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INTRODUCTION

In this section, we respond to and update two issues raised in the 2003 Periodic Review Report (PRR, pages 6 and 8):

- The potentially dramatic effects on Rutgers of a proposal made in 2002 by then New Jersey Governor James McGreevey to restructure the state’s research universities into three semi-autonomous and ultimately competitive university centers located in Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick.
- The need to assess the balance between an all-university identity, mission, and administrative responsibility with the need to foster and promote the special features and qualities of the Newark and Camden campuses.

Although these two issues are somewhat different in terms of their immediacy and significance (the state’s restructuring proposal is currently officially on “pause” and unlikely to be reactivated in the near future), they do converge on a broad and nearly universal concern of all large university systems—the need to regularly reassess structure and assure the proper balance between systemwide authorities (including identity and efficiencies derived from scale) with the granting of appropriate incentives, autonomy, and control at the campus level.

BACKGROUND

In October 2002, New Jersey Governor James McGreevy’s Commission on Health Science, Education, and Training issued a report recommending creation of a single public research university system with three distinct, fully comprehensive and largely independent university campuses based in Camden–Stratford, Newark, and New Brunswick–Piscataway. The current campuses of Rutgers University, the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ), and the New Jersey Institute of Technology (NJIT) were to be combined and then disaggregated geographically to establish the new system. Over a 15-month period, which coincided with President McCormick’s assumption of office and the completion of Rutgers’ 2003 Periodic Review Report (PRR), the Board of Governors and Trustees, Rutgers administration, faculty, students, alumni, and other constituencies engaged in intensive discussion and evaluation of this plan for the restructuring of the university into North/Central/South Universities, as recommended by the report.

In view of the consideration of the restructuring proposal then in progress, the report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education of August 2003 regarding our 2003 Periodic Review Report (page 8) noted that “the sweeping structural changes the Governor is proposing would have dramatic implications for shared governance structures and mechanisms.” It, therefore, recommended that “the issue of governance should be addressed by the self-study report and site visit team review five years from now.” Elsewhere in their report the reviewers of the PRR observed that implementation of the restructuring proposals would further complicate issues of intercampus governance. The reviewers of the PRR referred to “… issues raised by the 1998 Middle States review concerning the appropriate balance between Rutgers’ one-university concept and the responsibilities and autonomy of the three campuses.”

Under the heading of “Significant Campus Issues,” our 2003 PRR again called attention to the need to “assess the relationship between Rutgers–Newark, with its unique features and qualities, and the single university idea.” It noted that “the structure of campus autonomy in the context of
centralized planning and many centralized services within which Rutgers–Newark developed … is now in a state of flux and a process of administrative devolution is underway” (p. 6).

In December 2003, the Rutgers Board of Governors and Governor McGreevey announced jointly that the restructuring proposal was tabled, largely because of cost and governance concerns. In fall 2006, a task force on higher education, appointed by the state legislature, gave the concept of restructuring the state’s public research universities new attention. To date, the task force has not issued recommendations. There is currently no active state proposal for restructuring.

Nevertheless, the more general subject of intercampus governance, that is the balance between Rutgers’ one-university concept and the responsibilities and autonomy of the three campuses, continues to merit attention. This matter has been a clear focus of President McCormick’s administration since its inception. In a letter to members of the Rutgers community issued at the beginning of his presidency, he set forth “the devolution of authority from Old Queen’s to the university’s campuses and units” as one of the five key values that would guide his administration of Rutgers. This self-study has given us the opportunity to examine closely how this value is currently manifested. Moreover, our examination has allowed us to clarify responsibilities and functions under the principle of devolution in order to increase the ability of everyone in the Rutgers community to learn which offices and people are entrusted with which duties and to arrive at a better understanding of the importance of teamwork and collaboration, both of which are functions that President McCormick included in his five key values.

**ONE UNIVERSITY—THREE CAMPUSES**

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, is the premier public university of New Jersey and one of the oldest and most highly regarded institutions of higher education in the nation. With more than 50,000 students and more than 9,000 faculty and staff on its campuses in Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick, Rutgers is a vibrant academic community committed to the highest standards of teaching, research, and service.

Chartered in 1766 as Queen’s College, the nation’s eighth institution of higher learning, Rutgers is one of only nine colonial colleges established before the American Revolution. Rutgers became the land-grant college of New Jersey in 1864 and achieved full university status in 1924, a reflection of the institution’s rapidly expanding number of schools and academic programs. Legislative acts of 1945 and 1956 designated it as the state university of New Jersey. The University of Newark (now Rutgers–Newark) joined Rutgers in 1946, followed by the College of South Jersey (now Rutgers–Camden) in 1950. In a span of fewer than 50 years, Rutgers transformed itself from a disparate collection of schools, geographically dispersed and operating largely independently, to a prestigious educational institution. That advancement was recognized in 1989 when Rutgers was invited to join the top research universities in North America as a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU).

**NEW BRUNSWICK CAMPUS**

The birthplace of Rutgers, the New Brunswick Campus is the largest of the three campuses and the university’s historic and traditional center. Actually made up of five distinct campus sites, its settings include bucolic farms, sprawling suburban landscapes, and a big, bustling college town spanning the Raritan River and the Delaware and Raritan Canal State Park. Since 1981, undergraduates at Rutgers–New Brunswick have chosen among four colleges offering a broad liberal arts education—
Douglass, Livingston, Rutgers, and University Colleges—and schools offering specialized professional education in the agricultural, biological, environmental sciences; business; engineering; nursing; pharmacy; and the visual and performing arts. A reorganization of undergraduate education in New Brunswick, described in detail elsewhere in this self-study, aimed to reinvigorate the undergraduate experience for both students and faculty by combining the traditions and strengths of the four undergraduate liberal arts colleges into a single School of Arts and Sciences. This initiative has largely been accomplished.

