dual-degree program at Rutgers may be higher than the regular program.

11. Consistent with the institution’s educational programs and student cohorts, practices and policies that reflect the needs of adult learners;

This element which applies specifically to undergraduate education is covered in the self-study.

12. Course syllabi that incorporate expected learning outcomes; and

13. Assessment of student learning and program outcomes relative to the goals and objectives of the undergraduate programs and the use of the results to improve student learning and program effectiveness (see Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning).

These elements are covered in Section VI (Assessment of Student Learning) of the Self-Study.

Educational Offerings (Additional Elements for Graduate and Professional Education)

The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Additional elements for graduate and professional education

1. Graduate curricula providing for the development of research and independent thinking that studies at the advanced level presuppose;

Graduate curricula are detailed in university catalogs and departmental websites for the Camden Campus, Newark Campus, and New Brunswick Campus.

2. Faculty with credentials appropriate to the graduate curricula; and

Preparation and qualifications for faculty is covered in Standard 10 Element 1.
Scholarship and competence for graduate instruction, including supervision of doctoral dissertations, are the bases for membership in the Graduate Faculty.

3. Assessment of student learning and program outcomes relative to the goals and objectives of the graduate programs (including professional and clinical skills, professional examinations and professional placement where applicable) and the use of the results to improve student learning and program effectiveness (see Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning).

This element is covered in the self-study in section VI on Assessment of Student Learning.
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Team Chair: Dr. James V. Maher
Generalist Evaluator(s): Dr. Deborah Leather, Mr. David E. Hollowell
Date of Documentation Review: October 29, 2007

Summary Overview

We are pleased to provide the results of our review of the standards either partially or not addressed in the Rutgers Self-Study. First, the staff at the University is to be commended for developing a comprehensive and thorough roadmap which made our review quite easy. Similarly, the staff was helpful and forthcoming on the day of our visit in providing clarification and additional information as requested.

For Standards Not Addressed Within the Selected Topics Self-Study

Standard 1 – Mission and Goals:

Yes, the documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.

Clearly defined and articulated mission that is reflected in the goals and plans for the institution. The mission, goals, and plans are periodically reviewed by the administration and overall campus community, and the goals and plans have been adjusted as needed.

It is suggested that the University review the realization of faculty R&D as it relates to federal grants and contracts. One of the three major aspects of the Rutgers University mission is to conduct cutting-edge research that contributes to the medical, environmental, social and cultural well-being of the state, as well as aiding the economy and the state’s businesses and industries. While this may be realized with the amount of R&D money derived from other resources, Rutgers is noticeably below the public AAU average for federal R&D.

Standard 2 – Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal:

Yes, the documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.
State-wide, University and unit planning appear well coordinated. Comprehensive physical master plan completed in 2003. All Funds Budgeting introduced over last few years to further decentralize budget authority and accountability. President provides annual report on progress towards stated goals.

Standard 3 – Institutional Resources:

Yes, the documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.

University benchmarks against other AAU institutions as a whole and against a set of aspirational AAU peers. University recently developed a comprehensive debt policy to guide its use of debt. Clear policies exist on distribution and accountability for various revenue sources. There is a major focus on developing a more robust fundraising capability and preparation for a new campaign. Review of last two external audit reports indicates unqualified opinions and no major findings. There is a concern about level of State support. Large swings in support from one year to the next makes rational budget planning difficult. Also concern that sharp drop in State funding for both operating and capital purposes will hinder facility development as detailed in the facilities master plan. As full team is reviewing undergraduate education, they may want to look at the facility related goals that are part of that plan and how they will be addressed with constrained resources. Relatively large pay increases, particularly in FY10 and FY11 will place further pressure on the budget.

Standard 4 – Leadership and Governance:

Yes, documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.

The duties and responsibilities of the governing boards and administrative officers are clearly defined. There is an active University Senate and other shared governance bodies on the various campuses. There is a comprehensive policy library that is easily accessible. Conflict of interest policies exist at many levels.

Standard 5 – Administration:

Yes, documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.

The number and qualifications of administrative leaders appears appropriate to the size and complexity of the University. Websites show clearly the organizational structure of the University. Some concern about the amount of turnover in the Senior VP – Finance & Administration position.

Standard 6 – Integrity:

Yes, documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.
Collective bargaining agreements and various policy manuals provide clear guidelines for employment practices, compensation, and rules of conduct. Practices are ethical and in compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. Student behavior expectations and grievance procedures are well documented and an Office of the Ombudsperson for Students was recently created. Student access is readily available to catalog and curriculum information. The teaching/learning climate is conducive to open communication and expression of ideas.

