

Report of the Evaluation Team  
To the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, and Students  
of  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Accreditation Review  
Commission on Higher Education  
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

Report prepared after review of the institution's self-study report and related materials and a visit to the university March 29 - April 1, 1998.

## **Rutgers University**

Founded as Queens College	1766
Named Rutgers College	1825
Named a Land Grant Institution	1864
Assumed University Status	1924
Named Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	1945
Joined AAU	1989

Rutgers University today enrolls nearly 48,000 full- and part-time graduate and undergraduate students on campuses in New Brunswick, Camden, and Newark, New Jersey. Students are ethnically diverse. More than 90% of the undergraduates come from New Jersey. Approximately 25% transfer to Rutgers, mainly from the state's community colleges.

Its full-time faculty numbers 2,400, two-thirds of whom are tenured. The university is served by 6,000 staff members, one-third of whom are minorities and 60% are women.

Rutgers' principal decision-making body is its Board of Governors designated by the State of New Jersey. Complementing its work is the Board of Trustees and the University Senate.

The university's budget exceeds \$1 billion, the bulk of which is derived from the state (36%), student tuition and fees (21 %), and federal grants and contracts (16%). Major categories of expenditure include instruction and departmental research (30%), student aid (16%), and sponsored research (10%).

Rutgers' serves the State of Jersey by a three-fold mission of instruction, research, and service. In carrying out this mission, the university is guided by the following principles:

- To conduct fundamental and applied research; to train scholars, researchers, and professionals, and to make knowledge available to students, scholars, and the general public.

- To maintain its traditional strength in the arts and sciences, while simultaneously developing such new professional and career-oriented programs as are warranted by public interest, social need, and employment opportunities.
- To make its educational programs accessible to an appropriately broad student body.
- To extend its resources and knowledge to various sectors of the public and to bring its expertise to bear on the solution of public problems.

**Members of the evaluation team**

Kenneth A. Shaw, Chair  
Chancellor, Syracuse University  
300 Tolley Administration Building  
Syracuse University  
Syracuse, NY 13224

Ms. Shirley Binder  
Vice President for Student Enrollment Services  
University of Texas at Arlington  
Box 19113  
701 S. Nedderman Street  
Davis Hall, Suite 300  
Arlington, TX 76019-0113

Dr. Mark L. Brenner  
Office of the Vice President for Research  
and Dean of the Graduate School  
University of Minnesota  
420 Johnston Hall  
101 Pleasant Street, SE  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. John A. Brighton  
Executive Vice President/University Provost  
Pennsylvania State University  
201 Old Main  
University Park, PA 16802

Ms. Meredith A. Butler  
Director of Libraries  
State University of New York at Albany  
487 State Street  
Albany, NY 12203

Ms. Ann Dodd  
Assistant to the Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Director of Quality Development  
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
CB #1000  
300 South Building  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-1000

Dr. Julia Gaisser  
Professor of Latin  
Bryn Mawr College  
101 N. Merion Avenue  
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010

Dr. Paul Gandel  
Vice Provost for Information Services  
and Dean, University Libraries  
University of Rhode Island  
15 Lippitt Road  
Kingston, RI 02881

Dr. Thomas C. Greaves  
Professor of Anthropology  
Dept. of Sociology-Anthropology  
Bucknell University  
Lewisburg, PA 17837

Dr. Robert Hampton  
Dean, Undergraduate Studies  
University of Maryland, College Park  
2130 Mitchell Building  
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Ann Weaver Hart  
Dean of the Graduate School  
University of Utah  
310 Park Building  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dr. Weldon Ihrig  
Executive Vice President  
University of Washington  
Gerberding Hall, Room 306  
Seattle, WA 98195

Dr. Arthur Johnson  
Professor, Political Science  
University of Maryland, Baltimore County  
1000 Hilltop Circle  
Baltimore, MD 21228

Dr. Rita Maldonado-Bear  
Professor, Finance and Economics  
Stern School of Business  
New York University  
95 Tam O'Shanter Drive  
Mahwah, NJ 07430

Dr. Gary Miller  
Assistant Vice President, Distance Learning  
Pennsylvania State University  
211 Mitchell Building  
University Park, PA 16802

Dr. Charles O. Rutledge  
Dean, School of Pharmacy, Nursing & Health Sciences  
Purdue University  
1330 Heine Pharmacy Building  
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Dr. Timothy Sanford  
Director of Institutional Research  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
CB #3350, 210 Carr Building  
Cameron Avenue  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599

Dr. Joseph F. Sheley  
Dean, School of Social Sciences  
and Interdisciplinary Studies  
California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street, Amador Hall 255  
Sacramento, CA 95819

Dr. Joan Hinde Stewart  
Professor of French  
North Carolina State University  
6 Logging Trail  
Durham, NC 27707

Dr. Moses Turner  
Dept. Educational Administration  
426 Ericson Hall  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing MI 48824

Dr. Henry Wiebe  
Engineering Management Dept.  
Room 223, Engineering Management Building  
University of Missouri, Rolla  
Rolla, MO 65409

## **Table of Contents**

	<u>Page</u>
I. Accreditation Report Overview	1
II. Introduction to the Team Report	4
III. Areas of Special Emphasis	5
A. Undergraduate Education	5
B. Graduate/Professional Education	17
C. Information Systems/ Information Technology	21
D. QCI	32
III. Special Interest Areas	
A. Assessment	36
B. Governance	39
C. Finance	42
IV. Campus Reports	
A. New Brunswick	46
B. Newark	49
C. Camden	52
V. Summary	56

Section IMiddle States Re-accreditation Site Visit  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey**I. Accreditation Report Overview**

The following report represents the views of the re-accreditation site visit evaluation team. It is first sent to Francis Lawrence, president of Rutgers University, and then to the Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. This is a confidential report developed for the benefit of the institution. It represents an evaluation of the self-study report, related institutional materials, and interviews conducted at Rutgers University March 28 - April 1, 1998.

The group was organized into three teams and deployed to the three campuses which make up the university. Team leaders were designated for the three sites for the self-study's four special topics - undergraduate education, graduate/professional education, information systems/information technology, and organizational quality and communication improvement (QCI). In addition, three team members took on the responsibility for evaluating the areas of governance, finance, and assessment. (The full team schedule is attached.) Each team member had many opportunities to interview Rutgers faculty, administrators, staff members, and students.

The Rutgers self-study report was comprehensive in nature and provided rich information about the challenges and plans for the university

as a whole and for each of the three campuses. The report was organized around four special topic areas:

### **1. Undergraduate Education**

- The curriculum: priorities and challenges
  - Communications skills
  - Mathematics and scientific literacy
  - Research and creative activity
  - Information and computer literacy
  - Multicultural understanding
  - International perspectives
  - Citizenship education
- Professional education and its relation to liberal arts
- Academic support and enrichment for a broad range of students
- University support of faculty instructional development
- Co-curricular and student-life programs Assessment
- University-wide priorities

### **2. Graduate/Professional Education and Research**

- Arts and sciences
- Centers, bureaus, and institutes
- The professional schools
- Recommendations

### **3. Information Systems (Libraries)/Information Technology**

- Context and current status: the libraries
- Context and current status: computing services
- Recommendations

### **4. Organizational Quality and Communication Improvement**

- The national context
- The New Jersey context
- The Rutgers context
- The Rutgers QCI Program
- University-wide initiatives
- New Brunswick campus
- Newark campus
- Camden campus
- Recommendations

The self-study also included reports from the three campuses. These, too, were organized around the special topics and included responses specific to the New Brunswick, Camden, and Newark sites. The campus reports also included specific campus issues and recommendations.

This evaluation report mirrors the self-study organization in that it includes a section on the four special topic areas, a section on three special interest areas - assessment, finance, and governance - and a section on campus issues.

## Section II

### Introduction to the Team Report: Major Recommendations and Suggestions

The team was unanimous in its praise for Rutgers University's hospitality, its high level of organization, and the planning that made our time on campus so productive. We are also grateful for the openness and candor of all the Rutgers people we talked with over the course of our visit.

Our observations, both those that are positive and those that raise some concerns, will be of no surprise to the Rutgers community. The reports and our discussions with Rutgers faculty, students, staff, and administrators have emphasized both at one point or another. We are intimately involved ourselves in most of the same challenges and we are all working, as Rutgers is, to preserve what is best about our institutions while moving forward in service to students, the nation, and the world.

