

## Questions/Comments from Senate Standing Committees on the Proposal to Form the School of Graduate Studies

Compiled from Committee responses submitted by 9:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 29, 2016

### **Academic Standards, Regulations and Admissions Committee (ASRAC)**

1. Will Graduate Assistants supported by faculty from GSBS be able to join the AAUP after the merger?

*University personnel holding the title of "graduate assistant" are covered under Article III of the AAUP-AFT Agreement (the Recognition Clause) and thus those individuals would be covered after the merger, with any necessary changes in stipend and benefits to bring them into line with the current Agreement.*

2. Given the different funding sources, how will the School of Graduate Studies be able to ensure that all graduate students are treated equitably in terms of support and access to resources?

*We are working with the SVPAA to procure a central fund within the office of the SVPAA. This fund will allow us to provide more equitable support and services across SGS.*

3. Why must this be done so quickly? Wouldn't it be better to develop bylaws before the new entity is formed?

*A Task Force to develop a new set of Bylaws for SGS has been established. The Task Force includes faculty from both GSNB and GSBS. The Task Force will develop a draft set of Bylaws for discussion by the graduate faculty during the early part of the Spring 2017 semester. The goal is to have new Bylaws adopted by the time the SGS commences operations in July 2017.*

### **Budget and Finance Committee (BFC)**

1. In order for BFC to evaluate the suggested merger BFC members asked see the detailed budgets for FY 2015 and FY 2016 of the two schools.

*The GSNB FY16 budget for student services was approximately \$7.8M; in FY15 it was approximately \$6.5M. These funds support GSNB staff, health insurance for fellows, diversity fellowships, dissertation fellowships, conference travel, tuition remission for exchange fellows and Fulbright scholars, the comprehensive graduate writing program, and general operating expenses. In addition to GSNB's own funds, Rutgers-New Brunswick expends an additional ~\$57.4M to support 1,300 Ph.D. students via funding of TAs, internally-funded fellows, PTLs, and staff support for the graduate programs. These funds are allocated via the several Schools where the Ph.D. programs are housed. The GSBS FY16 academic expenditures were ~\$14.3M. These funds support services similar to those supported by GSNB (salary for staff and faculty administrators, travel awards, career development efforts for students and postdocs, and general operating expenses).*

*In addition, GSBS supports all Ph.D. stipends and health insurance for the first 12-18 months, tuition for AY 1-4 (faculty are now responsible for tuition on grants), and research supplements. Moreover, ~\$4.1M of the total was allocated to the professional schools to help support the teaching faculty. Finally, it should be noted that unlike GSNB, which is a RCM Cost Center, GSBS is a Responsibility Center with allocated RCM charges of ~\$2.8M in FY16. The FY15 GSBS expenditures were ~\$10.9M, with similar distribution except that RCM was not implemented in FY15.*

2. What are the services provided under the current structure of two graduate schools and what are the costs of providing these services? Please enumerate the cost and the benefits of the merger for each of one of services provided.

*Enumeration of individual services and their associated costs beyond what is outlined above and in the document provided is not feasible, particularly for GSNB where there is a mixture of centralized services, and services and support that are provided through the individual units that house the various graduate programs. For GSBS, the vast majority of services are provided by the graduate school.*

3. How does this merger change the fundamental fiscal problems that are plaguing the graduate programs in NB and RBHS?

*Budgets are currently balanced, but the burden of graduate student costs for supported students (i.e., primarily Ph.D. students) as reflected in high tuition charges is a serious threat to graduate education across Rutgers. The SGS – as a merged school – will be in a better position to negotiate ways to alleviate this problem.*

4. It seems that the current proposal makes no substantial changes to the current financial structure. While having a new name may be helpful, it is not clear how keeping all structures intact will strengthen any of the existing graduate programs.

*It is true that GSNB and GSBS have different financial structures relative to revenue – GSBS receives all tuition whereas GSNB receives no tuition, which goes instead to the several schools that host GSNB graduate programs. However, as noted in the answer to BFC question #1, the relative expenditure per student is commensurate, regardless of financial structure. Thus it seems that any disparities in student services between the two schools is not a result of the structure, but reflects either a difference in how the expenditures are distributed, or too little investment in graduate education. This is a complex issue, involving multiple units within entities (RBHS and Rutgers-NB) that have very different business models, and will require careful analysis to avoid changes that may have unintended negative consequences.*

5. We would like to know: What specific existing problems does this proposal address? Academic? Financial? Reputation? How these problems will be resolved by the merger?

