

Charge S-1810 – *Facilities and Infrastructure*

Submitted to the Rutgers Senate Executive Committee

26 September 2019

Evaluate the relevant systems, processes, and plans for university research facilities and infrastructure and make recommendations to create a comprehensive, robust, actionable, and sustainable plan that will support infrastructure needed for world-class research at the university.

Rationale: External funding agencies require that the University provides and maintains the core infrastructure necessary for proposed and currently funded projects. Those involved in the entire spectrum of research activities (researchers) are impacted by the disconnect between researchers and those - at the various administrative levels - who make decisions about building, improving, and maintaining facilities and infrastructure. Serious problems in existing facilities and infrastructure influence daily research activities, the ability to compete for new grants, and the recruitment of our next generation of research faculty and graduate students. The process for prioritizing and funding facility maintenance and improvements, and the parties responsible for this, are not consistent or well defined. The committee plans to evaluate the relevant systems and plans and to make recommendations to create a comprehensive, robust, actionable and sustainable plan that will support infrastructure needed for world-class research at the university.

Findings

1. All proposed buildings require a long-term business plan that identifies sources of funds to cover projected maintenance costs, but these funds are not protected from diversion to other purposes.
2. The office of Institutional Planning and Operations (IPO) is responsible for maintenance activities, at a minimum covering life, safety and code requirements, as mandated by statute. Additional maintenance activities are defined through a negotiation process between IPO and unit leader staff, as these are funded by units.
3. Unit leaders exercise wide discretion in what maintenance and infrastructure improvements are funded, and which of these are the responsibility of the unit versus the researchers. As a result, unit leaders can defer maintenance at the risk of asset failure and can pass costs to PIs for

maintaining general research assets (not usually budgeted on grant proposals and that are generally expected to be covered by indirect costs).

4. Researchers voice their concerns and requests regarding research infrastructure maintenance and to minimize disruption of research activities due to infrastructure improvements to department chairs; these requests may or may not be passed up the chain of command (depending on the concern, to Dean / unit leader, Chancellor, or in special cases, to the University President). There is little consistency in this process, often leading to situations where reasonable requests and remediable problems are not addressed. This can diminish research productivity and enthusiasm, to the detriment of the University's mission.

5. Faculty sometimes find themselves without appropriate lab space within their department to support their research, while such infrastructure might be available and under-utilized within other departments.

6. Funds from conventional sources to maintain research facilities and infrastructure are not consistent among disciplines or over time and are often inadequate, and virtually all philanthropic giving is restricted to uses other than maintenance. These suggest faculty involvement in creative fundraising efforts may be an optional way to supplement funds to sustain a vibrant research community. Interested faculty are unprepared for this.

Resolution

The Rutgers University Senate recommends that:

1. Rutgers develop a mechanism to ensure that funds earmarked for future maintenance costs are preserved and protected from diversion.
2. Rutgers develop a single formal mechanism by which budgetary unit leaders / Deans solicits the needs (as related to research required for facilities and infrastructure) directly from faculty, other researchers, and staff that support research services (relevant personnel, hereafter) annually so that needs can be considered in upcoming budgetary periods.
3. Pertinent decisions from unit leaders be transparent and be communicated to relevant personnel. This would include an annual report outlining:
 - i. the funds for maintenance
 - ii. maintenance dollars expended on research space, per square foot of such space
 - iii. funds expended to improve infrastructure in total and also specifically for research space
 - iv. responses to relevant personnel requests (see recommendation #2),
 - v. a report outlining research space inventory and a metric of effective use of such space, every three years.
4. The Dean's review process include metrics that involve their responsiveness to the maintenance and infrastructure needs, specific to research, communicated by relevant personnel.
5. Rutgers Administration, through the Rutgers University Foundation, engage interested faculty in discussions of fundraising mechanisms, opportunities and limitations with respect to improving research facilities and infrastructure, and offer assistance and training for interested faculty to develop creative and effective fundraising campaigns.

Appendix I: Transcripts from communications with Michael Gower, CFO, and Tony Calcado, IPO

The committee submitted questions to Michael Gower and Tony Calcado and received written responses. We met with Michael Gower on 15 Feb 2019 and Tony Calcado 08 April for follow up discussions. Questions are shown below, with replies from Gower and Calcado (shown in blue), and follow-up (green).