First, we offer a general overview. Then we will deal with each of the themes put forward in your self-study document. We will also touch on the special issues of governance, finance, and assessment. Finally, we will comment on issues specific to each of your three campuses.

We emphasize that there is much to report on the positive side of the ledger, particularly as it regards the one-university concept and its component parts.

- The Rutgers student body is made up of bright men and women, and they have sufficient support to persist through graduation.
- Rutgers has loyal and supportive boards of governors and trustees.
- Rutgers offers high quality education for relatively low cost.
- Rutgers has significantly increased funds raised through sponsored research and sponsored programs (doubled since 1988).

- Rutgers has made major gains in fund raising (more than double the annual amount raised since 1988), setting the stage for a major campaign.
- Rutgers has a dedicated and scholarly faculty that is comparable to the best of the AAU institutions.
- The faculty are generously compensated when compared with other AAU public institutions.
- The faculty is highly diverse - it is a leader among AAU's in this area.
- The administration has provided much needed leadership during a time of strained finances.
- Rutgers has a supportive and competent staff.
- The university has the beginnings of a merit salary plan for faculty and staff.
- There is an aggressive computing resource plan.
- The administrative and staff budgets are relatively lean.
- The university's mission and goals, as well as the campuses' missions and goals, are well defined.
- There is one university strategic plan and non-reoccurring opportunities are used selectively to support high priority items that will help move the plan forward.
- There is a willingness to reallocate resources to meet short- and intermediate-term priorities.
- There is a set of university-wide learning goals and a small fund to stimulate activities which reinforce these goals.
- The Rutgers library system is highly regarded, ranking among the nation's best.
- Teaching resource centers are available on all three campuses

- Rutgers has made a good beginning in an effort to improve both quality of service and communication for its internal and external constituencies through QCI.
- There is a wide and impressive array of pre-college and academic support programs whose success can be measured in the institution's high graduation rates.
- Improved shared governance through the strengthening of the faculty councils, the university senate, and the president's advisory committee.

### Overall Concerns

#### *State Government*

While New Jersey and other eastern states have gone through serious financial challenges, the situation at Rutgers is made all the more difficult by the following:

- Higher education's share of state and local funding is less today than in 1988. (5.2% versus 4% in 1997).
- The funding mechanism is unpredictable (ie., the university cannot know when and if salary increases will actually be funded). This state of affairs makes it very difficult to plan and set priorities.
- Little financial support exists for capital improvements.
- The change in governance for New Jersey higher education has led to concerns that the state colleges will be permitted to offer doctoral and other advanced graduate programs thus intensifying the competition for scarce graduate/professional and research funds. (Given the cost of launching a new high quality new graduate program, we believe this is a legitimate concern.)

**Suggestion**

We suggest that the university intensify its efforts to communicate the Rutgers story so that state decision makers and the population as a whole become more fully aware of the institution's essential role as a catalyst for economic and social development.

*Internal Challenges*

The most difficult and important internal challenge facing Rutgers is the task of finding ways to derive maximum benefit from the one-university concept while simultaneously allowing each campus to develop according to its unique mission and goals.

Central initiatives in strategic planning, QCI, computing environments, teaching centers, priority budgeting, and the like are good examples of places where university-wide leadership incentives are needed. At the same time, the central administration, the campuses, and the various units within the campuses need to be able to build on their unique strengths. While this is an apparent anomaly, it is the only way for Rutgers to advance.

Shifting the balance too far in the direction of the one-university concept can weaken the units whose combined strengths must exceed the sum of their parts. Shifting the balance too far toward the campus and college levels could weaken the whole. Attempting to bridge these extremes means ambiguity, misunderstandings, turf conflicts, and inevitable concern over communication. But building this bridge is the only way to ensure that the campuses and the university will improve.

**Suggestion**

Everyone at Rutgers is obliged to work through the issues that will result and find ways to make the system work better. For this to happen,

there must be incentives provided to insure that both the one-university and campus/college concepts flourish.

The team does not presume to prescribe a correct way. Rather, we suggest that, by working through this and many other issues in an open and constructive manner, progress can and must be made.

### *Governance*

As mentioned above, shared governance has been improved through strengthening the faculty councils and the University Senate and through the creation of the President's Advisory Committee. However, Rutgers needs to acknowledge its distinct circumstances: a faculty collective bargaining agreement that defines much of the working conditions and relationships and a shared governance system for each campus plus another for the whole university.

This requires considerable effort and good will on everyone's part. In addition, to acknowledge this circumstance it is important to look at existing shared governance structures to determine how they can be improved or replaced should a better way be found.

### **Recommendation**

The team recommends that Rutgers continue to improve its shared governance structures and mechanisms and its inter- and intra-communications and observes that such improvements will require goodwill and constructive efforts on all sides.

### *Priority setting*

The Rutgers self-study offers an impressive array of items worthy of attention. There is no shortage of initiatives, and each is important and consistent with the university's mission and goals. However, given current financial limitations, a process of prioritization is essential at the university

and campus levels. And new initiatives must be compatible with the priorities as outlined in the university's strategic plan. We believe this is a very significant matter.

### **Suggestion**

Our report will outline our suggestions for possible initiatives. But, rather than accepting them as written, we believe that Rutgers will be best served by identifying the most important ones from the self study, melding this with those named in our report, and selecting those can and should be implemented first. Then the university must develop the mechanisms and timetables that will see these priorities through to fruition.

### *The 16 Standards*

The MSA Team has reviewed each of the 16 standards set by the Commission on Higher Education and reports that Rutgers is in compliance with all of them.

###

## **Undergraduate Education**

### Current Status

Rutgers University is a large, complex, and distributed institution. Its multiple undergraduate programs are spread over three geographically distinct university campuses and several separate and diverse colleges. Although degree requirements vary from college to college on a given campus, faculty and courses cut across college units. Significant faculty and student collaboration and exchange characterize inter-campus relations.

Dedication to undergraduate education in its multiple dimensions is visible on the part of faculty and administrators alike. Their commitment is characterized by innovation and tradition, both of which are enriched and tempered by awareness of the advantages and challenges of a university as complex as this.

The weight accorded undergraduate education is apparent in rich and varied curricular offerings, in the accessibility of good advising, and in the increasing university-wide attention paid to teaching effectiveness in the tenure and promotion process. Two aspects of undergraduate education are particularly deserving of commendation: 1. the emphasis on providing undergraduate student research opportunities and 2. in a more general way, the attentiveness of faculty and administrators to developing student leadership skills.

## Strengths

1. The fact that the university ranks among the highest in six-year graduation rates for full-time first-time students at AAU public universities and does extremely well with minority student retention is commendable. These high rates of student success can be attributed in part to the university's academic support services, communities of interest and the various services provided by the undergraduate colleges.
2. There is general agreement that the first year is extremely important for successful adjust to the university and for student persistence. The quality and quantity of programs are first rate and range from a three-day orientation program before classes begin to the first-year seminar Shaping a Life at Douglass College. The Freshman Seminar Program in Newark is also an important program for first-year students.
3. Teaching of undergraduates is very important across all three campuses and among the numerous colleges. Students find faculty available (personally and electronically) yet challenging and faculty enjoy being in the classroom and encourage students to join them in their research. The instructional rating system is valued by students, faculty, and departments and is being used in the tenure/promotion process. Faculty and departments seem to feel that this rating system has contributed to the importance placed on teaching at Rutgers. Finally, there seems to be good synergy between the residential colleges and the academic

departments in providing excellent curricular experiences both in the major and the general education level.

4. There are several activities underway to increase the number of students enrolled in collegiate, interdisciplinary, and departmental honors programs. These programs have an obvious value for recruiting talented prospective students. However, they have an even greater impact on the students and faculty who participate in these programs.
5. Through a variety of activities on all campuses the commitment to serving all students is evident. The largest and newest of the general access support services for student success are the Learning Resource Centers. These centers offer peer tutoring, individual and group assistance, and supplemental instruction to support the more difficult courses.

### Concerns

1. A high percentage -- 46% -- of undergraduate teaching is done by teaching assistants (TA's) and part-time lecturers (PTL's). At the same time, the university plans to increase the number of TA's to be more in line with other public research universities and to reduce its use of PTL's.
2. Although the majority of Rutgers undergraduates enter directly from secondary schools, a sizable percentage enter as transfers. Some transfers, especially from 2 year institutions, experience problems that range from fairly obvious enrollment management issues to questions regarding the transferability of credits.