*The problems are procedural, financial and reputational. From the procedural perspective, we have student record and reporting issues that should not exist in a graduate school at an AAU university. We must break down walls that have historically*

*existed -- and that still persist today. From the financial perspective, students are not being treated equitably in some cases. The financial issues are primarily reflected in a few cases where student services are less than equitable. From the reputational perspective, we seek to form a support structure for the graduate education enterprise that puts us on par with our AAU peers.*

6. The proposal notes that one benefit will be to remove obstacles. What are they? And can they be resolved without merging?

*See answer to BFC question #5, above.*

7. What are the benefits (from the RCM budgeting viewpoint) to the proposed reporting structure to two chancellors?

*Formal and substantive academic reporting will be to the SVPAA. But since the funds ultimately flow from 2 Chancellors, and the faculty within the graduate school have primary appointments in schools that are overseen by the two chancellors, it is important that there be a dotted line report to each of them to assure continued recognition and support of graduate education.*

8. What will be the impact of the merged unit on similar graduate schools in Camden and in Newark?

*No impact at all. These remain autonomous graduate schools with their distinctive missions.*

9. Will this merger lead to changes in the assessment and quality assurance of graduate programs and in the decision process for creating new programs and ending existing ones?

*Both schools have robust assessment in place. We will work towards a common assessment rubric for the SGS, with an acknowledgement of disciplinary differences. The ultimate goal would be to ensure equivalent levels of review/approval for all graduate programs within SGS.*

### **Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC)**

1. The committee wanted the Deans of GSNB and GSBS to present to the committee greater detail of the rationale and vision for the combined graduate school. The question regarded why do these units need to merge and the committee wanted greater detail on which programs will be covered by the merger.

*The rationale is as stated in the proposal. The following graduate programs will be based in SGS: Anthropology; Art History; Atmospheric Science; Biochemistry; Bioenvironmental Engineering; Biomedical Engineering; Business and Science; Cell and Developmental Biology; Cell Biology, Neuroscience and Physiology; Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology; Chemical and Biochemical Engineering; Chemistry and Chemical Biology; Chinese; Civil and Environmental Engineering; Classics; Communication, Information and Library Studies (Ph.D.); Comparative Literature;*

*Computer Science; East Asian Languages and Cultures; Ecology and Evolution; Economics; Education (Ph.D.); Electrical and Computer Engineering; Endocrinology and Animal Biosciences; Entomology; Environmental Science; Financial Statistics and Risk Management; Food and Business Economics; Food Science; French; Geography; Geological Sciences; German; Higher Education (Ph.D.); History; Industrial and Systems Engineering; Industrial Relations and Human Resources (Ph.D.); Infection, Immunity and Inflammation; Italian; Jewish Studies; Kinesiology and Applied Physiology; Landscape Architecture (M.L.A.); Linguistics; Literatures in English; Materials Science and Engineering; Mathematical Finance; Mathematics; Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; Medicinal Chemistry; Microbial Biology; Microbiology and Molecular Genetics; Molecular Biology, Genetics and Cancer; Music (Ph.D.); Neuroscience; Nutritional Sciences; Oceanography; Packaging Engineering; Pharmaceutical Science (Ph.D.); Philosophy; Physics and Astronomy; Physiology and Integrative Biology; Planning and Public Policy (Ph.D.); Plant Biology; Political Science; Psychology (Ph.D.); Public Health (Ph.D.); Quantitative Biomedicine; Religious Studies; Social Work (Ph.D.); Sociology; Spanish; Statistics; Toxicology; Women's and Gender Studies. Other programs within RBHS may also join the new SGS, but this will be determined in collaboration with the faculty of the programs and the Deans of their respective Schools.*

2. The committee wanted to what impact the merger would have on graduate students, staff and faculty. The committee wanted to know whether the graduate students, staff, and faculty were aligned or non-aligned and would these be "harmonized" in the new school. (the question regarding graduate student representation is unanswered in question 4)

*Faculty and staff would remain in the same bargaining units they were in pre-merger, or maintain their non-aligned status. Graduate students meeting the conditions specified in the answer to ASRAC question #1 (holding title "graduate assistant") would become part of AAUP-AFT.*

3. The committee raised the question about the 10 faculty in GSBS that voted against the proposal. What are the views of those opposed to the merger?