Written questions and answers submitted to Michael Gower and Tony Calcado prior to the committee meeting are shown in black and blue, respectively. Follow up questions and answers (green and magenta, respectively).

1. How are priorities for new research infrastructure identified? What role do the faculty play in this process?

The Chancellors, through their respective strategic plans and supported by the Rutgers 2030 Master Plan, identify educational, research, community service, and/or clinical priorities for facilities initiatives. The Rutgers 2030 Master Plan did include faculty input as well as from other stakeholders. At the local level, faculty involvement should filter through department chairs to deans, and then to the respective Chancellor, in order to create an ongoing master list of priorities. Institutional Planning and Operations coordinates those priorities across the university, and facilities management supports the effort through technical knowledge.

Committee follow-up: Our question was incompletely phrased. The Chancellor identifies the priorities but what are the steps and who is involved in the final decision for new research infrastructure?

(Paraphrased): Either the Dean or Chancellor can offer funds to support these initiatives. Building or major research infrastructure could involve the President, but after this it is a Chancellor's decision. Rarely, Building our Futures Act or other similar legislation from NJ can pay for new infrastructure.

How much of Chancellor's budget is discretionary? NB-RBHS has more room? But how much more? Vice Chancellor for research call for suggested research activities.

2. Does the University earmark funds for such new research infrastructure initiatives on an annual basis, or is this accomplished on an ad hoc basis?

Projects are required to have a business plan to understand what the university commitment is and whether the effort is sustainable. Prioritization of limited funds is then made at the chancellor level and either incorporated into budgets or in the rolling capital financial plan if debt financing is required.

Committee follow-up: We may not have been clear in our intent. The answer addresses important questions of sustainability, whereas (here) we're interested to know whether the annual budget has a recurring line item for new research infrastructure or if such endeavors are incorporated into annual budgets on an ad hoc basis.

(Paraphrased): The Chancellor has discretion. Some have funds earmarked for R&D, but they do not have to have funds earmarked for this.

3. How are future economic benefits to the university, in terms of projected increases in successful external award revenue or revenue streams from in-house and outside users, considered in budgeting decisions for new research infrastructure?

The initiator of the project through the respective chancellor unit should clearly outline anticipated costs, benefits, and return on investment in the business plan.

4. Please provide a list of buildings (on all campuses) that house research facilities and a brief statement of each building's current condition and existing plans (renovation, demolition).

For security reasons this information is not public, and we cannot accommodate such a broad request. IP&O maintains the systems of record for all university space, owned or leased, as well as a database outlining the condition of that space, including the equipment servicing it. The Chancellor and his/her designee have access to these records, and they are incorporated into the ultimate decision-making process.

5. How is maintenance for existing buildings currently budgeted and funded? Non-auxiliary buildings are funded through the RCM budget matrix using cost pool allocations. Renovations and upgrades typically are funded through use of reserves, gifts and grants, and long-term debt. The University's Internal Bank can issue long-term debt in order to finance priority renovation projects; payment for principal and interest on that debt is the responsibility of the Responsibility Center or chancellor unit initiating the project. Occasionally, funds are available through the State of New Jersey such as those recently made available through the Building the Future bond act.

Further comments (Paraphrased): Renovations are paid for by the cost unit. Either budget it or work with Chancellor for other avenues, including multi-year borrowing. The CFO from Chancellor's units get involved. If external borrowing is required, Mike Gower gets involved. In response to a committee question, it can work as a top down process if needs are not being met. The animal facility at RBHS is one example of this.

6. What is the relationship between the master plan and deferred maintenance? How is maintenance being paired up with the master plan priorities?

The Rutgers 2030 Master Plan addresses the strategic needs of the university. Simply said, it outlines how to implement the University Strategic Plan from a physical and technological perspective. While the plan may address deferred maintenance needs through such strategies of building improvements, infrastructure improvements, or retirement of assets to address the strategic plan, it is not specifically built to do so.

7. Who provides the information you have regarding adequacy or deficiencies in facilities and infrastructure?

There are two distinct types of deficiencies in facilities or infrastructure. The first are issues with respect to routine and normal breakdowns. These are identified through the Operations staff and addressed. The second are deficiencies in facilities and infrastructure with respect to research not supported by what presently exists. This information comes from researchers proper through their respective chairs, deans, and chancellors.