3. Admission to Rutgers University is centralized, although there is an admissions office on each of the campuses. Duplicated review processes, which caused a delay in moving information to the colleges will be eliminated this fall and centralized review and notification will speed the process.
4. The lack of a sophisticated recruiting software program and an integrated student data base makes it difficult to respond individually to recruited students. New campus-based prospect systems and the recent purchase of the College Board's Enrollment Planning Services Software will assist in tracking students and in developing an overall geo-marketing recruitment strategy.
5. There is another concern related to the admissions process that appears to be related to how targets are set. Consideration should perhaps be given to involving undergraduate deans more actively in setting enrollment targets.

### **Undergraduate Education -- Newark**

A goal of the Newark campus is to increase the enrollment by one-half; from 9,326 in fall, 1997, to approximately 15,000 by 2005. Enrollment has dipped slightly over the past ten years and the composition of the student body has changed over that period of time to include more ethnic minority students and more women than men.

### **Strengths**

1. Newark is proud of its status as America's most diverse campus.” The campus has displayed a strong commitment to its highly diverse student population and its retention rates are impressive. In fact, retention rates are substantially higher not only than those of other urban universities, but higher than most other AAU public universities.
2. A caring faculty, strong support programs, careful testing and placement of entering students and the opportunity for students to be actively involved in research and/or internships on campus or in the local community are all distinct assets for the Newark Campus. In addition, high levels of student diversity are seen by students and faculty as a value-added experience

### Concerns

1. The concerns stated previously about centralized admissions and financial aid also pertain to the Newark campus.

### **Undergraduate Education -- Camden**

The Camden campus successfully delivers a range of undergraduate programs to a student body that is diverse in age, economic and personal circumstances, and ethnicity. Most are commuter students, and many work long hours in addition to meeting their academic obligations.

### Strengths

1. There is a high level of student satisfaction and a faculty seriously committed to undergraduate education. The graduation rate is high.

2. Camden has recently instituted an honors program, and has dedicated a floor of one of its dormitories to honors students, providing each with a computer and access to small and the Internet.
3. The Teaching Excellence Center is successful in helping faculty gain experience with new teaching techniques, including use of the computer and Internet.

### Concerns

1. Some basic academic and administrative services are not fully meeting the needs of all the students. The quality of academic advising is uneven. Students have difficulty learning to use the online library catalogue, books are often unavailable, and it typically takes a week or more to get a book.

### **Undergraduate Education -- New Brunswick**

While general education or distribution requirements vary from college to college at New Brunswick, there is significant overlap which makes for an array of programs displaying both unique college characteristics and significant similarities. The natural desire of each college -- both undergraduate and pre-professional -- to distinguish itself in a variety of ways results in a broad spectrum of opportunities for students.

### Overall Suggestions

1. The record of success in the area of undergraduate student retention and graduation can and should be continued. The newly-created University

Student Retention Committee should provide suggestions that will help maintain and improve this area.

2. As the self-study and members of the Rutgers community have indicated, there are a number of significant trans-disciplinary and organizational issues that must be addressed if undergraduate education is to continue to improve. Curriculum priorities and efforts to achieve more active learning opportunities for undergraduates can only be achieved by working with the faculty at all stages of the process. There must be ongoing support for faculty instructional development and appropriate incentives. There must be ongoing formative and summative assessments. In an era when needs will undoubtedly exceed resources, activities that yield the greatest return for investments in student learning must receive highest priority.
2. In view of the heavy undergraduate teaching responsibilities given to teaching assistants and part-time lecturers, it is important that Rutgers take steps to insure that both groups receive adequate support and mentoring.

## **Graduate/Professional Education**

### The current situation

The excellence of professional education, research and service in an array of professional schools is central to the University's mission. These programs educate thousands of New Jersey's citizens for social service, public, and private sector employment throughout the state. Professional schools provide application of knowledge based upon the best current research. In many cases, professional schools are involved with strong research programs that advance their fields.

The total number (head count) of graduate and professional students registered in 1997 on all three campuses was 12,629, with 4,487 classified as full time. Of these, 1,574 students were supported as fellows, teaching assistants or graduate assistants, with the 378 graduate assistants supported with federal funds.

There are over 100 centers, bureaus, and institutes (CBIs) at Rutgers. The CBIs present important opportunities to promote increased disciplinary and interdisciplinary research by providing a venue that enhances the likelihood that strong faculty from different disciplines will work together on common problems.

### Strengths

1. Restructuring has shifted resources and responsibility for graduate student support to the unit deans who are now directly involved with graduate education. The deans, who have primary control of unit resources, are now responsible for providing institutional resources for

graduate student support.

2. The Centers, Bureaus, and Institutes (CBIs) substantially contribute to the vitality, flexibility, and prestige of the university. Most of the CBIs attract resources and often serve as important interfaces to external entities. Outstanding faculty have been attracted to the unique activities and special resources available within the CBIs.
3. CBIs have been a valuable means to form partnerships with other institutions. Interdisciplinary graduate study and collaborations in research and program delivery are strong and expanding across academic programs; among academic departments, CBIs, and professional schools, and between institutions with complementary resources. This is particularly visible in Newark where the New Jersey Institute of Technology, the Medical and Dental University of New Jersey, and Rutgers-Newark have developed and continue to develop outstanding inter-institutional arrangements and partnerships with private organizations and the new science park.
4. CSPAD (Committee on Standards and Priorities) exercises quality control and review through the cross-campus review of programs. While a few examples of inadequate oversight of graduate programs were apparent, faculty, students, and staff universally praised the operation and effectiveness of this process. It serves as a catalyst to improve quality of the programs. Expanding the scope of the reviews to include CBIs as well as doing cluster reviews demonstrates a commitment to keep the review process relevant to the needs of the University.
5. Three campuses operating as one university offer unique advantage for the sharing of faculty and unique facilities. This is especially valuable for the creation of graduate examining committees that draw on faculty from

all three campuses.

6. Deans and academic units at New Brunswick now have the flexibility to rebudget funds within their units to address high priority needs. This situation has the potential to unleash significant creativity and productivity.
7. Merit-based salary adjustment demonstrates the university's commitment to promoting excellence

### Concerns

1. Support for graduate assistants and fellowships is inadequate. Non-supported graduate students often have to find employment unrelated to their graduate studies which limits the time they have available for the course work and research responsibilities. This can extend the time to degree. The amount of the typical stipend (\$11,086 for 1996-97) is also inadequate to recruit top quality graduate students and is lower than that at most of the top AAU universities.
2. The slowed pace in the acquisition of new library resources (serials and collections) threatens Rutgers' capacity to sustain the number of high quality graduate and professional educational programs.
3. There is the perception, if not the reality, that while the standards for the promotion and tenure process are uniformly applied across the university, the workload and available resources to support research and scholarly activities are not similarly assigned.
4. Distance education is underdeveloped for the contemporary needs of graduate and especially professional education. There is a need to articulate the elements that must be included to assure quality for all the graduate and professional educational programs.

Suggestions

1. The data on graduate students need to be expanded and made readily available to graduate programs and the unit deans. The team suggests this process be implemented.
2. The promotion and tenure standards should reflect the unique responsibilities and focus of the respective campuses. Similarly, resources should be allocated to support the unique responsibilities of the programs on each of the campuses
3. Both the total number of assistantships and fellowships as well the amount of the stipends need to be increased.

###

## **Information Services (Libraries)/IT**

Rutgers University has made a strong institutional commitment to address the challenges of the information age by taking steps to improve and expand the enabling infrastructures of computing, networking, and library resources. In many ways, the university-wide commitment to instructional computing and the general technology infrastructure have become forces for change and a catalyst for unity among the different campuses and academic units. Information technology and the university libraries represent two places where Rutgers is realizing the vision of a single university.

### **Libraries**

#### Current Status

Rutgers University libraries are acknowledged within the university and among their peers in the Association of American Universities and the Association of Research Libraries as comprehensive research libraries which provide excellent resources and services to support the research and teaching mission of the University. Significant progress has been made in the past several years to organize the eighteen Rutgers University libraries, geographically dispersed on three campuses, into a unified library system with a common library-wide information infrastructure. This unified library is further strengthened by a talented staff with a strong shared commitment to collaboration and the provision of quality user services, cooperative collection development, a fully networked electronic access system, and a well functioning delivery system for physical formats.