The campus also offers a broad array of liberal arts and sciences graduate programs as well as professional programs in communication, information, and library studies; education; engineering; management and labor relations; pharmacy; planning and public policy; psychology; social work; and the visual and performing arts. In fall 2007, a total of 34,804 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at Rutgers–New Brunswick, comprising 69 percent of the university’s total student population. A total of 1,084 Ph.D. students were enrolled on this campus, comprising 90 percent of all Ph.D. students enrolled at the university. In the same period, New Brunswick accounted for 89 percent of all Rutgers students living in campus housing. In FY 2006, New Brunswick’s disciplines received $269.3 million in external funding or 88.5 percent of the university’s total external research funding.

NEWARK CAMPUS

Established in 1892, Rutgers–Newark today is housed on 38 acres in the downtown area of Newark, New Jersey’s largest city—located just 20 minutes from New York City. Undergraduates at Rutgers–Newark may enroll in one of four colleges: Newark College of Arts and Sciences, University College, College of Nursing, or Rutgers Business School. The campus is also home to the School of Law–Newark, Graduate School–Newark, School of Criminal Justice, and the new School of Public Affairs and Administration. Recently, the doctoral program at the School of Criminal Justice was ranked fourth in the nation by U.S. News & World Report. The same magazine has ranked the Rutgers–Newark Campus first in student diversity in each of the last 10 years.

In 2007, Rutgers–Newark was ranked 12th among small research universities in the new national Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index. The campus is also home to acclaimed research centers, such as those focusing on neuroscience, global affairs, metropolitan studies, and jazz. In fall 2006, Rutgers–Newark enrolled 20 percent of the university’s total student population.

CAMDEN CAMPUS

Located in the heart of the Camden waterfront and metropolitan Philadelphia region, Rutgers–Camden, the university’s campus with the smallest population and highest rate of student satisfaction, is a vibrant university campus, with an excellent reputation for teaching, research, and service. Locally, the campus’s outreach and engagement in community building, exemplified by the Rutgers–Camden Business Incubator, is a major economic engine for the city. Rutgers–Camden began in the 1920s as an amalgam of the College of South Jersey and the South Jersey Law School. Since these collegiate units became part of Rutgers in 1950, the campus has grown to include an impressive and ever-increasing portfolio of graduate and undergraduate programs in the arts, humanities, sciences, and business. In the fall of 2007, the campus welcomed its first Ph.D. students into its new doctoral program in childhood studies. The Rutgers–Camden campus is home to the only law school in southern New Jersey and is viewed nationally as a strong center of legal education.
**BEYOND THE CAMPUS BORDERS**

It should be noted that although the formal university structure acknowledges three campuses, Rutgers also has facilities and a strong presence in every county in the state and in many of its municipalities and communities. As part of its land-grant mission, Rutgers established the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station (NJAES) in 1880 to bring scientific rigor to farming practices. Today, NJAES serves as a center for research and information, enabling Rutgers and the state of New Jersey to fulfill a joint mission to provide solutions to agricultural challenges facing New Jersey residents. Its services are available through offices in all 21 New Jersey counties as well as off-campus research stations and an all-season 4-H camp.

Through its Division of Continuous Education and Outreach, Rutgers provides high-quality, off-campus classroom facilities that include smart classrooms, video conferencing, and internet connections back to campus. Current off-campus facilities exist in Freehold (Monmouth County) and Mays Landing (Atlantic County). Additionally, several academic units now offer internet-based courses through RutgersOnline, the virtual campus at Rutgers University. Some specialized noncredit certificate programs are also offered online. Online courses extend the services and reach of the university.

We take very seriously our role as New Jersey’s only comprehensive public research university. We view our mission as serving the citizens of New Jersey, statewide, with programs of education, research, and outreach at our core academic centers and integrated efforts that extend from these campuses to all corners of the state.

**CENTRALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION OVERVIEW**

Universities operating under the basic tenet of shared governance and inclusiveness, as does Rutgers, often struggle with the balance between central oversight and local autonomy. Clark Kerr, former chancellor of the University of California, defined universities as organizations in which faculty, students, staff, alumni, and, in the case of public institutions, elected officials, compete with administrators and each other for control. University systems, with separate and distinct campuses, deal with the additional complication of achieving appropriate balance between central governance and campus-level independence and identity.

As previously noted, President McCormick has adopted the principle of devolution as one of the cornerstones of his administration. Devolution is intended to provide the campuses with an appropriate level of autonomy and control, increasing the ability of local administration and faculty to accomplish their goals. It is intended to place responsibilities at the appropriate level of organization, to provide incentives for success, and to hold responsible units and individuals accountable for their performance. Devolution to local control and autonomy is intended to enhance individual initiative and motivation, permit rapid response to local conditions, and develop local cultures. But the organization must still strongly foster collaboration and interaction across the university. It must also retain for central administration those structures and controls that benefit from economies of scale, are required by external agencies to be centralized, or relate to maintaining a consistent vision, stature, support, and recognition of Rutgers University as an entity, including the preservation of its “brand name.”
Certain key areas of academic and administrative affairs have been devolved to the campuses. Examples are described in detail later in this document. As will be clear, some functions have devolved to all three campuses; others have been devolved to only one campus with the other two sharing a centralized function (one size does not always fit all, for reasons to be given). The university has determined that other areas of responsibility will be held centrally, for the reasons noted above. Examples include:

- Central board-level governance
- Legal counsel
- State and federal relations
- University-level public affairs
- Fundraising oversight and support
- Labor relations and union negotiations
- Accounting, internal control, and audit
- University-level promotion and tenure review
- Management of the library system
- Management of facilities construction
- Debt management
- Universitywide budgeting

The balance between central control and devolution is under constant review and, in some instances, remains a work in progress. The goal is to achieve the president’s mandate for appropriate devolution.

GOVERNANCE

BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees was the governing body of the university from the time of its founding as Queen’s College in 1766 until the university was reorganized as the state university under the Chapter 61 Laws of 1956. The 1956 state law created a Board of Governors as the governing body of the university, which formulates regulations and policies. It also 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 Board of Governors consists of 11 members, six appointed by New Jersey’s governor (with the approval of the legislature) and five appointed through the Board of Trustees, plus non-voting faculty and student representatives.
The Board of Governors currently consists of the following individuals.
(Degrees are shown only for Rutgers alumni.)