*Votes were via secret ballot. We do not know which faculty voted against the merger, nor do we know the reasons behind their decision.*

4. The committee wanted further information concerning the SGS impact on the medical and dental schools. The proposal indicated that the Deans of these schools were consulted but the proposal had limited information regarding this consultation.

*There should be no negative impact on the medical or dental schools. The plan for the SGS has been discussed at the RBHS Leadership and RBHS Deans' meetings as well as in other venues that included the medical and dental school deans.*

## Instruction, Curricula and Advising Committee (ICAC)

1. While we understand why "New Brunswick" is not included as part of the new school's name, having a name that appears to be all-encompassing creates an issue for Newark and Camden, who also have graduate schools.

*We understand the concern, but it was not possible to find a name for the new school that would include a modifier. Geographic modifiers are not appropriate, nor are modifiers that describe the large number of disciplines that will be included in the new school. Hence, we chose the more generic and inclusive name. The graduate faculties of the two schools have approved this name. Avoiding confusion with the graduate schools in Newark and Camden can be handled by clear messages on all of our websites. An illustration of how this can be done effectively is provided by the University of Michigan, which has graduate schools on its Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint campuses. Excellent websites make it clear which programs are offered where. We have already jointly hired a Communications Director for SGS who is working on web communications so that clarity of message is ensured. We would be happy to work with GS-Newark and GS-Camden as we roll out this communications plan, to ensure that the identity of their schools is clearly differentiated from SGS.*

2. We would like to see a list of the schools/programs that are included in this proposal. While they seem to be saying everything except the professional schools, engineering is listed as one of those included. We think it would be useful to actually have the affected schools listed.

*The following graduate programs will be based in SGS: Anthropology; Art History; Atmospheric Science; Biochemistry; Bioenvironmental Engineering; Biomedical Engineering; Business and Science; Cell and Developmental Biology; Cell Biology, Neuroscience and Physiology; Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology; Chemical and Biochemical Engineering; Chemistry and Chemical Biology; Chinese; Civil and Environmental Engineering; Classics; Communication, Information and Library Studies (Ph.D.); Comparative Literature; Computer Science; East Asian Languages and Cultures; Ecology and Evolution; Economics; Education (Ph.D.); Electrical and Computer Engineering; Endocrinology and Animal Biosciences; Entomology; Environmental Science; Financial Statistics and Risk Management; Food and Business Economics; Food Science; French; Geography; Geological Sciences; German; Higher Education (Ph.D.); History; Industrial and Systems Engineering; Industrial Relations and Human Resources (Ph.D.); Infection, Immunity and Inflammation; Italian; Jewish Studies; Kinesiology and Applied Physiology; Landscape Architecture (M.L.A.); Linguistics; Literatures in English; Materials Science and Engineering; Mathematical Finance; Mathematics; Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; Medicinal Chemistry; Microbial Biology; Microbiology and Molecular Genetics; Molecular Biology, Genetics and Cancer; Music (Ph.D.); Neuroscience; Nutritional Sciences; Oceanography; Packaging Engineering; Pharmaceutical Science (Ph.D.); Philosophy; Physics and Astronomy; Physiology and Integrative Biology; Planning and Public Policy (Ph.D.); Plant Biology; Political Science; Psychology (Ph.D.); Public Health (Ph.D.); Quantitative Biomedicine; Religious Studies;*

*Social Work (Ph.D.); Sociology; Spanish; Statistics; Toxicology; Women's and Gender Studies. Other programs within RBHS may also join the new SGS, but this will be determined in collaboration with the faculty of the programs and the Deans of their respective Schools.*

3. The question of the Bylaws seems to be a rather critical one. As the proposal notes under "Faculty governance," GSNB and GSBS each have a separate set of Bylaws that specify faculty governance matters. The proposal indicates that forming a committee to harmonize those by-laws will be the first order of business for the new School, and that until that can be done the existing by-laws would remain in effect. We're not sure how that is going to work. Bylaw revision tends to be tedious, contentious, and prolonged. A School whose faculty is governed by two different sets of bylaws for even one year is going to find itself with a lot of problems. There also should be a defined process for approving any revised bylaws.