Collections are seen as generally adequate to support the extensive array of undergraduate and graduate programs at the university, but there is growing concern, especially among some graduate students and faculty, that the journal collection is no longer adequate to support their research. Rutgers' collections are supplemented by the collections of other distinguished research libraries nearby as well as by resource-sharing partnerships with the Research Libraries Group, OCLC, the Center for Research Libraries, and a host of regional consortia. Library staff work in close collaboration with university teaching faculty and seem to be well integrated into the governance and administrative advisory processes.

### Strengths

1. The university libraries seem to be well integrated in Rutgers' academic life and have significant visibility among faculty and students.
2. The university has invested significant funds in the libraries over the past decade to develop their technological infrastructure and enhance their facilities. The largest research libraries on the New Brunswick campus and the libraries of both the Newark and Camden campuses are attractive and functional new or newly renovated facilities. Large investments have been made in networking all eighteen libraries and in developing state-of-the-art electronic classrooms and laboratory facilities to create enhanced learning and teaching environments. These facilities also appear to be designed to be readily adaptable to tomorrow's technological needs. The university also funded the purchase and implementation of a new state-of-the-art electronic library system that can form the foundation of its virtual library.
3. The degree to which the libraries have achieved organizational integration

- is a significant strength, especially at a university as diverse and geographically dispersed as Rutgers. Such organizational integration allows the libraries to reduce administrative overhead, make best use of limited staffing resources, capitalize on technology investments, coordinate service delivery and provide a uniform standard of service quality at all library locations, and avoid unnecessary duplication of costly research resources. Continued organizational integration should be encouraged and supported.
3. Faculty and student respect for library staff was much in evidence, as was the library administrators' dedication, commitment, and enthusiasm for planning library services to be responsive to user needs. Librarians are embracing web-based technologies and resources. They are providing a broad spectrum of well regarded user-education instruction for students and faculty.
  4. Librarians are actively engaged in the academic life of the institution and maintain close collaborative relationships with the faculty of the various colleges, schools, and departments. The university librarian practices a collaborative style of leadership and encourages faculty and staff input into priority setting and decision making.
  6. The university librarian and her council are working collaboratively with faculty on a new strategic plan for the university libraries that should increase the library's visibility and further strengthen its position.

### Concerns

1. *Collections Support.* Historically, the Rutgers University libraries' collections budget has been well supported and equal to the task of supporting the teaching and research needs of a first-tier research

University. In the past seven years, many other priorities have competed for diminishing university resources. Rutgers has made a wise investment in network and-technology infrastructure and enhanced facilities. However, the investment in library collections has remained steady at a time of dramatic expansion of information products and extraordinary increases in the cost of these products. Annual cancellation of journals, especially those in the sciences, has contained costs. But this strategy has had significant negative impact on the libraries' ability to fulfill its mission and on the faculty's perception of the library as a reliable resource. As more of the libraries' collections budget is used to purchase fewer journals at higher cost, much less is available to purchase monographs, increase electronic options, or provide the materials needed for graduate research. The libraries' ability to provide research support for new academic programs is also compromised. This is a problem not unique to Rutgers and, in a time of diminished resources, one that is not easy to solve.

### Suggestions

1. The need for reinvestment in library collections must be addressed by base funding targeted for strategic investments in research materials and increased funding for resource sharing and document delivery rather than one-time opportunistic funding. Strategic planning efforts underway in the libraries should identify priorities for collection growth based on the university's strategic planning priorities and a three- to five-year plan for reinvestment should be developed using an all-funds approach. The new on-line integrated library system. SIRSI. can be used for gathering data about who uses the library's resources, the types of materials used in the collections, the location of demand, and the degree to which demand

- can be satisfied by extant collections, document delivery, etc.
2. The Library Strategic Planning Advisory Council should be encouraged to reach general agreement about the percentage of collections funds to be spent for monographs, journals, electronic resources and other types of research materials. These general guidelines must take the competing needs of undergraduate and graduate education, teaching and research, and disciplinary differences into consideration.
  3. Increasing collection development resources and the growth of library endowments should be a significant priority of Rutgers' capital campaign.
  4. Students on the Camden campus expressed unhappiness about their lack of timely access to library materials that support undergraduate education. Collection use data can be used to identify heavy demand items that may need to be duplicated. If duplication of resources is not a realistic fiscal alternative, the libraries need to focus on other, more timely means of access and delivery.
  5. Since the bibliographic record for approximately 30% of library holdings are not converted to machine-readable form and, hence, not available on the online catalog, Rutgers should invest one time resources in the conversion of these records to provide electronic access to all library holdings.

## **Computing and Technology Infrastructure**

### Current status

Rutgers University Computing Services (RUCS) provides centralized computing and telecommunications support across all three campus.

Services include voice and data networking services, timesharing and other

central computing functions, administrative applications, and instructional computing resources. RUCS has a talented staff with a strong commitment to collaboration and providing effective services despite limited resources.

Significant progress has been made in the past few years to expand and strengthen the university's computing and networking resources. Thanks to the implementation and effective use of a student computing fee, access to computing resources for students has been greatly expanded. Virtually all students now have and use e-mail accounts. The fees have also been used to increase the number of university-wide computer labs and enhance departmental instructional technology resources.

To support research computing needs, Rutgers developed an innovative program to encourage and facilitate the use of remote high performance computing facilities at other institutions. Capitalizing on grants and other one-time funding, the university was also able to make significant progress in expanding its networking capacity. It has also positioned itself to take a leadership role in the new national Internet 2 network initiative by successfully obtaining a high-speed networking grant from NSF. Unfortunately, given the size and geographic complexity of the Rutgers' campuses, much of the university still does not have adequate network connectivity.

### Strengths

1. Despite limited resources, Rutgers has strong technical leadership with a talented staff. Furthermore, there is a strong commitment to collaboration and effective services.
2. RUNet 2000 will address the very serious shortcomings of the university's current networking environment of restricted campus

- bandwidth and uneven or lack of network access in buildings and residence halls. The university community should be commended for making such a bold commitment to this ambitious and massive initiative. RUNet 2000, when completed, will clearly have a very significant and positive impact on the university's teaching, research, and service missions.
3. The new distributed model for technical support being piloted on the Livingston campus is an important first step in trying to address the service component issue that will be key to the success of RUNet 2000 and other university-wide technology initiatives.
  4. Creative steps have been taken to make the university's old legacy of administrative systems more responsive to today's business needs by providing add-on data warehousing applications and web-enabled front-ends. RUCS has also taken the necessary steps to ensure that all critical university administrative systems are year-2000 compliant.
  4. Rutgers University is placing high priority on the development of an information technology infrastructure that will help faculty and academic departments meet the changing needs of instruction in coming years. The university is to be commended for the creation of smart classrooms at the New Brunswick campus and, to a lesser extent, on the Newark and Camden campuses. Increased coordination among these initiatives should be encouraged. The strategic plan for undergraduate education, which places strong emphasis on active learning and inquiry-based learning, should help further focus the direction of future development of infrastructure and support.
  6. Distance education is a logical extension of the university-wide instructional technology environment. This includes inter-campus

delivery as well as the ability to extend programs beyond campus to the workplace and home. The university has created a central office to create a policy environment that will facilitate innovation in this area. The office has established several committees to study the issues associated with an expanded distance education effort. Meanwhile, significant progress is being made at the Newark campus. Plans to establish a video bridge at New Brunswick could significantly reduce transmission costs between Newark and Camden campuses, encouraging creative use of inter-campus distance education among distributed faculties.