Committee follow-up: Is there a readily available resource that identifies the person from Operations responsible for a specific building, and where can faculty find this information?

(Paraphrased): Yes. I defer the question for where to find this resource/information to Tony.

What formal process is in place to facilitate communication between researchers and responsible parties regarding needed infrastructure/facility improvements?

There are regular meetings with departmental and senior administrators, as well as deans and senior leadership of IP&O, to discuss and facilitate solutions to these issues.

How can a process that is transparent and uniform across all campuses be created? There is nothing hidden in this process.

8. How are research needs integrated into Rutgers' net zero strategy? Please clarify question. Is this referring to carbon neutrality?

Committee follow-up: This question refers to the Rutgers net zero policy celebrated in a report about facilities among universities in the U.S. (attached). The report generally notes that many universities expanded in the 1970s, often with poor construction. Also, recent emphases on buildings have been towards those not dedicated for research. Rutgers is commended by phasing out old and small buildings and replacing them with new, more efficient and cost-effective buildings for an overall net-zero growth in building space. This aims to reduce future maintenance. Given that most new buildings have been for nonacademic uses, we would like to know how research needs integrated into Rutgers' net zero strategy?

Reply: With respect to the net zero strategy, please note that Rutgers requires that all new construction be designed to LEED Silver certification, and in fact the new Chemistry and Chemical Biology building is LEED Gold

Committee: Let's discuss.

(Paraphrased): The net zero strategy calls for reduced building costs and square footage. This strategy should lead to new buildings for more research.

9. What plans are in place to communicate maintenance and building plans to unit leaders?

These are two distinct lines of business. Maintenance plans are made through Operations Area Managers or other senior level operations staff with departmental administrators or building coordinators. Long-term building plans are typically made with deans, chancellors, and Planning, Development and Design (PD&D) personnel from IP&O

10. When final decisions are made regarding the fate of buildings/research space, how are stakeholders in the Rutgers community informed and involved?

Stakeholders are typically part of the process. Communication at the dean and departmental level should transmit this information.

11. How are efforts to mitigate maintenance and infrastructure problems prioritized? Prioritization begins with building envelope and then works its way in. Roofs, pointing, windows, plumbing, HVAC, etc.

At what point is an ongoing maintenance problem recognized as financially better to be renovated?

This is a case-by-case decision, with an understanding of where the funds to renovate would come from.

Committee follow-up: What entities at the University are financially responsible for these renovations? Perhaps this varies on a case by case basis as well, but what general guidelines are used to determine responsible parties?

(paraphrased from Tony Calcado 08 Apr 19 meeting): Renovations go to Chancellors for financial. RCM- routine maintenance comes from maintenance budget. If it is over \$10,000 repair, look to department, dean, Chancellor. Capital projects- funded by deans (relief subvention) or Chancellor. Upgrade \$100K- \$250K Chancellor. If millions are requested, may be borrowed from internal bank.

Program monies in RCM era are in hands of Chancellor

What process is used to make this determination?

The originating unit prepares a business case to show the beneficial impact vs. costs to determine what the Return on Investment would be.

Committee follow-up: Two questions: (A) Does this mean lab scientists must come up with a business plan to enumerate costs and benefits of mitigating or not mitigating infrastructure problems? It seems challenging for us to quantify the grants not obtained from deficiencies. For example, if a power outage thawed irreplaceable samples decreasing publication output from an externally funded project, the short and long term costs to the PI and University are difficult to quantify. (B) Who makes the final decision?

(Paraphrased): Ongoing maintenance costs are built into budgets through the Chancellor's office and Tony Calcado's office. For further details, I defer to Tony. Regarding (A), that is exactly right. PI's should communicate with their Dean or VC of Research and come up with a number.

I can address your recent question of what constitutes maintenance versus renovation, and differences in responsibility for maintenance and renovation. The burden for renovation costs fall to the leader of the unit. Facilities are responsible for maintenance. They can be difficult to tease apart and involve ongoing conversations between the campus CFO and Tony Calcado.