*A Task Force to develop a new set of Bylaws for SGS has been established, and includes faculty from both GS-NB and GSBS. The Task Force will develop a draft set of Bylaws for discussion by the graduate faculty during the early part of the Spring 2017 semester. The goal is to have new Bylaws adopted by the time the SGS commences operations in July 2017.*

4. We're not exactly sure what the list of "Common Support for all Graduate Programs" on page 3 is illustrating.

*It is illustrating the types of programs/services that currently exist in either/both GSNB and GSBS, and will be made available to all of the students (and the faculty) within SGS.*

5. As funding under RCM means that funds will need to be solicited from both the New Brunswick and RBHS Chancellors, we are concerned about how these monies get pooled. Are the "Common Support" areas covered by pooled funds, or are they coming from another, "central" source? What can be done to more equalize those areas of student financial support listed on page 4? It seems clear that while the schools are being merged, the students are not!

*See answer to ASRAC question #2, above.*

### **Research, and Graduate and Professional Education Committee (RGPEC)**

1. What is the financial impact on schools which are part of the larger graduate program, particularly where extant services mean redundancies? RBHS has used the RCM model for many years, and different schools within RBHS contribute to GSBS. This model was not in effect on the legacy Rutgers side. How will the new grad school be financially supported, and how are the two financial systems to be merged?

*Schools within RBHS do not make a direct financial contribution to GSBS. Yet they do provide the faculty who teach in the graduate school, just as occurs in the component schools of GSNB. GSBS receives all tuition and "shares" a portion of that tuition with the*

*medical/dental schools to help subsidize faculty efforts. Also see answer to ASRAC question #2 and BFC question #4, above.*

2. Please address how tuition allocation will be handled, given existing differences in practice between legacy Rutgers and legacy UMDNJ.

*See answer to BFC question #4, above.*

3. Faculty at FASN at Rutgers Newark must budget graduate student tuition in external grant proposals; this appears to also be currently the case at GSNB (as highlighted in FAQ #7). At FASN, many tenured faculty simply elect to budget for and hire post-docs as they are effectively less expensive; this erodes our ability to carry out our core mission of graduate education. Can we ensure that the resultant new tuition model currently being negotiated specifically for SGS be extended to all graduate programs at all Rutgers campuses? If not, programs at Rutgers units that do not belong to SGS, but that are of similar caliber and complement strengths to those within SGS, will be unfairly hampered in their ability to educate graduate students. This would occur by way of both budgets to external funding agencies with severely reduced non-personnel costs and higher rejection rates from those agencies due to elevated budgets, or by way of continuing to elect to budget for post-docs instead. This would put those non-SGS graduate programs at a distinct disadvantage at best.

*The project on which Deans Kukor and Scotto are working (as mentioned in FAQ #7) is to see if we can find a way internally to handle tuition charges made to external grants. We want to convince institutional leadership that we should adopt a model similar to what is used by most of our peers among the AAU Publics, viz., to provide an institutional subvention that would allow Rutgers PIs to charge a reduced amount of tuition as a direct cost in a grant budget. This initiative is being conducted on behalf of ALL Rutgers PIs – in Newark, RBHS, New Brunswick and Camden. It is not (and in fact, cannot) provide a benefit only to PIs within SGS.*

4. Current fringe rates (cf. #7, page 5), are not competitive with those of our peers. The total package of graduate student costs, and not just the salaries, should be addressed. Currently it costs \$75,000 per year to support a PhD student in Engineering.

*We understand and we agree. See the answer to RGPEC question #3 above.*

5. The proposal states that "Professional practice doctoral and master's degrees will not be housed in SGS. Professional degrees will continue to be supported and awarded by the individual professional schools." For a professional school whose program is currently part of GSNB (e.g. SC&I), can you confirm that the program would remain in the new SGS even though the school is technically a professional school? Perhaps the Proposal should explicitly state that all programs that are currently part of GSNB will be part of the new SGS.