### Concerns

1. Funding is a serious concern for RUNet2000. Clearly this is an extremely important project with high visibility and strong support from all levels of the university. However, thus far only half the total cost of this project has been identified. Even more important, the ongoing cost of operating and maintaining the network needs to be addressed. As RUNet2000 moves forward, it will also be important to develop university-wide consensus on scheduling guidelines and building priorities for a networking project that will take multiple years to complete.
2. The new pilot project to develop distributed support within key departments throughout the university will be dependent on two funding issues. First, enough central resources need to be identified to begin the timely funding of distributed support positions beyond the initial three departments. Second, this model calls for departments to take over the funding of these positions after the initial start-up period. In a time when departments seem to have little discretionary budget resources, there are

- serious concerns about the long-term economic viability of this approach to continued maintenance of a distributed support program.
3. The ability of the university's legacy systems to support new business practices will become an increasingly critical issue for the university. Finding the funds necessary to replace the old legacy system will be difficult given the other competing and important technological initiatives to which the university has already committed. Furthermore, finding and keeping enough qualified data processing personnel will be an equally important element to the success of any replacement strategy of administrative computing systems.
  5. Substantial effort and work has been invested in developing the ability of faculty to use the expanded instructional computing capabilities in ways that will support strategic change in the instructional environment. This effort is being pursued seriously by several different, but inter-related, units and committees. Their work has reached the stage where faculty and staff are confronting several key tactical challenges.
    - Coordination for development of instructional applications. While there are many inter-related committees at work on different aspects of this challenge, no single point of coordination, leadership, and accountability has emerged.
    - Funding for innovation. Thus far, most innovation in the development of new instructional applications appears to be funded through internal grants. It is questionable whether this can support the scale of innovation that is desired.
    - Diffusion of innovation and good practices. Innovation at the department and individual faculty levels has produced a number of success stories. However, it appears that these individual

successes are not being communicated to the academic community in general in a systematic way.

6. The use of information technology to extend programs into the community is becoming an important competitive issue for many public and private universities. The speed with which Rutgers articulates a mission and goals for distance education could affect its position, especially in the area of professional education. The financial system for outreach and distance education returns a percentage of net income to the central administration. There is little understanding of how this income is used, creating dissatisfaction with the income-sharing system and thus a disincentive to academic units to become involved. The financial system should be better rationalized and communicated.

#### Suggestions

1. Attention to the people side of technology initiatives through training and faculty and staff development will maximize effectiveness and support academic priorities such as learner-centered instructions.
2. Planning should begin now for a replacement, upgrade, and ongoing operation strategy for the RUNet 2000.
3. Careful priority setting and investment strategies to create new instructional applications must be addressed by the Rutgers community if the new electronic resources and planned infrastructure services are going to respond to initiatives such as learner-centered instruction and world-class research programs.
4. Consider external benchmarking. The struggle to set priorities among the various opportunities to stimulate innovation and change in the use of

instructional and information technology could be assisted by a focused benchmarking effort that will provide data on which decisions can be made.

5. Go forward with plans to develop a university-wide information technology advisory council and consider the development of more formal mechanisms for linking other technology committees and task forces to this university-wide council.

###

## **University Program for Organizational Quality and Communication Improvement**

### Current Status

In the early 90's a comprehensive review of university operations was conducted. This review revealed numerous complaints about administrative processes. As a result, the Committee to Study Routine Requests for Action was formed to address the issue. It recommended that a quality program be initiated to increase administrative efficiency and to enable the university to become more responsive to the needs of students, faculty, staff, visitors, alumni and other key University constituencies. This 1992 report was quickly followed by an edict from the New Jersey State Department of higher Education that all colleges and universities in the state should start quality improvement initiatives. In September 1993, President Lawrence created the University Program for Organizational Quality and Communication Improvement.

Under the direction of Dr. Brent Ruben, a professor in the Department of Communications, this initiative was structured with five interrelated major emphasis areas: 1. Organizational Assessment, 2. Leadership, 3. Work Processes, 4. Faculty/Staff Workplace Climate, and 5. Service Excellence.

The goals of the QCI initiative are to improve work and communication processes and to create a service-oriented culture in order to achieve desired outcomes such as those on page 2.18 of Volume 1, Overview, Executive Summary, and Special Topics Reports. There is much anecdotal evidence that the goals of the QCI initiative are being met and that quantitative measures of outcomes are being developed.

Each campus is at different stages in the implementation of QCI. Nevertheless, a significant number of participants from the various

campuses have taken part in the programs associated with each of these areas.

### Strengths

1. Programs to improve organizational effectiveness are, in general, difficult to implement and sustain. It is a testimony to Rutgers' leadership that the QCI program at Rutgers has been successfully launched and has been sustained and strengthened. The QCI staff has developed a framework that is customized for a research university, and this has enabled them to develop a strong infrastructure. As a result, there has been steady growth of the program in the service and support areas of the University.
2. Various initiatives such as the Retired Faculty Task Force, Faculty/Staff Recognition Program, the New Staff Employee Welcome Program, and a variety of training programs and workshops have been started. These initiatives have been successful in promoting a more collegial, service-oriented, responsive environment in some units. Already the nature and type of service being provided by campus support groups at New Brunswick and Newark has changed and/or improved. The simplest, yet significant, evidence of this is the improved way telephones are answered at New Brunswick.
3. QCI efforts have streamlined the graduate student application process to assure a 24-hour pass-along of applications to the graduate departments where admissions decisions are made. Increasing the number from four to eight staff serving students at the counter area has also enhanced financial aid processing at New Brunswick. All employees at Newark and the theater and art gallery staff and all student affairs employees at Camden have had initial QCI training. This has increased their

- appreciation of campus operations and issues.
4. A phased implementation plan exists for all three campuses as well as for University-wide initiatives. Furthermore, this plan has been adopted successfully by units with varied missions. A significant University-wide initiative planned for the near future is the Make Rutgers Your First Choice project aimed at prospective students. This will require coordination and cooperation among all three campuses to ensure that the potential benefits of attending each campus are clearly presented.
  5. Requests for help from the QCI program have increased to the point where the QCI staff is being stretched in their ability to respond in a timely fashion. This is perhaps the strongest indicator of a successful, growing program.

### Suggestions

1. Organizational effectiveness could be enhanced if QCI were linked and integrated with the university's strategic planning effort and to University Accountability and Excellence measures. This requires an assessment of the relationship and impact of university strategic planning initiatives against QCI goals. This linkage will allow the University to prioritize activities and allocate resources in a way that best serves the University's overall objectives.
2. There is a need to increase efforts to include all groups on each campus in the QCI effort. It is suggested that faculty and department chairs help shape the program agenda to ensure that their concerns are addressed. Such inclusiveness will help to integrate efforts to improve academic excellence with those designed to improve organizational effectiveness and efficiency, which is a major challenge for QCI.

4. Explicit measures and indicators need to be developed to track success in achieving QCI goals . Development of such measures sooner rather than later will permit the tracking of the implementation progress for the priority areas of improvement identified in Excellence In Higher Education assessments. Successful development of such measures also will allow QCI leaders to use successful examples to further promote its use.

###

### Section III - Special Interest Areas

#### **Outcomes Assessment**

##### Current situation

Rutgers has developed general guidelines and procedures for assessing institutional effectiveness with special attention to student learning outcomes. The assessment process is an eclectic one with little centralized structure. The university expects its individual units and departments to assess the effectiveness of the programs offered, to make sure that they are meeting their goals, and to determine that they are contributing to the overall effectiveness of the university. For the most part, this is happening.

##### Strengths

- 1) The university-wide student instructional rating system is coordinated by the Teaching Excellence Center. Students in all courses rate their instructors and courses every semester. The system has a core of ten questions plus an option of nine additional questions that can be added by individual departments. The results of these ratings are shared with the instructors and departments for instructional improvement and are used in the faculty tenure and promotion process.
- 2) The mission course Shaping a Life was instituted four years ago by Douglass College and was first offered to 100 students as a pilot project. It was then reviewed and revised. In the second year, the freshmen in Douglass were randomly split with half taking the course

and half not; these students were assessed for their reaction to the content and the instruction of the course, and then changes were made as indicated. These students are still being studied to determine the effects of the course on retention, graduation rates, and college loyalty, among other things. This is an excellent example of the way outcomes assessment should work.

- 3) At Newark, the QCI Excellence in Higher Education Self-Assessment Program identified seven areas in need of improvements. Five action groups have been appointed to develop plans to address possible changes in these areas. This, too, is a good example of assessment at work.
- 3) Academic program reviews are being conducted on a regular basis across the university by the Committee on Standards and Priorities (CSPAD). These thorough reviews include a unit self-study, external reviewers, presentation to the appropriate dean, and follow-up after one month and one year.

### Concerns

The Rutgers assessment process could be improved if additional attention were applied in two areas.