Richard L. McCormick, President
Margaret A. Coppolo, Douglass College, 2009, Student Representative–2008
Martha A. Cotter, Faculty Representative–2008
Albert R. Gamper Jr., University College–Newark, B.S., 1966
Rochelle Gizinski, Rutgers College, B.A., 1980
Leslie E. Goodman, Rutgers College, B.A., 1965; Graduate School of Management–Newark, M.B.A., 1970; School of Law–Camden, J.D., 1980
M. William Howard Jr.
Robert A. Laudicina, Rutgers College, B.A., 1963; Graduate School–New Brunswick, M.A., 1965

Duncan L. MacMillan, Rutgers College, B.A., 1966
Patricia Nachtigal, School of Law–Newark, J.D., 1976
Gene O’Hara, University College–Newark, B.S., 1962
Samuel Rabinowitz, Faculty Representative–2008
John F. Russo Sr.
Patrick M. Ryan
George R. Zoffinger

The Board of Trustees currently consists of the following individuals.
(Degrees are shown only for Rutgers alumni.)

Richard L. McCormick, President
Sol J. Barer, Graduate School–New Brunswick, M.S., 1972; Graduate School–New Brunswick, Ph.D., 1974
Felix M. Beck, Emeritus, School of Business–Newark, B.S., 1949; Graduate School of Management–Newark, M.B.A., 1953
Gregory Bender, School of Engineering, B.S., 1968
Joan L. Bildner, Emerita
Michael A. Bogdonoff, Rutgers College, B.A., 1980; School of Law–Camden, J.D., 1983
Floyd H. Bragg, Emeritus, Rutgers College, B.S., 1936
Elena Buchanan, University College–New Brunswick, B.A., 1970
Dominick J. Burzichelli, Cook College, B.A., 1984

Abena P. Busia, Faculty Representative–2008
John Herbert Carman, Emeritus, Rutgers College, B.A., 1960
Peter Cartmell, Emeritus, Rutgers College, B.S., 1943
Vivian A. Chester, College of Pharmacy, B.S., 1977
Gary M. Cohen, Rutgers College, B.A., 1980; Graduate School of Management–Newark, M.B.A., 1983
Kevin J. Collins, Emeritus, School of Law–Newark, L.L.B., J.D., 1964
Hollis A. Copeland, Rutgers College, B.A., 1978
Clinton C. Crocker
Dale F. Cruzan III, Cook College/School of Environmental and Biological Sciences, 2009
Anthony J. DePetris, Camden College of Arts and Sciences, B.A., 1984
Margaret T. Derrick, Newark College of Arts and Sciences, B.A., 1971
Carleton C. Dilatush, Emeritus, Rutgers College of Agriculture, B.S., 1940
Michael R. Dressler
Robert A. Druskin, Rutgers College, B.A., 1969
Robert P. Eichert, Rutgers College, B.A., 1978
Dennis M. Fenton, Graduate School–New Brunswick, Ph.D., 1977
Evelyn S. Field, Emerita, Douglass College, A.B., 1949; Graduate School of Education, M.Ed., 1965; School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, M.L.S., 1975
Ryan C. Fowler, Graduate School–New Brunswick, Student Representative–2008
Jeanne M. Fox, Emerita, Douglass College, B.A., 1975; School of Law–Camden, J.D., 1979
John R. Futey, Rutgers College, B.A., 1969; School of Law–Camden, J.D., 1972
Albert R. Gamper Jr., University College–Newark, B.S., 1966
Ronald W. Giaconia, Emeritus, Rutgers College, B.A., 1958
Rochelle Gizinski, Rutgers College, B.A., 1980
Gerald C. Harvey, Rutgers College, B.A., 1972
John A. Hendricks, Rutgers College, A.B., 1962
Robert A. Hering, Cook College, B.S., 1979
Mark P. Hershhorn, Rutgers College, B.A., 1971
M. William Howard Jr.
John J. Hurley, Rutgers College, B.A., 1972, Graduate School of Library Service, M.L.S., 1975
Jeffrey M. Isaacs, Livingston College, B.A., 1984
Paul Jennings, Emeritus, Rutgers College, B.S., 1945
Charles A. Jurgensen, Emeritus, College of Engineering, B.S., 1931
Wajdi W. Kanj, School of Engineering, 2008, Student Representative–2008
Kevin E. Kennedy, Rutgers College, B.A., 1987
Walter L. Leib, Emeritus, Rutgers College, B.A., 1951; School of Law–Newark, J.D., 1953
Richard A. Levao, Emeritus, Rutgers College, A.B., 1970
Christine M. Lomiguen, School of Engineering, 2009
Kimberly Banks MacKay, School of Law–Newark, J.D., 1995
Iris Martinez-Campbell, Livingston College, B.A., 1975; Graduate School of Social Work, M.S.W., 1981
Carol Ann Monroe, Douglass College, B.A., 1986; Graduate School of Management–Newark, M.B.A., 1991
Maggie M. Moran, Douglass College, B.A., 1996
Robert E. Mortensen, School of Education, B.S., 1963
Patricia Nachtigal, School of Law–Newark, J.D., 1976
Gene O’Hara, University College–Newark, B.S., 1962
Dean J. Paranicas, Emeritus, Rutgers College, B.A., 1973; School of Law–Newark, J.D., 1976
Barbara Pollison-Beck, Douglass College, B.S., 1982
Sidney Rabinowitz, College of Pharmacy, B.S., 1956
Richard J. Rawson, School of Law–Newark, J.D., 1977
George A. Rears, Rutgers College, B.A., 1989; Graduate School of Management–Newark, M.B.A., 1995
Norman Reitman, Emeritus, Rutgers College, B.S., 1932
Thomas A. Renyi, Rutgers College, B.A., 1967; Graduate School of Management–Newark, M.B.A., 1968
Dudley H. Rivers, Rutgers College, B.A., 1982
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Alvin J. Rockoff, Emeritus, Rutgers College, B.S., 1949
John F. Russo Sr.
Patrick M. Ryan
Kenneth M. Schmidt, Rutgers College, B.A., 1967
Daniel H. Schulman
Marijane Singer, Emerita
Susan Stabile, College of Nursing, B.S., 1984
Dorothy M. Stanaitis, University College–Camden, B.A., 1982
Robert L. Stevenson, School of Engineering, B.S., B.A., 1965
Sandy J. Stewart, Camden College of Arts and Sciences, B.A., 1981; Graduate School–Camden, M.S., 1987