*Our rationale is that research-based degree programs should be based in the SGS, while professional degree programs should (and must, in many cases) remain in the professional schools. The following graduate programs will be based in SGS:*

*Anthropology; Art History; Atmospheric Science; Biochemistry; Bioenvironmental Engineering; Biomedical Engineering; Business and Science; Cell and Developmental Biology; Cell Biology, Neuroscience and Physiology; Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology; Chemical and Biochemical Engineering; Chemistry and Chemical Biology; Chinese; Civil and Environmental Engineering; Classics; Communication, Information and Library Studies (Ph.D.); Comparative Literature; Computer Science; East Asian Languages and Cultures; Ecology and Evolution; Economics; Education (Ph.D.); Electrical and Computer Engineering; Endocrinology and Animal Biosciences; Entomology; Environmental Science; Financial Statistics and Risk Management; Food and Business Economics; Food Science; French; Geography; Geological Sciences; German; Higher Education (Ph.D.); History; Industrial and Systems Engineering; Industrial Relations and Human Resources (Ph.D.); Infection, Immunity and Inflammation; Italian; Jewish Studies; Kinesiology and Applied Physiology; Landscape Architecture (M.L.A.); Linguistics; Literatures in English; Materials Science and Engineering; Mathematical Finance; Mathematics; Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; Medicinal Chemistry; Microbial Biology; Microbiology and Molecular Genetics; Molecular Biology, Genetics and Cancer; Music (Ph.D.); Neuroscience; Nutritional Sciences; Oceanography; Packaging Engineering; Pharmaceutical Science (Ph.D.); Philosophy; Physics and Astronomy; Physiology and Integrative Biology; Planning and Public Policy (Ph.D.); Plant Biology; Political Science; Psychology (Ph.D.); Public Health (Ph.D.); Quantitative Biomedicine; Religious Studies; Social Work (Ph.D.); Sociology; Spanish; Statistics; Toxicology; Women's and Gender Studies. Other programs within RBHS may also join the new SGS, but this will be determined in collaboration with the faculty of the programs and the Deans of their respective Schools.*

6. Will the combined MD/MPH programs be impacted by this proposal? The School of Public Health is not in the GSBS, but is run out of the School of Public Health (i.e. outside RBHS), and not the graduate school.

*Neither the M.D. nor the M.P.H. will be part of SGS. The goal is for all research-based Ph.D. programs in RBHS and New Brunswick to be a part of SGS.*

7. What does naming the new school, the "School for Graduate Studies," suggest for the Graduate School - Rutgers Newark? If external communities see a School of Graduate Studies for Rutgers, there is concern it will provide confusion around where and how the Graduate School - Rutgers Newark (and presumably the Graduate School –Rutgers Camden), fit within the system.

*We understand the concern, but it was not possible to find a name for the new school that would include a modifier. Geographic modifiers are not appropriate, nor are modifiers that describe the large number of disciplines that will be included in the new school. Hence, we chose the more generic and inclusive name. The graduate faculties of the two schools have approved this name. Avoiding confusion with the graduate schools in Newark and Camden can be handled by clear messages on all of our websites. An illustration of how this can be done effectively is provided by the University of Michigan, which has graduate schools on its Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint campuses. Excellent*

*websites make it clear which programs are offered where. We have already jointly hired a Communications Director for SGS who is working on web communications so that clarity of message is ensured. We would be happy to work with GS-Newark and GS-Camden as we roll out this communications plan, to ensure that the identity of their schools is clearly differentiated from SGS.*

8. What are possible means of enabling students and faculty who are part of the Graduate School Rutgers Newark to benefit from this arrangement? My interpretation of the proposal is that there are a number of exciting opportunities that might emerge for students and faculty who are part of the schools that are looking to merge, we would like to explore ways that our students and faculty can also benefit from some of the opportunities - as they too are Rutgers graduate students and Rutgers graduate faculty. Note this question may also apply to Camden graduate programs.

*We agree. When possible, students and faculty from other units should be able to benefit from programs that will be offered by SGS, and vice versa. Our first priority needs to be students and faculty within the SGS, but to the extent that spaces are available (for workshops, for example) or funds are available (where there are costs associated with operating a program), we intend to make SGS programs available to those outside SGS who might have an interest in our programs.*

9. It would be desirable to have more graduate student involvement in the plan, beyond GSA involvement. Would it be possible to solicit input from the grad programs, and particularly once the merger has gone into effect. Announce the change beyond the GSA so that all grad students are aware of the change and the financial ramifications beyond travel awards. An outline of plans regarding travel awards, including how the amounts will change and how the awards will be distributed, would be helpful.