1. As stated in the self-study in the section on graduate/professional education and research, additional data are needed on outcomes related to graduate students and graduates of the campuses. There appears to be a genuine need for such data in the colleges and departments.

3. While the eclectic assessment process at Rutgers is a strength, it also results in an incomplete overall institutional effectiveness effort. Too much reliance on individual program assessments may mean that some of the university-wide questions are not being asked or answered. For example, the individual departments at Rutgers seem to have a good idea of how well they are doing with students. But there is less direct evidence of what it means to have been educated at Rutgers as a whole.

###

## **GOVERNANCE**

### **Current situation**

The university functions as a three-campus, one-university system. The principal authority for institutional decision making rests with the Board of Governors. The Board is composed of 11 voting members, six appointed by the governor and five elected by the Board of Trustees.

The Rutgers University Board of Trustees serves in an advisory capacity to the administration and the academic units. The Board of Trustees includes 59 voting members including public, alumni and three student members.

The university-wide governance body is the University Senate which includes elected faculty, students, alumni and administrators. There is also a faculty advisory committee to the president which includes three faculty members from each of the campuses. Decisions about courses are made at the school and college level.

### **Strengths**

1. In 1989, the New Brunswick Faculty Council was created. It is made up of 51 (now expanded to 78) faculty from the academic units on campus, and its function is to advise the provost. The Camden and Newark campuses have similar faculty representation for their campuses. These groups help to insure improved internal decision making and communications.

2. The provost position at New Brunswick was eliminated in 1996 and the university academic vice president then replaced the provost as the person who works with the Faculty Council. The university vice president for academic affairs and all of the New Brunswick academic deans attend every meeting of the New Brunswick Faculty Council. These new approaches are seen as an improvement.
3. College and school bylaws are in place to give faculty in the units responsibility for academic and curricular issues.
4. At New Brunswick, there is some optimism about the progress made by the Faculty Council and the administration in consultation and dialogs following the 1996 reorganization.
5. Faculty leadership is hopeful that the new faculty advisory committee will be a successful means of improving communications between faculty and administration.
5. The reorganization of the New Brunswick residential colleges under the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and giving greater authority to the New Brunswick unit deans have had positive results in the operation of the university, particularly the New Brunswick campus. Strategic planning and the work of the Committee of the Future has also produced new, opportunities for collaboration.

### Concerns

1. While progress has been made in improving faculty governance, the multiple bodies for governance such as the Board of Governors, the

Board of Trustees, the University Senate, and the faculty councils do add confusion about where consultation takes place.

2. While most acknowledge that shared governance structures have been improved, there is the belief that it can and must get better. Concerns regarding communication among the campuses, the nature of topics discussed, the handling of sensitive issues, and the uncertainty over power and responsibility leave room for clarification and improvement.

#### Suggestions and Recommendation

1. QCI programs should be considered a vehicle for bringing about a more collaborative approach between faculty and administration and among different faculty groups.
2. Where possible, the president and the vice president for academic affairs should meet with a small group of faculty leadership in making decisions in matters of high sensitivity. The team understands that the president asked the Faculty Advisory Committee to serve that role and they declined. As elected faculty representatives, they felt obligated to report on meetings to their campuses. Perhaps the president and vice president can explore other options for confidential consultation with a small group of faculty leaders.
3. As stated in the introduction (page 8), the team *recommends* that Rutgers continue to improve its shared governance structures and mechanisms and improve its inter- and intra-campus communications and observes that such improvements will require goodwill and constructive

efforts on all sides.

## **FINANCES**

Rutgers is a major research university competing effectively among the AAU universities nationally in spite of a history of limited support from the State of New Jersey. While the level of state support in itself could be addressed if there were an opportunity to plan effectively, the situation is compounded by the historic approach by the state over the past decade of unplanned, mid-year underfunding of the appropriated support. The good news is that the current state administration has worked to provide the amounts allocated over the past three years. Nevertheless, suspicions and uncertainties remain, impacting the university's approach to resource management.

Currently, the university negotiates faculty and staff labor agreements before it knows the level of state support. The salary agreements at Rutgers are traditionally influenced by the statewide contract negotiations. This has resulted in an average annual increase in salary of some 5% over the past decade, which has sustained Rutgers' faculty salaries as the highest among the AAU public universities.

The governor and/or legislature then may or may not agree to fund all or part of the cost of the salary levels negotiated. Even in years when there is agreement to appropriate state support for salaries, mid-year actions have revoked that support. The cumulative shortfalls over the past decade have underfunded state support by over \$76 million in the 1998 fiscal year,

which is 26% of the \$294.9 million appropriation. With this history, the state is now proposing to move the cost of employee benefits to the institutions. If accomplished, the fear is that this could result in even greater potential funding shortfalls for Rutgers in the future.

The university has acted to offset the underfunding in state support by increasing tuition to Rutgers' students and has reduced internal expenditures. The former actions have increased tuition an average of over 7.5% per year over the past decade, which is above the average inflation rate of 3-4% per year over that same period. The result of the state's actions has been to cost shift the funding of salary increases onto the students while cutting programs and services. Tuition levels are now fourth highest among AAU public universities, which could adversely impact student access.

The revenue trends show a decline in the proportion of state support and increases in the share of revenues from both tuition and sponsored research. However, the increases in sponsored research revenues cannot be viewed as offsets to the reductions in state support. Sponsored research revenues are restricted to funding the research that is contracted from the University and cannot be used to support basic instructional and support activities.

Within its limited resources, the university has used internal reallocations as a way to support new initiatives. The reallocation actions have been focused principally on moving resources from the administrative

support and physical plant areas to academic areas. The limited funding made available has been used primarily as a one-time investment for opportunities until other funding sources can be generated. Relying on the practice of removing resources from the support and physical plant areas to fund the academic needs could create serious service and facilities deficiencies which will eventually adversely impact the academic programs.

An example of underfunding the support areas is capital facilities. State capital funding has been inadequate, coming nowhere near its share of the university's over \$350 million in deferred maintenance, code noncompliance, and technological obsolescence problems in University buildings. Only 23% of the University's 10 million square feet of state supported teaching, research, and support facilities were constructed since 1980. Of the remaining 77%, some 42% were constructed between 1960-1980 and are in need of maintenance and modernization, as are several of the older facilities that haven't been upgraded.

As a result of the lack of state capital funding, Rutgers took action during the 1980's to debt finance facilities to support its academic programs. That action utilized most of the university's debt capacity severely restricting that funding option today, even after utilizing creative refinancing options. Rutgers' financial position, as reported by Moody's, is "highly leveraged." It states, "Unlike other state universities which receive state funding for academic buildings, Rutgers has taken on significant debt using its own credit for academic facilities." In its non-state-supported

facilities, the university has used revenues generated to fund on-going maintenance and modernization to minimize deferred maintenance backlogs.

The result of the above resource limitations is to negatively impact Rutgers' ability to act on new ventures and opportunities such as RUNet 2000, modernization of information support systems, matching donor's gifts in a fund raising campaign for new facilities, providing the facilities needed by the growth in sponsored research, and providing modern academic facilities to address student expectations.

### Suggestions

1. Rutgers must make difficult choices to make which will require a clear understanding of the strategic priorities and an ability to make tradeoffs among many excellent opportunities.
2. Rutgers needs to find ways to continue to generate even more opportunity funding, but in doing so it must consider the trade-offs involved by balancing the academic along with the support services and physical plant investments to avoid future problems.
3. At the university level, clarification is needed for faculty and staff about the decision-making processes and priorities for allocating resources, including feedback on opportunities not selected for funding.

###

## Section IV - Campus Reports

### **New Brunswick Campus Report**

The New Brunswick campus is administered through central university offices and campus-based operations. It has an enrollment of over 34,000 students representing approximately 75% of the total university enrollment. It is a Research I Campus which joined the Association of American universities (AAU) in 1989. External funding increased from \$78 million in 1988 to \$143 million in 1997. The New Brunswick campus faculty includes 18 members of either the National Academy of Sciences or the National Academy of Engineering. The 1993 National Research Council rankings of graduate programs placed nine programs in the top quartile.

The New Brunswick campus serves as the locus of the central administration which provides support for the other two campuses as well. The university vice president for academic affairs also serves as the New Brunswick campus leadership. The New Brunswick Faculty Council was created in 1989 and serves as an advisory group to the university academic vice president for the New Brunswick campus. The Camden and Newark campuses have similar faculty representation for their campuses.