Abram J. Suydam Jr., Rutgers College of Agriculture, 1951
Arthur L. Taub, Emeritus, College of Pharmacy, B.S., 1951
Anne M. Thomas, Emerita
Michael R. Tuosto, Emeritus, School of Business, B.S., 1962; Graduate School of Management–Newark, M.B.A., 1965
Laurel A. Van Leer, Cook College, B.S., 1982
Lucas J. Visconti, Cook College, B.S., 1982
Mark C. Vodak, Faculty Representative–2008
John E. Wade
Mary Vivian Fu Wells, Emerita
Curtis M. Williams II, Camden College of Arts and Sciences, B.A., 2007
George R. Zoffinger

PRINCIPAL UNIVERSITY OFFICERS

Rutgers Policy Sections: 50.1.3, revised 7/14/2006, and 50.1.5, revised 2/13/04, identify the seven principal officers of the university as well as their responsibilities as follows:

President

The President shall be the chief executive officer of the university as provided in the Charter and in the Bylaws of the Board of Governors and is clothed with corresponding authority. All assignments of duties to other officers in these Regulations shall be subject to the President’s interpretation and decision as shall the interpretation, within applicable law, of any regulation, policy, or practice of this university. The President shall have oversight of the relations of the university with governmental, community, philanthropic, and business institutions, the programs of public information throughout the university and official, non-academic university publications. The President also shall be responsible for providing policy direction and oversight to the university Division of Intercollegiate Athletics on the New Brunswick/Piscataway campus.

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Under the President, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be the Chief Academic Officer, Budget Officer, and the President’s deputy and principal adviser on all matters affecting the educational and academic operations of the university. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be responsible for the formulation and administration of university academic policy, in consultation with the Provost–Newark and the Provost–Camden (see policy 50.1.5, Campus Officers). In fulfillment of that role, this officer shall identify general goals and objectives for the overall academic programs of the university and shall advise, and act as the representative of, the President on academic matters affecting the several faculties and campuses of the university. Furthermore, this officer shall have direct oversight of undergraduate and graduate education, research, university budgeting, land-grant programs, libraries, enrollment management, financial aid,
student affairs, institutional research, continuing education, and schools, faculties, centers, and institutes on the New Brunswick/Piscataway campus.

**Senior Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer**

Under the President, the Senior Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer shall be the Chief Administrative and Financial Officer and shall have responsibility for the direction of the administrative and financial management of the university as distinct from its educational and academic administration. To this end, and in consultation with the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, this officer shall exercise the principal coordinating role in the day-by-day management of all administrative and financial matters affecting the university, insuring that the operations of the university are conducted in accordance with university policy. In addition, this officer shall administer the provisions of public laws and shall formulate and administer internal policies and procedures which apply to all persons employed by the university, shall direct the provision of diverse employee services, and shall designate individuals to represent the interests of the university in collective negotiations with organized staff employee groups. Furthermore, this officer shall have direct oversight of public safety, human resources, facilities management, capital projects, computing, and business services. This officer also shall be responsible for the financial management of the university including the controller’s operations, the treasury operations, risk management and insurance, and, for administrative purposes only, internal audit.

**Secretary of the University**

Under the president, the secretary of the university shall be responsible for supporting the activities of the Rutgers’ Board of Governors and Board of Trustees; coordinating university commencement and the honorary degrees nomination process; maintaining the University Policy Library; serving as the university’s custodian of records to ensure compliance with the New Jersey Public Access to Government Records Law, accepting service of legal process on the university’s behalf and forwarding legal documents to general counsel; directing the use of the university seal and attesting to the signatures of university official documents, preparing letters of introduction, directing the procedure for lowering flags to half-staff, and reporting the passing of a Rutgers community member.

**Vice President and General Counsel**

Under the president, the vice president and general counsel shall serve as the general legal officer to the Board of Governors, the president, and to other administrative officers of the university. The Office of the Vice President and General Council shall manage and supervise all legal affairs for the university; provide legal advice to the president, Board of Governors, and administration on a broad array of legal issues; and represent the university in all legal proceedings. The Office of Vice President and General Counsel strives to advance the mission of the university and its complex constituency by providing timely advice toward sound decision making in all issues that face a modern, public research university.

**The Provost–Camden**

The Camden provost shall be the principal university officer for the Camden campus in respect of academic affairs, student life, business management, campus security, and physical plant operations. The provost shall provide overall policy direction for the deans of the several schools, colleges, and faculties and for the directors of the aforementioned administrative departments on the Camden campus; shall administer personnel policies and procedures concerning both faculty and staff of those units and shall have responsibility for the proper maintenance of their personnel records; shall direct, with the advice of deans and directors, the planning and budgeting process for the campus as a whole; shall allocate resources among the several academic units and administrative departments; and shall
provide general supervision of all academic and administrative affairs of and between the several units and departments, to ensure that their affairs are being carried out effectively and in accordance with the policies of the university. The provost shall be accountable to the president of the university.

The Provost–Newark

The Newark provost shall be the principal university officer for the Newark campus in respect of academic affairs, student life and student services, human resources, business management, campus security, facilities/capital planning, and physical plant operations. The provost shall provide overall policy direction for the deans of the several schools, colleges, and faculties, for the directors of independently organized research units, and for the directors of the aforementioned administrative departments on the Newark campus; shall administer personnel policies and procedures concerning both faculty and staff of those units and shall have responsibility for the proper maintenance of their personnel records; shall direct, with the advice of deans and directors, the planning and budgeting process for the campus as a whole; shall allocate resources among the several academic units and administrative departments; and shall provide general supervision of all academic and administrative affairs of and between the several units and departments, to ensure that their affairs are being carried out effectively and in accordance with the policies of the university. The provost shall be accountable to the president of the university.

