

University Senate Standing Committees' Second-Round Responses on Nursing Merger Proposal

Student Affairs Committee:

The Student Affairs Committee voted in support of the concept presented in the proposal to merge the nursing programs in Newark and NB.

The concerns are as follows:

1. There should be clear name/location distinction with the newly merged programs and the School of Nursing-Camden. Our suggestions were: School of Nursing-Newark/NB or School of Nursing-RBHS.
2. The name of the school on a student's diploma needs to be resolved for any current students. Will they have the name of their current school/program(the one they were admitted under) or the soon to be created merged school on the diploma? Will it be their choice which to have on the diploma?
3. Where will the newly merged school be centered in terms of physical location? How will this impact on other schools/programs located in the same places?

University Structure and Governance Committee:

Although helpful in some ways, the new report simply is not sufficient advance for earlier concerns to be assuaged. To take three examples:

- the new report announces that the President has "decided" that the two Newark Schools will merge: this must lie somewhere between thoughtless drafting and incompetence - the Senate has authority to regulate this, and we were previously told that the administration had come but late to realize this - apparently they have forgotten again

- in response to inquiries about potential Camden concerns over the proposed new name, the report merely observes that the new name is different from the Camden name; it neither acknowledges that there is a genuine concern, nor addresses how such a concern might be assuaged (and as we later saw in the Committee of the Whole discussion, Camden remains unhappy about the name)

- the response to our budgetary concerns appears to be that the administration is unconcerned - no great comfort really.

In light of all this, and our very limited time, the feeling at the USGC meeting was that a vote was premature, and could only possibly be conditional upon many unknowns. When pressed (in the belief that a vote was required) for a "balance of opinion" the 11 people present in our meeting yielded 8 prepared to conclude that merging was probably better than not, though

concerned that now was not the right time to conclude, and three who could not be persuaded to express an opinion at all.

From Committee-of-the-Whole Discussion at February Senate Meeting:

Academic Standards, Regulations, and Admissions Committee: Co-chair Martha Cotter did not express a committee vote on the overall question, but did say that there are many unanswered questions. The ASRAC also questioned why this must be done by July 1, 2014.

Instruction, Curricula and Advising Committee: Chair Natalie Borisovets said that her committee agreed the merger is a logical thing, but that the newly expanded proposal is not what should be expected on an issue as big as this proposed merger. She said that, while it is clear that not everyone is happy about this, they do agree it has to happen.

Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee: Member Karen Thompson said that the FPAC did not vote on the proposal, and would not until the Labor Management Committee had reviewed the plans in March.

Research, and Graduate and Professional Education Committee: Co-chair Jane Otto said that the RGPEC in February had voted unanimously to endorse the merger proposal.