#### **Strengths**

1. Undergraduate programs at New Brunswick are organized under four undergraduate residential liberal arts colleges. Under a reorganization of the New Brunswick campus in 1996, the reporting relationship for these colleges shifted to the dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

- Undergraduates enrolled in the professional schools affiliate with one of the residential colleges for housing and food service. In the reorganization the Faculty of Arts and Sciences dean also became dean of the Graduate School with the increased authority and budget flexibility given to the unit deans.
2. The New Brunswick campus attracts many highly qualified students both at the undergraduate and graduate level.
  3. The faculty are highly qualified and have been successful in attracting significant external funding for research. The faculty also take an active role in governance, particularly through the Faculty Council which seeks improvements in university functions and activities.
  4. The creation of Centers Bureaus and Institutes(CBI) has been helpful in promoting interdisciplinary research and collaboration among faculty in spite of their having created some tension regarding allocation of resources among the traditional units.

#### Concerns, Suggestions, and a Recommendation

1. The faculty have indicated a need for a more significant role in campus governance. This issue and a specific recommendation are referenced in other sections of this report.
2. There are insufficient resources to fund many worthy projects to further the quality and effectiveness of the mission of the campus. In this area, the reallocation of resources to provide funds for new projects has been helpful. Priority setting, with full understanding of the attendant

trade-offs, is essential.

3. Conduct a campus review of Centers, Bureaus, and Institutes for enhanced funding or phasing out as appropriate.

###

## **Newark Campus Report**

### **Current situation**

The Newark campus joined Rutgers University in 1946 and has evolved as a highly diverse, truly urban facility. It enrolls approximately 9,500 students, two-thirds of whom are undergraduates. It has become a major force for change in its community. At the same time, it is challenged by the symptoms of neglect that have become common for many major cities in the US, particularly in the Northeast.

### **Strengths**

1. Rutgers-Newark has a collaborative relationship with the Newark community that is a unique advantage of the campus and of Rutgers as a whole. This relationship has been consciously cultivated over a long period of time and pervades many of Rutgers-Newark's programs and services. The campus is actively involved in the revitalization of Newark as an urban community.
2. The campus enjoys the culture of an urban university that cares for and nurtures its students. There is much evidence of leadership, common vision, and commitment to a common purpose among faculty and staff.
3. The campus is involved in the University Heights Science Park. This Park represents an advantage to the university's research, teaching, and service missions.
4. Rutgers-Newark has created a cooperative effort among many of the disciplines, departments and schools. For example the Center for

Molecular and Behavioral Neuroscience (CMBN) has added a new dimension to the campus both in its cutting-edge and interdisciplinary research.

5. The campus is an important partner in the CHEN (Council for Higher Education in Newark) collaborative effort with NJIT (New Jersey Institute of Technology), UMDNJ (University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey), and Essex County College. This partnership extends the impact of the university in the Newark educational community and also expands the resources available to its students
6. Rutgers-Newark campus enjoys a geographical advantage in its access to transportation, trade and key cultural and financial centers. Many of its programs take advantage of this unique characteristic.
7. Rutgers-Newark displays an effective commitment to its urban environment. Evidence of this commitment includes its high undergraduate retention to graduation rates.
8. Rutgers-Newark has a long standing and well developed support structure to facilitate outreach for its academic units.
9. The campus library actively supports the campus's integration with the community by providing access to the community and to students at other institutions in the community.

Concerns:

- 1 To a great extent, the campus's engagement in the community and CHEN (Council for Higher Education in Newark) is the result of a long-

- term vision and commitment by the campus's leadership and by the leadership of collaborating institutions. The university should consider ways to deepen the involvement of faculty and staff in this partnership to ensure continued effective leadership.
- 2 Increased attention may be needed to sustain the urban mission of Rutgers-Newark as more emphasis is placed in research and graduate education.
  - 3 The growth in research and graduate education at Rutgers-Newark is outstripping its physical facilities. Research instruments lack adequate space, maintenance, and climate control, threatening the quality and safety of facilities. Given this growth pattern, delayed maintenance and capital facilities are a major concern.

Suggestion

1. Rutgers should continue thoughtfully and openly to address the sometimes ambiguous pressures arising from the single University ideal juxtaposed against the unique features and qualities of Rutgers-Newark.

###

## **Camden Campus Report**

### **Current situation**

Rutgers University at Camden is a small, intimate campus located in an area characterized by significant economic and structural difficulties. Physically the institution stands apart from its surroundings as a modern, well-kept, and relatively integrated collection of facilities and buildings. The vast majority of students commute to campus; few faculty live in the immediate Camden area.

The Camden campus serves southern New Jersey and has set as a priority increasing its regional and statewide visibility and effectiveness. It offers an array of undergraduate programs; several masters-level programs, including the MBA, and a Law degree. The faculty of 220 take great pride in their commitment to teaching and, within the one-university Rutgers culture, in their research productivity.

The University's location presents major challenges to the recruitment of students and the level of participation of the faculty in campus life. The importance of these efforts cannot be understated in the face of the campus's commitment to increase its enrollment by up to 1,000 students after several years of decline.

### **Strengths**

1. The campus boasts solid liberal arts and professional curricula, enthusiastic students, and a faculty that is highly committed to quality education and scholarship.

2. Students on average are afforded small classes taught by faculty committed to highly personalized and interactive instructional approaches. Interest in students' welfare is high, and students, in turn, are appreciative and proud of their university.
3. Recent administrative personnel changes have raised aggregate faculty morale levels. Collegiality is encouraged and apparent, and faculty members speak optimistically, if guardedly, about their campus's future.
4. The Camden campus's commitment to quality instruction is highly commendable. The commitment is exemplified, to a large degree, by the university's Teaching Excellence Center which focuses on promoting and supporting faculty expertise in teaching. Students are challenged by the faculty and register high levels of satisfaction with the quality of instruction and advising.
5. Members of underrepresented groups describe the campus climate as highly accepting and supportive of them.
6. Overall, the Camden campus has embraced the QCI concept. Many of the Camden staff have undergone QCI training; all new staff must undergo the training; and some staff have become certified as QCI trainers. There is, of course, much room for improvement. Travel time to New Brunswick causes scheduling difficulties for many Camden campus offices and their employees who cannot be served by campus trainers.

### Concerns

1. Many students registered complaints about their ability to access library services easily. Commonly, they felt intimidated by the size and scope of the library and by the need, in their opinion, for an unreasonable level of computer literacy in order to use the library.
2. Both students and faculty remarked about the frequency with which volumes pertinent to undergraduate education are unavailable in the library and the length of the recall period for these books. The problem seems linked to the extent to which other Rutgers campuses rely upon Camden's Robeson Library to meet the needs of their undergraduates.
3. Noting their commitment to quality research as members of the one university, numerous faculty members expressed regret that their research and subject-matter expertise is underutilized by Rutgers University. They would like very much to assist in the instruction, mentoring, and dissertation advisement of doctoral candidates at the University's other two campuses.
4. It is clear that many Camden faculty are interested in exploring new instructional technologies for their students. The two "smart classrooms" now on the campus are presently fully utilized. Many faculty members found it discouraging that the campus most directly involved with undergraduate instruction was not the beneficiary of the University's recent distribution of "smart classroom" equipment.

5. The campus's telecommunication system is seriously inadequate. Many faculty have no phones in their offices. Those who do are dependent on a switchboard that closes down at night.

Suggestions

1. The library should continue to explore ways by which to reduce students' anxieties regarding library services and to accept as a professional challenge increasing the "user friendliness" of the facility.
2. The library should explore the issue of availability of holdings to its undergraduates as potentially a university-wide problem and, to the extent necessary, to pursue remedies that underscore the university's long standing commitment to quality undergraduate education.
3. The Camden campus should work with the university to pursue better transfer articulation agreements with the community colleges that serve as its primary feeders.
4. The university should explore ways better to involve members of the Camden faculty who so desire in the education and training of doctoral students university-wide.
5. At the earliest possible date, the Camden campus should upgrade its telecommunication system.

###

## Section V

### **Summary of Recommendations and Suggestions**

#### *Overall Suggestions and Recommendation*

1. We suggest that the university intensify its efforts to communicate the Rutgers story so that state decision makers and the population as a whole become more fully aware of the institution's essential role as a catalyst for economic and social development.