12. What is involved in the decision-making process to determine the fate of specific facilities and infrastructure (i.e., fix or demolish and rebuild, or repurpose to office space)?

IP&O maintains a database that catalogues the condition of an existing structure using a number of variables. Strategic priority needs are then aligned with existing available funds, and potential solutions are presented to the chancellor units for input into a final determination.

Committee follow-up: How often is that database updated? Can it be shared with faculty for a specific building? This would allow faculty to provide their ground-level insight into the infrastructure issues and identify where potential discrepancies the understandings of IP&O and researchers exist.

(paraphrased from Tony Calcado 08 Apr 19 meeting) The database is called Facilities Condition Analysis. Major equipment is bar coded. Value on infrastructure for insurance purposes.

In response to your question “Is there a readily available resource that identifies the person from IPO responsible for a specific building and where can faculty find this information”: There are three sources of information for Building Condition / Building Maintenance

1. FCA database
2. Every building has a manager, and each building in a zone is managed by a Building Maintenance manager / supervisor
3. Each building has a departmental contact person that works with facilities (a liaison). Researchers should contact the liaison in the unit who then passes the information on to facilities.

To address your question of how building maintenance and repair priorities are set, how they are triaged, we establish the priorities in order of building envelope (roof, windows), HVAC issues, electrical, and cosmetic.

To deal with deferred maintenance, we set aside some funds per year to decrease deferred maintenance. In other cases, some buildings are functionally obsolete. Ford Hall needs to be torn down. Do a cost analysis. Is the building functional for its purpose. Decisions based on usage, location, historical value, cost to upgrade or repair compared to value of use.

13. For buildings slated for demolition/renovation but that are actively being used, how do we ensure the infrastructure is functional so that the research mission can be carried out seamlessly?

Occupied buildings meet all life safety and code requirements as mandated by statute. With respect to the research mission, that is dependent on the requirements of that research and if the building has the necessary infrastructure available to meet that need. If not, that is not a building issue; instead, it is a department/dean/chancellor issue to arrive at a proper solution.

14. Please provide us with a formal document that defines the responsibilities of the RCM responsibility centers and of the RCM Central Cost Centers. How does the RCM model allocate the responsibilities to maintain infrastructure and to maintain research facilities?

Service Level Agreements (SLA) have been developed for services provided by the RCM Cost Centers. Embedded in those SLA's are requirements to provide ongoing maintenance and related services. These should not be confused with upgrades.

Committee: We would be grateful if you could elaborate on this, perhaps briefly now and in a follow-up email.

(Paraphrased): Just a few notes on cost centers and SLAs. Cost centers do not make money but provide service to Responsibility Centers.

Maintenance budgets for ongoing maintenance. Maintenance budgets are developed on the campus level. SLAs are contracts for how often custodial services and the like are done. The Scale of service depends on how much money the unit has committed; more funds equates to more service. There is a push and pull between Tony's office and unit leaders to figure out building maintenance budgets and services provided. Chancellors make decisions on priorities but not with maintenance issues.

15. What specific maintenance issues – in terms of infrastructure required for research - are the responsibility of a) university facilities, of b) individual units, and of c) individual researchers? Where are the guidelines that define these responsibilities and how are they communicated to responsible parties?

This question is very broad, and the ability to provide a simplistic answer is not possible. At a very high level, University Facilities is required to maintain building systems and related assets. Equipment specific to the researchers is the responsibility of the department and/or individual laboratory. As an example, Facilities is responsible to provide water to the lab, but it is not responsible for supplying distilled water.

Committee: We recognize the broad scope of questions 15 and 16 and that costs associated with 'niche' research assets are often the responsibilities of the principal investigators. The questions stem from anecdotes from faculty on the committee that some infrastructure and maintenance costs that aren't categorized as niche assets are the responsibilities of departments and (perhaps more often) the PIs but that these costs are not consistently charged to PI's among units. We seek a better understanding of how these decisions are made and whether the university has a consistent policy that PI's can reference when pursuing remedies for deficient research infrastructure and maintenance required for sustained research.

(Paraphrased): As copied from discussion of Q11: I can address your recent question of what constitutes maintenance versus renovation, and differences in responsibility for maintenance and renovation. The burden for renovation costs fall to the leader of the unit. Facilities are responsible for maintenance. They can

be difficult to tease apart and involve ongoing conversations between the campus CFO and Tony Calcado.