*We currently have slots for graduate students on our Executive Councils, and under SGS this will continue. We also agree with the need for communication to our internal and external stakeholders and have just jointly recruited a Communications Director to ensure that this happens in a timely and effective manner. Following the integration, we will seek additional student input on issues involving student services and related matters.*

10. Have the online PhD programs (for example, School of Health Professions) been factored into the model?

*Dean Scotto is in discussion with the dean of SHP regarding their research based Ph.D. programs. No decisions have been made to date and will not be made without consultation with, and agreement of, the faculty of the programs.*

11. How does this merger impact the admission of departmental faculty into the Graduate School, where requirements differ?

*Faculty are admitted to individual graduate programs based on criteria established by the programs themselves.*

## Student Affairs Committee (SAC)

1. Will the student information systems be merged when the schools are merged? Currently, the GSBS students are on the Banner System and GSNB students are on RUTADMIN.

*Our goal is to have a single system for management of all data related to graduate students in the SGS. Whether that can be accomplished by the time of the merger is beyond our control.*

## University Structure and Governance Committee (USGC)

1. Membership: Page 10. Question 21: How will faculty reappointments, promotions, or other personnel matters be handled? N/A Why is the question not applicable?  
*Not Applicable because faculty are not hired into or promoted within a graduate school. They are hired/promoted within the school in which their primary appointment resides.*

2. How would membership in SGS be determined? What is the procedure across multiple units under multiple chancellors, how will appointments/memberships be handled in this proposal? How will you harmonize membership process?  
*Faculty are admitted to individual graduate programs based on criteria established by the programs themselves. Since these are not primary appointments, the chancellors will not play a role in these decisions.*

3. Harmonizing By-Laws: Page 4. Question 5: Will faculty from all of the current GSBS and GSNB graduate programs have input in governance of the new SGS? Harmonization of bylaws tend to be more complicated and contentious than might be expected. There are always differences in culture and expectation. Why not have draft by-laws done ahead of time?  
*All programs have input in governance currently, and this will continue under SGS. A Task Force to develop a new set of Bylaws for SGS has been established, and includes faculty from both GS-NB and GSBS. The Task Force will develop a draft set of Bylaws for discussion by the graduate faculty during the early part of the Spring 2017 semester. The goal is to have new Bylaws adopted by the time the SGS commences operations in July 2017.*

4. Branding/Identity: Page 6. Question 13. Why is “New Brunswick” being removed from the name of the new graduate school? Have you conferred with the other graduate schools (Camden and Newark) regarding this aspect and what were their concerns if any? How does removing the descriptor “New Brunswick” specifically impact the graduate schools in Camden and Newark?  
*We understand the concern, but it was not possible to find a name for the new school that would include a modifier. Geographic modifiers are not appropriate, nor are modifiers that describe the large number of disciplines that will be included in the new school. Hence, we chose the more generic and inclusive name. The graduate faculties of*

*the two schools have approved this name. Avoiding confusion with the graduate schools in Newark and Camden can be handled by clear messages on all of our websites. An illustration of how this can be done effectively is provided by the University of Michigan, which has graduate schools on its Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint campuses. Excellent websites make it clear which programs are offered where.*

5. Stakeholders: Page 10. Question 26: What other stakeholders might be involved and/or impacted? What stakeholders have GSNB consulted and communicated with? Please elaborate on how both GSNB and GSBS have communicated or consulted with students and alumni?

*The primary stakeholders are the members of the graduate faculty. They have been consulted and have been extensively involved in the discussions and debates. Graduate students have not been brought directly into the discussion because our goal was to “hold them harmless.” They should be able to pursue their degree studies without distraction from organizational matters. The leadership of GSBS and GSNB alumni associations have been extensively involved in these discussions. Alumni also provided input via the DAC, which is broadly representative of the disciplines included in SGS. The DAC unanimously voted in favor of the re-structuring.*

### **From Individuals**

Adam Kustka: Faculty at FASN at Rutgers Newark must budget graduate student tuition in external grant proposals. I understand this is also currently the case at GSNB (as highlighted in FAQ #7). At FASN, many tenured faculty simply elect to budget for and hire post-docs as they are effectively less expensive; this erodes our ability to carry out our core mission of graduate education.