2. Everyone at Rutgers is obliged to work through the issues that will result and find ways to make the system work better. For this to happen, there must be incentives provided to insure that both the one-university and campus/college concepts flourish.

The team does not presume to prescribe a correct way. Rather, we suggest that, by working through this and many other issues in an open and constructive manner, progress can and must be made.

3. Our report will outline our suggestions for possible initiatives. But, rather than accepting them as written, we believe that Rutgers will be best served by identifying the most important ones from the self study, melding this with those named in our report, and selecting those that can and should be implemented first. Then the university must develop the mechanisms and timetables that will see these priorities through to fruition.

#### **Recommendation**

1. The team recommends that Rutgers continue to improve its shared Governance structures and mechanisms and its inter- and intra-

communications.

### *The 16 Standards*

The MSA Team has reviewed each of the 16 standards set by the Commission on Higher Education and reports that Rutgers is in compliance with all of them.

## **Undergraduate Education**

### Suggestions

1. The record of success in the area of undergraduate student retention and graduation can and should be continued. The newly-created University Student Retention Committee should provide suggestions that will help maintain and improve this area.
2. As the self-study and members of the Rutgers community have indicated, there are a number of significant trans-disciplinary and organizational issues that must be addressed if undergraduate education is to continue to improve. Curriculum priorities and efforts to achieve more active learning opportunities for undergraduates can only be achieved by working with the faculty at all stages of the process. There must be ongoing support for faculty instructional development and appropriate incentives. There must be ongoing formative and summative assessments. In an era when needs will undoubtedly exceed resources, activities that yield the greatest return for investments in student learning must receive highest priority.

3. In view of the heavy undergraduate teaching responsibilities given to teaching assistants and part-time lecturers, it is important that Rutgers take steps to insure that both groups receive adequate support and mentoring.

## **Graduate and Professional Education**

### Suggestions

1. The data on graduate students need to be expanded and made readily available to graduate programs and the unit deans. The team suggests this process be implemented.
2. The promotion and tenure standards should reflect the unique responsibilities and focus of the respective campuses. Similarly, resources should be allocated to support the unique responsibilities of the programs on each of the campuses.
3. Both the total number of assistantships and fellowships as well the amount of the stipends need to be increased.

## **Information Systems and Libraries**

### Suggestions (Libraries)

1. The need for reinvestment in library collections must be addressed by base funding targeted for strategic investments in research materials and increased funding for resource sharing and document delivery rather than one-time opportunistic funding. Strategic planning efforts underway in the libraries should identify priorities for collection growth based on the university's strategic planning priorities and a three- to five-year plan for

- reinvestment should be developed using an all-funds approach. The new on-line integrated library system, SIRSI, can be used for gathering data about who uses the library's resources, the types of materials used in the collections, the location of demand, and the degree to which demand can be satisfied by extant collections, document delivery, etc.
2. The Library Strategic Planning Advisory Council should be encouraged to reach general agreement about the percentage of collections funds to be spent for monographs, journals, electronic resources and other types of research materials. These general guidelines must take the competing needs of undergraduate and graduate education, teaching and research, and disciplinary differences into consideration.
  3. Increasing collection development resources and the growth of library endowments should be a significant priority of Rutgers' capital campaign.
  4. Students on the Camden campus expressed unhappiness about their lack of timely access to library materials that support undergraduate education. Collection use data can be used to identify heavy demand items that may need to be duplicated. If duplication of resources is not a realistic fiscal alternative, the libraries need to focus on other, more timely means of access and delivery.
  5. Since the bibliographic record for approximately 30% of library holdings are not converted to machine-readable form and, hence, not available on the online catalog, Rutgers should invest one-time resources in the conversion of these records to provide electronic access to all library holdings.

#### Suggestions (Information Systems)

1. Attention to the people side of technology initiatives through training and

- faculty and staff development will maximize effectiveness and support academic priorities such as learner-centered instructions.
2. Planning should begin now for a replacement, upgrade, and ongoing operation strategy for the RUNet 2000.
  3. Careful priority setting and investment strategies to create new instructional applications must be addressed by the Rutgers community if the new electronic resources and planned infrastructure services are going to respond to initiatives such as learner-centered instruction and world-class research programs.
  4. Consider external benchmarking. The struggle to set priorities among the various opportunities to stimulate innovation and change in the use of instructional and information technology could be assisted by a focused benchmarking effort that will provide data on which decisions can be made.
  5. Go forward with plans to develop a university-wide information technology advisory council and consider the development of more formal mechanisms for linking other technology committees and task forces to this university-wide council.

### **Quality and Communication Improvement (QCI)**

#### Suggestions

1. Organizational effectiveness could be enhanced if QCI were linked and integrated with the university's strategic planning effort and to University Accountability and Excellence measures. This requires an assessment of the relationship and impact of university strategic planning initiatives against QCI goals. This linkage will allow the University to prioritize

activities and allocate resources in a way that best serves the University's overall objectives.

2. There is a need to increase efforts to include all groups on each campus in the QCI effort. It is suggested that faculty and department chairs help shape the program agenda to ensure that their concerns are addressed. Such inclusiveness will help to integrate efforts to improve academic excellence with those designed to improve organizational effectiveness and efficiency, which is a major challenge for QCI.
3. Explicit measures and indicators need to be developed to track success in achieving QCI goals . Development of such measures sooner rather than later will permit the tracking of the implementation progress for the priority areas of improvement identified in Excellence in Higher Education assessments. Successful development of such measures also will allow QCI leaders to use successful examples to further promote its use.

### **Outcomes Assessment**

(No specific suggestions made.)

### **Finances**

#### Suggestions

1. Rutgers must make difficult choices to make which will require a clear understanding of the strategic priorities and an ability to make tradeoffs among many excellent opportunities.
2. Rutgers needs to find ways to continue to generate even more opportunity funding, but in doing so it must consider the trade-offs

- involved by balancing the academic along with the support services and physical plant investments to avoid future problems.
3. At the university level, clarification is needed for faculty and staff about the decision-making processes and priorities for allocating resources, including feedback on opportunities not selected for funding.

## **Governance**

### Suggestions and Recommendation

1. QCI programs should be considered a vehicle for bringing about a more collaborative approach between faculty and administration and among different faculty groups.
2. Where possible, the president and the vice president for academic affairs should meet with a small group of faculty leadership in making decisions in matters of high sensitivity. The team understands that the president asked the Faculty Advisory Committee to serve that role and they declined. As elected faculty representatives, they felt obligated to report on meetings to their campuses. Perhaps the president and vice president can explore other options for confidential consultation with a small group of faculty leaders.
4. As stated in the introduction (page 8), the team *recommends that* Rutgers continue to improve its shared governance structures and mechanisms and improve its inter- and intra-campus communications and observes that such improvements will require good will and constructive

effects on all sides.

## **New Brunswick Campus**

### Suggestions and a Recommendation

1. The faculty have indicated a need for a more significant role in campus governance. This issue and a specific recommendation are referenced in other sections of this report.
2. There are insufficient resources to fund many worthy projects to further the quality and effectiveness of the mission of the campus. In this area, the reallocation of resources to provide funds for new projects has been helpful. Priority setting, with full understanding of the attendant trade-offs, is essential.
3. Conduct a campus review of Centers, Bureau, and Institutes for enhanced funding or phasing out as appropriate.

## **Newark Campus**

### Suggestion

1. Rutgers should continue thoughtfully and openly to address the sometimes ambiguous pressures arising from the single university ideal juxtaposed against the unique features and qualities of Rutgers-Newark.

## **Camden Campus**

### Suggestions

1. The library should continue to explore ways by which to reduce students' anxieties regarding library services and to accept as a professional challenge increasing the "user friendliness" of the facility.

2. The library should explore the issue of availability of holdings to its undergraduates as potentially a university-wide problem and, to the extent necessary, to pursue remedies that underscore the university's long standing commitment to quality undergraduate education.
3. The Camden campus should work with the university to pursue better transfer articulation agreements with the community colleges that serve as its primary feeders.
4. The university should explore ways better to involve members of the Camden faculty who so desire in the education and training of doctoral students university-wide.
5. At the earliest possible date, the Camden campus should upgrade its telecommunication system.

###