Additionally, the two provosts are members of the president’s cabinet and *ex officio* members of the all-university promotion review committee, which is the last body to review faculty applications for promotion before a final recommendation is made to the president and the Board of Governors, chaired by the executive vice president for academic affairs. As principal academic officers for their campuses, as stated in Rutgers Policy, Section: 10.1.12, Summer Session, revised 9/90, each provost is also responsible for the administration of a campus summer session.

UNIFORM FINANCIAL PROFILE

Rutgers University is one institution with respect to its financial profile. For purposes of financial reporting, the Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick campuses are not separate, stand-alone entities. They do not independently issue debt or borrow money.

Rutgers receives a single state appropriation for all three campuses. The allocation of these resources across the university has, historically, been a central function. In the past, the basis for this distribution has not been clearly articulated and, as a result, faculty and senior administrators on the Newark Campus and Camden Campus long believed that the university budget office, which serves as the budget office for both the New Brunswick Campus and the entire three-campus university, favored the New Brunswick Campus over the Newark and Camden campuses. President McCormick sought to address this perception by having the university’s chief budget officers develop a comparison of budget allocations across the three campuses. This analysis, which shows no significant disparity in the resources allocated to each campus, has been shared with senior administrators and faculty on the Newark and Camden campuses.

Historically, tuition revenue from all campuses and units was held centrally and budgets were assigned to each unit by the central budget office. Beginning in academic year 2003–2004, a new system of all-funds budgeting was implemented. Under all-funds budgeting 55 percent of tuition revenues is allocated to the units that generate the revenue and 45 percent is allocated to central administrative costs. The all-funds budgeting model also increases the return of grant overhead to the
units that receive the grants and has eliminated the universitywide practice of negotiated “special
deals” between investigators and central administration and replaced it with uniform rates of return to
units and local control of future distribution. Similarly, rates of return of net proceeds from summer
and winter sessions, off-campus programs, and other revenue sources have been increased and made
uniform across the university.

A key feature of the budgeting process has also been the closer integration of institutional
resources with accomplishment of academic priorities. To increase transparency, broad categorical
budget data (tuition income, state allocation, research funding, indirect cost recovery, etc.) are
provided to all the deans for all university units annually, and each school is required to have a
budget advisory committee to review and provide advice to the dean on resource allocation. Although
this budgeting process has been fully implemented through only two fiscal year cycles (with a third
one in process), most of our schools have adapted extremely well to the system, focused attention on
more effective allocation of their resources, and greatly increased attention to the sources of this
funding and the development of additional academically driven support. This new budgeting system
has resulted in some increased and more uniform distributions for each school. At the same time,
each school has been given responsibility for building its academic programs using this increased
funding.

Inevitably, however, there have been disagreements and tensions resulting from the
implementation of this system. First, change itself causes anxiety. Even though the previous system
was universally criticized for its opacity, inconsistency, and lack of local input or control, it was
familiar. Second, transferring responsibilities for more effective management of resources, along with
the additional support to local units, has raised institutional expectations of administrative and staff
performance. Third, while consistency and uniformity were widely lauded as a great advance, there
remains a residual culture of seeking special arrangements or deals. Finally, some members of the
community naturally expected (or hoped) that the new budgets would release vast new resources to
support new programs (in spite of many communications to the contrary), or would correct real or
perceived slights and neglect that had accumulated over a long period of time. While the reallocation
of resources during implementation of all-funds budgeting purposefully held every unit initially
harmless and resulted in at least some additional funding for all units, the fact is that there was little
flexibility in the budget prior to or after the shift to the new system. This misapprehension was
exacerbated by the fact that the past two years have been the most difficult for the university in terms
of state support.

Nevertheless, each year we seek to refine and improve all-funds budgeting and, with our newly
acquired experience, increase comfort with the system. Conversations among the three campus
leaders remain constructive and new suggestions for budgeting refinements are being addressed on a
case-by-case basis.

The all-funds model as first introduced dealt only with the academic units. An administrative all-
funds model is still in development. One complexity is that some administrative functions are
provided by the Newark and Camden campuses, and others are provided universitywide. In addition,
the law schools in Newark and Camden operate their own libraries, and the law and business schools
operate their own admissions offices. How to incorporate these needs into the budget system without
violating basic principles of consistency, uniformity, and transparency has not yet been resolved,
although some accommodations have already been made. These and other issues are being addressed
in the administrative all-funds model that is being developed.
ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The campus provosts and executive vice president for academic affairs act independently as the academic officers for their units, overseeing all aspects of faculty development, curriculum, and degree requirements. However, a universitywide Promotion Review Committee, with representation from each campus, makes final recommendations on all tenure and promotion decisions to the president and Board of Directors. This provides for a level of consistency, uniform expectations, and institutional imprimatur to all faculty appointments at the university.

Also curricular decisions are made at the campus level, there is ongoing discussion across campuses to assure coherent goals, to maintain an overall standard of quality commensurate with a degree from Rutgers, to promote relatively simple transfer from program to program, and to accommodate cross-campus articulation, joint, and collaborative activities (e.g. permitting students on all campuses to complete the same first two years of the 2 + 4 Pharm.D. curriculum).

UNIVERSITY POLICY LIBRARY

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.

After careful consideration of best practices used at other institutions of higher education and in keeping with the administration’s goal to streamline processes wherever possible, significant modifications in policy delegation at Rutgers were recommended. These changes are designed to benefit the operations of the university and provide policy and procedure information to students, faculty, and staff in a more logical, functional format. The Policy Delegation Program proposal was presented to the Committee on Educational Planning and Policy for consideration on May 26 and approved by the Board of Governors on June 9, 2005.

The University Regulations and Procedures Manual has been renamed the University Policy Library to more closely reflect the online repository that it has become. The manual has been reorganized and renumbered into a library of functional-based sections under logical headings. All policies have been transferred to a “policy template” which lends structure and ensures consistency from one policy to another. Additionally, the template format identifies Board, academic or administrative regulations and policies and identifies those individuals and offices responsible for formulating, revising, administering, and approving them. The university is continuing to review all policies to rescind those that are no longer applicable to university operations and to update the others. With regard to the substance of the policies themselves, the various constituencies affected will continue to be consulted for input on new, revised, or rescinded policies, and the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel will be consulted on policies with legal implications.