Standard 7 – Institutional Assessment:

Yes, documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.

The University’s goals and plans are clearly articulated for all campuses and are used at all levels of the institution from division to unit/college to program. The Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning (OIRAP) provides a systematic and thorough use of both qualitative and/or quantitative measures that help the institution assess how well its goals and plans are being achieved. Additionally, the OIRAP provides the necessary information, in user-friendly form, to the campus community so that it may make informed decisions. Data and narrative reports are clear, widely disseminated, and used in institutional planning and development as they relate to organizational progress and resource distribution.

Standard 8 – Student Admissions and Retention (Graduate Level Education):

Yes, documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.

The admissions policies and criteria are developed and implemented so that the prospective student may make knowledgeable decisions. The information on programs and outcomes (including required placement tests, credits required and other program requirements) is inclusive and readily available for all graduate level degrees. Information regarding financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds is readily available with directions to important offices to assist in application.

Standard 9 – Student Support Services (Graduate Level Education):

Yes, documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.

The graduate support services program relates to student needs and is available regardless of location or method of delivery. The professionals who supervise and provide these services are qualified. Procedures for advisement, grievances, and program support are equitable, suitable, and responsive. Policies and procedures regarding graduate student support services are widely disseminated in
paper and electronic formats. The OIRAP coordinates the ongoing assessment of student support services which is used to modify and develop services as needed.

Standard 10 – Faculty:

Yes, documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.

The faculty and other teaching staff are properly prepared academically. The roles, responsibilities, and standards for tenure/tenure-track faculty, part-time faculty, lecturers, and teaching assistants are specifically defined in collective bargaining agreements, university policies, and college and department practices. The “[s]tandards for ensuring faculty quality are embedded in university policies for the appointment, promotion and review of faculty.” (Rutgers Roadmaps for Documentation Review) The faculty to student ratio is impressive and above the average of the public AAU cohort. Academic freedom is integral to the learning environment.

The faculty within each college and school on all three campuses offer, maintain, and revise the programs of their respective curricula. The Rutgers faculty are surveyed annually to provide information on their teaching, research, service, and professional activities. The faculty, including teaching assistants, are recognized by their internal and external peers for their teaching, research, and service accomplishments at both the disciplinary and research university levels. The University Senate periodically performs surveys on the status of tenure/tenure track and non-tenure-track faculty.

While all the documentation was available concerning faculty ranks, responsibilities, roles, and procedures, that information is scattered and somewhat difficult to know where to locate, at least to the Middle States reviewer. It is suggested that the University provide faculty a more efficient way to navigate all faculty policies and procedures.

Standard 11 – Education Offerings (Graduate Level):

Yes, documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard.

The University offers a considerable array of graduate programs which support its mission and are conducted at levels of rigor appropriate to the programs or degrees offered. The GRE and GMAT scores for the last six years for entering graduate and professional students is above the national mean; where appropriate, accreditation by the national disciplinary organization has been achieved. There are adequate learning resources and support services for all locations and delivery modes.
The expected outcomes and requirements toward the degree are clearly articulated. Program curriculum is reviewed periodically through internal as well as external mechanisms.

While there are published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit, it is curious that the “Transfer of Credit” webpage for each of the campuses is composed differently. It is recommended that the University review those pages as well as the actual policies for consistency among the campuses.

One area for particular attention by the Visiting Team:

As part of the generalist review, it was not obvious where the review occurred for: 1) five year bachelor’s to master’s programs (e.g. Bachelor of Science/Master of HRM degree); 2) joint or dual degree programs at the master’s or doctorate levels (e.g. PhD in Urban Studies with NJIT and UMDNJ or internal joint degree programs); 3) accelerated degree programs (e.g. B.A. or B.S./M.P.P. [3-1-1] dual degree); or post-baccalaureate certificates. Since these areas were neither prevalent in the Roadmaps nor in the draft self-study, the generalists recommend that the Visiting Team take a closer look at these offerings as they relate to Standard 13.
UNIVERSITY RESPONSE

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Institutional Response to Summary Certification Report

We are pleased to respond to the results of the review undertaken by MSCHE team chair, Dr. James V. Maher, and generalist evaluators Dr. Deborah Leather and Mr. David E. Howell on October 29, 2007. We found their comments informative and we undertake this communication to address the issues/questions raised in their report.