*The project on which Deans Kukor and Scotto are working (as mentioned in FAQ #7) is to see if we can find a way internally to handle tuition charges made to external grants. We aim to convince institutional leadership that we should adopt a model similar to what is used by most of our peers among the AAU Publics, viz., to provide an institutional subvention that would allow Rutgers PIs to charge a reduced amount of tuition as a direct cost in a grant budget. This initiative is being conducted on behalf of ALL Rutgers PIs – in Newark, RBHS, New Brunswick and Camden. It is not (and in fact, cannot) provide a benefit only to PIs within SGS.*

Can we ensure that the resultant new tuition model currently being negotiated specifically for SGS be extended to all graduate programs at all Rutgers campuses? If not, programs at Rutgers units that do not belong to SGS, but that are of similar caliber and complement strengths to those within SGS, will be unfairly hampered in their ability to educate graduate students. This would occur by way of both budgets to external funding agencies with severely reduced non-personnel costs and higher rejection rates from those agencies due to elevated budgets, or by way of continuing to elect to budget for post-docs instead. This would put those non-SGS graduate programs at a distinct disadvantage at best.

*The project on which Deans Kukor and Scotto are working (as mentioned in FAQ #7) is to see if we can find a way internally to handle tuition charges made to external grants. We aim to*

*convince institutional leadership that we should adopt a model similar to what is used by most of our peers among the AAU Publics, viz., to provide an institutional subvention that would allow Rutgers PIs to charge a reduced amount of tuition as a direct cost in a grant budget. This initiative is being conducted on behalf of ALL Rutgers PIs – in Newark, RBHS, New Brunswick and Camden. It is not (and in fact, cannot) provide a benefit only to PIs within SGS.*

James Oleske: I also have some questions on the impact of these changes on MD and PHD collaborative arrangements, teaching and research at NJMS Rutgers. There are combined MD/MPH programs. Will these be impacted? I have experienced the benefit and advantages of collaboration with my PHD colleagues at NJMS Rutgers. Will these changes negatively impact on cross collaboration between MDs and PHDs at current school sites?

*Neither the M.D. nor the M.P.H. will be part of SGS.*

Kyle Farmbry: The name of the proposed school: What does naming the new school, the "School for Graduate Studies," suggest for the Graduate School - Rutgers Newark? If external communities see a School of Graduate Studies for Rutgers, I fear it will provide confusion around where and how the Graduate School - Rutgers Newark (and presumably the Graduate School -Rutgers Camden), fit within the system.

*We understand the concern, but it was not possible to find a name for the new school that would include a modifier. Geographic modifiers are not appropriate, nor are modifiers that describe the large number of disciplines that will be included in the new school. Hence, we chose the more generic and inclusive name. The graduate faculties of the two schools have approved this name. Avoiding confusion with the graduate schools in Newark and Camden can be handled by clear messages on all of our websites. An illustration of how this can be done effectively is provided by the University of Michigan, which has graduate schools on its Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint campuses. Excellent websites make it clear which programs are offered where.*

Kyle Farmbry: What are possible means of enabling students and faculty who are part of the Graduate School-Rutgers Newark to benefit from this arrangement? My interpretation of the proposal is that there are a number of exciting opportunities that might emerge for students and faculty who are part of the schools that are looking to merge, we would like to explore ways that our students and faculty can also benefit from some of the opportunities - as they too are Rutgers graduate students and Rutgers graduate faculty. (Does Camden have the same question regarding how to link this proposed School of Graduate Studies with opportunities for its graduate students?).

*We agree. Students and faculty from other units should be able to benefit from programs that will be offered by SGS, and vice versa. Our first priority needs to be students and faculty within the SGS, but to the extent that spaces are available (for workshops, for example) or funds are available (where there are costs associated with operating a program), we intend to make SGS programs available to those outside SGS who might have an interest in our programs.*

Jan Ellen Lewis: I value and applaud the efforts of Deans Kukor and Scotto to develop a more reasonable tuition model and would want it to be applicable across the system. (I am not sure

that this particular issue has direct bearing on the matter before this committee; I would have the same concerns if any graduate unit were able to negotiate tuition rates in this way for their own units rather than the entire system. Or to put it more positively, policies such as this should be system-wide.)

*The project on which Deans Kukor and Scotto are working (as mentioned in FAQ #7) is to see if we can find a way internally to handle tuition charges made to external grants. We aim to convince institutional leadership that we should adopt a model similar to what is used by most of our peers among the AAU Publics, viz., to provide an institutional subvention that would allow Rutgers PIs to charge a reduced amount of tuition as a direct cost in a grant budget. This initiative is being conducted on behalf of ALL Rutgers PIs – in Newark, RBHS, New Brunswick and Camden. It is not (and in fact, cannot) provide a benefit only to PIs within SGS.*