The University Policy Library is available at http://policies.rutgers.edu/. The policies are listed according to eight functional sections: academic; administrative; environmental health, safety, and parking; financial management; governance and legal matters; human resources; information technology, and university relations.
LABOR RELATIONS

Rutgers is unique among New Jersey’s higher education institutions in that, while its employees are state employees, it negotiates its own contracts with its bargaining units. Negotiations with unions representing employees of the other colleges and universities are carried out by the state. Rutgers has a total of 11 bargaining units representing its faculty, TAs and GAs, part-time lecturers, physicians, security personnel, staff, and others. While Rutgers’ negotiations are informed by those carried out by the state, the university’s special status permits the development of contract provisions better suited to the university’s status. Thus, for example, in contract negotiations concluded in fall 2007, with the AAUP-AFT faculty union, the union agreed to a smaller than expected salary increase in exchange for a commitment to invest the savings, plus an equal amount from the university, in hiring at least 100 additional faculty over the four year life of the contract. These employee contract negotiations are all handled centrally with advice and input from all campuses.

FACULTY AND STAFF PERSONNEL POLICIES

In accord with Rutgers Policy Section 60.5.5, the executive vice president for academic affairs ensures that all university academic departments follow the same procedures with regard to faculty personnel actions. University Human Relations is responsible for ensuring universitywide uniform staff policies. Devolution of authority is fully compatible with the maintenance of uniform policies and procedures, not only in these areas, but also as noted below, in several other significant areas.

DEVOLUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY IN AREAS UNDER THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR ADMINISTRATION AND CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

PURCHASING AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

The provost at Newark has assumed administrative responsibility in the area of business services, specifically purchasing, and even more significantly, in the area of university facilities on the Newark Campus. To a lesser extent, the provost at Camden assumed administrative authority for certain aspects of university facilities on the Camden Campus.

Rutgers Policy Section: 20.1.11 - Purchasing Policy, revised 12/22/06, notes that the Rutgers University Board of Governors delegates authority for the procurement of goods and services to the President and to the Senior Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer (Senior VP and CFO). The Senior VP and CFO is responsible for assuring compliance with the policies for the procurement of goods and services universitywide. The Director of Purchasing at Rutgers–New Brunswick and the Director of Purchasing–Newark (within specified limits), or a designated representative, are responsible for procuring all goods and services by placing orders with suppliers. To meet local campus needs, the Director of Purchasing–Newark has authority to approve purchases, purchase orders, contracts, and agreements that have a total value up to $250,000. All university departments and employees are expected to comply fully with the policies and established procedures.
related to the procurement of goods and services, including the use of the Rutgers Integrated
Administrative System, Procure to Pay process (RIAS).

Under Rutgers Policy Section: 20.1.2, Facilities & Capital Planning Services, revised 1998, while
adhering to university guidelines on bidding, procurement, design standards, and the like, the provost
of the Newark Campus is responsible for the following on the Newark Campus:

- Facilities maintenance services
- Acquisitions of land and leases with technical input from University Facilities
- Capital construction projects development and execution
- Master planning with technical input from University Facilities

With respect to Camden, under Rutgers Policy Section: 20.1.2, the provost of the Camden
Campus is responsible for facilities maintenance services. The central Office of University Facilities
is responsible for capital projects development and construction, as identified by the provost, land
acquisitions and leases, as identified by the provost, and master planning.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The Office of Information Technology (OIT) spans the three university campuses in Camden,
Newark, and New Brunswick and is headed by the vice president for information technology and
chief information officer, who reports to the executive vice president for academic affairs and the
senior vice president for administration and chief financial officer. OIT is composed of four units:
Strategic Planning, Office of Instructional and Research Technology, Enterprise Systems and
Services, and Campus Computing Services (CCS). Each is led by a university director who together
are responsible for IT strategic planning, research and instructional support, information protection
and security, telecommunication services, universitywide application services, universitywide
systems and operations, and student/faculty/staff computing services.

CCS is comprised of four divisions: Central Systems and Services, Newark Computing Services,
Camden Computing Services, and New Brunswick Computing Services. All campus-based units are
headed by a campus-based director, who reports to the university director of CCS. In Newark and
Camden, the campus directors have the complementary rolls of representing the interests of their
provost within OIT and representing the interests of OIT to their provost. This enables them to
simultaneously represent both their local campuses and the central administration of OIT when
developing and deploying information technology on their campuses. Given the essential
complementary rolls of the Newark and Camden campus directors, a dual reporting relationship (e.g.,
to their campus provost and to the university director of CCS) is being considered for these positions.

GRANT AND CONTRACT ACCOUNTING

Under Rutgers Policy Section: 40.2.11, Grant and Contract Accounting, revised 7/5/05, and a
memorandum of understanding between the senior vice president and treasurer (now the senior vice
president for administration and chief financial officer) and the provost at Newark, responsibility for
most aspects of post-award administration on the Newark Campus has devolved to the Newark Grant
and Contract Accounting Office. One systematic difficulty of grant accounting is the provision of
ample and timely information. Currently, there is inadequate information about both the income and
expenditures that support individual grant activities. It is especially difficult to track specific revenue
streams—both direct and indirect (facilities and administration)—needed to manage the grant activity
at the campus level and also at the departmental/principal investigator level. To a large extent, this is
a reflection of use of an outdated administrative data management system. The university has
committed to the upgrade of this system. The first phase, purchasing and accounts payable, is in place
and functioning well. A second phase, general ledger and financial data warehouse, is currently being implemented, and the university has now committed substantial funding and staff for future phases, including human resources/payroll, budgeting, and grant management, which will be put in place over the next three years. In this regard, a project implementation team and project management team will be appointed to design and implement the system. The implementation team will include functional and technical specialists from human resources, payroll, budget management, accounting and information technology. The project management team will provide project oversight and will include senior managers from the same functional and technical areas plus a representative from internal audit.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Rutgers Policy: Section: 30.1.2, Police Department, revised 10/19/01, authorizes the Rutgers University Police Department (RUPD), the university’s law enforcement and security agency, to operate on the Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick campuses 24 hours per day, 365 days per year, providing the university community with a full range of police and security services. Per the provisions of the policy, the RUPD operates from headquarters on the Camden Campus, Newark Campus, and New Brunswick Campus.