The goal of the generalists’ visit was to review the standards either partially or not addressed in the Rutgers Self-Study. Their report acknowledges that our document roadmap, a compendium of over 800 online reports, findings, charts, policies, procedures, financial plans, budget processes, etc., documents our compliance with Middle States Standards. We are very pleased that the reviewers certified that the documentation demonstrates compliance with Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 10 and Standards 8, 9, and 11 at the graduate level. We address specific concerns about the Standards in the following responses.

Standard I – Mission and Goals

Reviewers note:

It is suggested that the University review the realization of faculty R&D as it relates to federal grants and contracts. One of the three major aspects of the Rutgers University mission is to conduct cutting-edge research that contributes to the medical, environmental, social and cultural well-being of the state, as well as aiding the economy and the state’s businesses and industries. While this may be realized with the amount of R&D money derived from other resources, Rutgers is noticeably below the public AAU average for federal R&D.

Our R&D funding is low compared to public AAU institutions primarily because we do not have a medical school, dental school, or school of public health. These schools typically account for 60-70 percent of a university's federal research support. On the other hand, on a per capita basis, particularly in areas like engineering and pharmacy, our R&D support per faculty member is quite high. Ironically, because of our close affiliation with the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, we actually lose credit for R&D support. For example, our faculty represent about 40% of the faculty membership, including a share of the leadership of the Cancer Institute of New Jersey, the state’s only National Cancer Institute-designated Comprehensive Cancer Center. All external support goes through UMDNJ, so we receive no credit in our rankings for any of the program, institutional, and multidisciplinary initiatives housed at the Cancer Center. The same is true for the multi-institutional School of Public Health, in which one of our faculty members, who is also an associate dean in...
the E.J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, serves ex officio as associate dean. Rutgers does quite well with state support, relative to our peers, and with our recently appointed Vice President for Research and Graduate and Professional Education, a newly reorganized Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, a newly appointed Vice President for Public Affairs, and several new key decanal appointments, we anticipate improvements in our federal R&D support in the near future.

Standard 10 – Faculty

It is suggested that the University provide faculty a more efficient way to navigate all faculty policies and procedures.

In 2005, in order to make university policy clearer and to specify who is responsible for the formulation, revision, and approval of university regulations, policies, and procedures, the university undertook a thorough review of the University Regulations and Procedures Manual, specifically the process by which policies and procedures have been cataloged, adopted, revised, and communicated.

The Manual has been renamed the University Policy Library to more closely reflect the online repository that it has become and it has been reorganized and renumbered into a library of functional-based sections under logical headings. Policies concerning faculty are found in Human Resources, Section 60.5: http://policies.rutgers.edu/contents60.shtml#5.

The generalists raised one final issue for attention by the visiting team:

As part of the generalist review, it was not obvious where the review occurred for: 1) five year bachelor’s to master’s programs (e.g. Bachelor of Science/Master of HRM degree); 2) joint or dual degree programs at the master’s or doctorate levels (e.g. PhD in Urban Studies with NJIT and UMDNJ or internal joint degree programs); 3) accelerated degree programs (e.g. B.A. or B.S./M.P.P. [3-1-1] dual degree); or post-baccalaureate certificates. Since these areas were neither prevalent in the Roadmaps nor in the draft self-study, the generalists recommend that the Visiting Team take a closer look at these offerings as they relate to Standard 13.

We note that Standard 13 (Related Educational Activities) covers Basic Skills; Certificate Programs; Experiential Learning; Non-credit Offerings; Branch Campuses, Additional Locations, and Other Instructional Sites; Study Abroad; Distance or Distributed Learning; and Contractual Relationships and Affiliated Providers. With the exception of post-baccalaureate certificates, the offerings mentioned in the generalists’ report, cited above, are covered under Standard 11 (Educational Offerings), rather than Standard 13.

The first and second Elements of Standard 11 cover dual and joint degree programs, and the tenth Element of Standard 11 specifically covers accelerated degree programs. The Roadmap for Standard 11 thus appropriately includes two relevant links, one for the joint Ph.D. in Urban Systems with NJIT and UMDNJ, and one for an accelerated dual degree program (B.A. or B.S./Master of Public Policy). Further, Section III: Undergraduate Educational Offerings and General Education (Standards 11 and 12) of the Draft Self-
Study Report (October 2007) and the Final Institutional Self-Study Report (January 2008) include a section on Dual and Joint Degrees and a link to the list of the university's Dual and Joint Degree Programs.

We also note that Section IV: Related Educational Activities (Standard 13) covers the university’s Certificate Programs.