On the Newark and Camden campuses, the police chiefs report to the Office of the Provost while following policies, procedures, administrative practices, issues involving the collective bargaining agreements, and emergency operational plans as established by the executive director for public safety.

The Newark Department of Public Safety is responsible for the oversight of life safety responses, the University police department, security division, key shop, transportation services, shuttle bus transportation, and the introduction of a coordinated, campuswide card access program. Police, parking, and transportation services on the Camden Campus are provided through the Camden Division of Public Safety. On the Camden Campus the key shop is the responsibility of Facilities Maintenance Services.

Rutgers Policy: Section: 30.1.3, Emergency Services, revised 09/21/01, establishes the Emergency Services Department within Public Safety. The department administers four major programs for the university community. The Fire Safety Bureau is staffed by state certified fire inspectors and conducts fire inspections on all of the university campuses as well as the agricultural and marine field stations statewide. The Training Bureau administers courses in defensive driving, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), first aid, and other emergency service topics to the entire university community. The Emergency Response Bureau, comprised of the emergency response program and Emergency Medical Services (EMS), operates primarily on the New Brunswick campuses 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. The Emergency Response Bureau provides services such as command and control functions at incidents involving fire, medical, chemical, and rescue emergencies, motor vehicle lockouts, and elevator emergencies. During large emergencies on outlying campuses, the Emergency Response Bureau has responded to assist with personnel and equipment. The executive director for public safety is responsible for safety and security services on the New Brunswick Campus and for all services provided by the Department of Emergency Services.

The university’s Emergency Management Team works in collaboration with the university community, local governments, the state of New Jersey and the National Guard in mutual aid partnerships and conducts yearly exercises designed to better prepare Rutgers for any kind of emergency or disaster (i.e. an “all hazards” approach to emergency management). The Virginia Tech tragedy reinforced the value of these kinds of relationships and the need to consistently train with others. Following the tragedy, Rutgers conducted a full scale emergency exercise, with more than 200
participants that included elements similar to those that occurred at Virginia Tech and integrated additional complexities including fire, hazardous materials, emergency medical concerns and a host of other communication challenges. The lessons learned from this exercise, and the changes that were made to operational practices, were shared with mutual aid partners during post-exercise follow-up meetings.

Since the Virginia Tech tragedy, Rutgers also:

- Reviewed existing emergency management plans and “active shooter” policies
- Established another form of emergency notification by way of utilizing text messaging to augment existing methods of emergency notification (this system continues to be tested and validated)
- Reviewed the mental health services, staffing, availability of counseling centers and funding
- Was active in the development of the New Jersey Campus Security Task Force Report that was submitted to Governor Corzine in October 2007.

HUMAN RESOURCES

The associate vice president for human resources reports to the senior vice president for administration and chief financial officer. The office, University Human Resources (UHR), oversees functions that support university employees and promote a positive work environment for faculty and staff. UHR consists of the following units: the core HR services of benefits, compensation and classification, employee relations, and salary administration; the Center for Organizational Development and Leadership; the Faculty and Staff Assistance Program; the Office of Labor Relations; the Office of Employment Equity; and Sexual Assault Services, and Crime Victim Assistance.

The Newark Office of Human Resources reports to the Newark provost and is led by an associate provost for human resources who provides leadership and direction to that office. Working in consultation with UHR, the office is responsible for the local administration of many faculty and staff personnel issues and advises on universitywide policy development and compensation issues. Areas of local responsibility include recruitment, benefit advisement and assistance, professional development, and continuous improvement programs.

The Camden Office of the Provost recently appointed a human resources consultant who reports to the provost’s office and works with University Human Resources to provide assistance to both management and employees on basic human resource issues. The Office of the Provost also advises on universitywide policy development and compensation issues.

DEVOLUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY IN AREAS UNDER THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

The vice president for enrollment management directs the Office of University Undergraduate Admissions, the Office of Financial Aid, and the Office of the University Registrar. In addition, general policy and procedures for all three campuses are coordinated by the vice president. The
Camden and Newark offices of admissions, financial aid, and registrar report directly to their respective provosts. They do, however, utilize systems and services centralized in New Brunswick.

**University Undergraduate Admissions**

The Office of University Undergraduate Admissions currently functions as a centralized unit to recruit prospective applicants, process and review applications, render decisions, award university merit scholarships, yield admitted students, and satisfy the new student enrollment goals for the schools on the New Brunswick Campus.

In July 2003, as part of devolution, operating budgets and line personnel for the Camden and Newark admissions offices were shifted to the campus provosts. Their admissions offices then assumed responsibility for establishing and satisfying campus enrollment goals, developing admissions guidelines, managing application review, campus-based scholarship programs, on and off-campus recruitment events, open houses, yield activities, and developing campus publications, communications, and enrollment services.

The Camden associate provost for enrollment management and the Newark admissions director work closely with colleagues in Office of University Undergraduate Admissions in the areas of strategic planning, program coordination and enrollment management. Admissions counselors in all three campus offices continue to review first-year and transfer applications for all college choices. Counselors in the Camden and Newark admissions offices prioritize the review of first choice and single choice applicants to their regions.

Each campus develops a strategic marketing plan based on geodemographic and enrollment data. “High-yield” areas are identified for each campus so that regional market penetration is maintained. In addition, a universitywide database of prospective students is available and the admissions offices have the ability to segment or augment this pool for their communication needs. Recruitment territories are assigned to counselors based on several factors including campus interests and program priorities. Counselors in the Office of University Undergraduate Admissions are responsible for marketing and promoting the entire university as well as the New Brunswick Campus. Recruiters in all three offices represent the entire university, regardless of their campus affiliation. This allows us to maximize outreach and minimize duplication of efforts within recruitment territories.

**Office of Financial Aid**

In 2003, the Office of Financial Aid was restructured. As a result of that initiative, the campus director at Newark reports directly to the Newark vice provost and the campus director at Camden reports directly to the Camden associate provost for enrollment management. Presently, there is a “dotted line” relationship between the campus directors and the university director in order to ensure consistency in student aid delivery standards.

The university director of financial aid, located in New Brunswick, oversees all matters of technical operations; federal, state, and institutional compliance; student employment; and funds management for all three regions. All interactions with federal and state entities are conducted through the university director. Client service activities are the responsibility of the individual campus directors at all three regions. NCAA compliance and reporting is handled by the campus directors with technical support from the New Brunswick office.

The reporting and service relationships between New Brunswick and the campuses are the same, and local responsibilities are also the same. The role of the offices in enrollment management decisions specific to the campuses is handled at the campus level, as is the interaction of the campus financial aid offices with other campus administrative offices. All matters concerning personnel take place at the campus level.
University Registrar

The Camden Office of the Registrar and the Newark Office of the Registrar report to their respective provosts. The provosts’ offices have responsibility for registration and record-keeping activities. Both registrars’ offices have a “dotted line” relationship to the university registrar for coordinating registration and record-keeping schedules and activities. The university registrar supports both those offices in universitywide registration activities and documents such as computer support, registration schedules, diplomas, transcript forms, change of grade forms, etc.

GRADUATE ADMISSIONS

The admissions offices on the Camden and Newark campuses handle both undergraduate and graduate applications with ultimate accountability to the campus provost. The Office of Graduate Admissions in New Brunswick reports to the vice president for research and graduate and professional education. The New Brunswick Office of Graduate Admissions provides some central systems support to the Camden and Newark admissions offices, primarily through development of the online graduate application.

PRE–AWARD GRANT ADMINISTRATION

The Newark and Camden provosts along with the Rutgers–Newark Office of Sponsored Research and the Rutgers–Camden Office of Sponsored Research serve as pre-award administrative offices. Both campuses are authorized by the university to review and endorse all proposal submissions and award documentation. Their services include proposal preparation and electronic submission, budget preparation approval, award agreement negotiations, and training.

STUDENT LIFE

Responsibility for student life rests primarily with the provost or vice president responsible for each campus. However, many policies and the coordination of some student life functions are centralized in New Brunswick. Areas of student life that are coordinated centrally include the University Code of Student Conduct, disability services, compliance with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, student harassment policy complaints, and housing (but not residence life).

HEALTH SERVICES

In 2003, the university restructured Rutgers University Health Services as part of a larger program of devolution of authority to the campuses. Formerly a centralized unit operating under an executive director, the three student health services (Camden, Newark, New Brunswick) now operate independently, report to campus officials, and maintain independent budgets. The 2003 restructuring also had an impact on student health insurance, mental health services, and the occupational health program. The current organizational structure is as follows:

- The director of the Newark Health Center reports to the Office of the Provost in Newark and supervises the health service and campus-based occupational health and student health insurance programs.
- The director of the Camden Health Service reports to the Office of the Provost in Camden and supervises the health service and campus-based occupational health and student health insurance programs.
- The executive director of Rutgers Health Services in New Brunswick reports to the vice president for student affairs.
• The Office of Risk Management and Insurance supervises the student health insurance and occupational health programs in New Brunswick and provides consultation and support for the Newark and Camden occupational health and student health insurance services.

• Each campus health service separately pursues accreditation from an appropriate agency based upon the components of each health service.

• Each campus health service provides mental health and psychological services to its campus.

As a result of devolution, each campus receives a proportionate share of the student health fee and state support based on enrollment figures. Following a two-year transition period, certain services that were provided centrally, such as laboratory services, central administrative services, and health education materials, are now supplied and paid for locally on each campus.

There continues to be regular collaboration on issues that cut across all campuses. For example, a cross-campus committee is now examining options for a revised student health insurance plan with additional coverage options.

GOVERNANCE AND POLICYMAKING
IN THE RUTGERS UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

The Rutgers University Libraries are organized as a system across the three university campuses in Camden, Newark, and New Brunswick, all reporting to the university librarian, who, in turn, reports to the executive vice president for academic affairs. The libraries in Camden and Newark are headed by campus directors who share dual reporting relationships to their campus provosts. In New Brunswick, the university librarian heads the campus libraries. Associate university librarians, based in New Brunswick, serve as program officers coordinating assigned areas across the system and providing support to the university librarian.

The campus library directors administer the library operations on the campus, represent their library and the library system to their campus constituency, represent the interests of the campus to the libraries as a whole, and contribute their expertise to the development of the library system in support of the campus and university missions. Campus directors have authority to hire staff; library faculty positions need the approval of the university librarian because their tenure resides in the Rutgers University Libraries and not at the campus level.

The libraries’ success in these endeavors depends on the ability to address both local and systemwide needs effectively. Because each of the campuses has distinct priorities, missions, and needs, each campus director works closely with his or her provost to support those needs. Each director sits on the Council of Deans on the respective campus. The university librarian also works closely with each provost to assure that there is sufficient input for planning and collaborative efforts. There is a universitywide Libraries Advisory Committee that includes faculty representatives from all the campuses, the mission of which is to provide direct faculty input into library directions. In addition, two of the campuses have Faculty Council library committees that provide advice to the campus and to the library system. The libraries have liaisons to all academic departments on all campuses to assure there is sufficient input to library activities.
Associate university librarians in the areas of research and instructional services, technical services, and collection development each manage a universitywide council for public services, collection development, or technical services. The councils include appointed and elected library faculty and staff members from all campuses and are charged with coordinating and developing policies and programs in their areas.

The University Librarian’s Cabinet, the most senior administrative and coordinating group in the libraries, is responsible for determining programs and policies for the libraries. Membership includes the campus directors and the associate university librarians.

Budget allocations are made taking the needs of all campuses into consideration, and all campuses share responsibility for decisions about expenditures.

CONCLUSION

Absent any discernible movement toward revisiting the restructuring proposals by the state and governor, the system of strategic devolution we have in place has, on balance, served us well. It will continue to be refined and improved, and the university is committed to an ongoing process of addressing any remaining issues and those which will inevitably arise in the future.