Deans manage budgets differently at their discretion and this could lead to some inconsistencies on what infrastructure and maintenance costs are passed on to PIs for research assets not typically considered as 'niche' assets.

A question from the floor involved how Core Facilities are maintained. Kimball and Gower are collaborating on defining the core facilities. There are federal rules on how core facilities are budgeted. They are funded by F&A and by charges to end-users on grants. Essentially, the University heavily subsidizes these. For example, the new animal cages were paid for by Dr. Kimball's office (\$8.5M), a state grant and a loan (the latter two sources are \$4.5M in summation).

16. What specific maintenance issues – in terms of research facilities themselves- are the responsibility of a) university facilities, of b) individual units, and of c) individual researchers? Where are the guidelines that define these responsibilities and how are they communicated to responsible parties?

See number 15. Communication is up to the department & deans office.

17. What is the relationship between indirect cost return funds and the maintenance plan? What is the specific formula that directs some fraction of indirect costs towards maintenance funds?

In the RCM budget model, all indirect cost recovery (F&A) is returned to the school or center that generates it. Those funds are directly available to the Responsibility Center to pay for ongoing maintenance costs or capital financing costs (debt).

18. Usually in capital budgeting, any building proposal must include future costs, including future maintenance costs. Does Rutgers have a policy whereby no new building can be built without identified source of funding to maintain it?

All proposed buildings require a business plan that identifies sources of funds including maintenance costs.

Committee follow-up: Are those funds specifically earmarked for that maintenance or can they be diverted to other priorities in the future? Has there been any analysis on how well those business plans accommodate maintenance costs over modest time frames (i.e., 5 or 10 years)?

(Paraphrased): These funds can be used for other priorities.

If so, does the policy differ among public-private partnership, donor-funded, and bonded buildings?

No

19. How do facilities and maintenance offices budget for unanticipated F&M expenses?

Unanticipated expenses are covered by reallocating funds from other areas/projects.

20. How is the quality of facilities and infrastructure considered in the personnel evaluation of those responsible, if at all?

Please clarify this question.

Additional (edited) comments/questions submitted by committee members:

MVS: Donors for new buildings are generally less interested in footing the bill for future maintenance costs. It has been suggested that donations under the banner “budget substitution” could be used to help defray these costs. How could such funds be appropriately earmarked for maintenance of research infrastructure and integrated into Chancellors’ campus infrastructure plans?

(Paraphrased): If fundraisers bring in budget substitution funds, how they are spent is still at the discretion of the Chancellor or Dean.

(Further comment from a committee member, paraphrased heavily and missing context here:) Does the current system incentivize administrators to demote maintenance and infrastructure issues until they become deferred maintenance?

Other get earmarked for facilities. There are appropriations for facilities and for deferred maintenance. Directed appropriations are possible but most funding comes in the form of block grants that are divided up; some could be spent on deferred maintenance. The Chancellors each have the discretion to make specific earmarks for such funds.

Follow up questions and answers from Michael Gower

1. Is there a readily available resource that identifies the person from Operations responsible for a specific building, and where can faculty find this information?
2. How are efforts to mitigate maintenance and infrastructure problems prioritized? [Prioritization begins with building envelope and then works its way in. Roofs, pointing, windows, plumbing, HVAC, etc.](#)

At what point is an ongoing maintenance problem recognized as financially better to be renovated?

[This is a case-by-case decision, with an understanding of where the funds to renovate would come from.](#)

What entities at the University are financially responsible for these renovations? Perhaps this varies on a case by case basis as well, but what general guidelines are used to determine responsible parties?

[This question is deferred to Tony Calcado.](#)

What process is used to make this determination?

[The originating unit prepares a business case to show the beneficial impact vs. costs to determine what the Return on Investment would be.](#)

Committee follow-up: Two questions: (A) Does this mean lab scientists must come up with a business plan to enumerate costs and benefits of mitigating or not mitigating infrastructure problems? It seems challenging for us to quantify the grants not obtained from deficiencies. For example, if a power outage thawed irreplaceable samples decreasing publication output from an externally funded project, the short and long term costs to the PI and University are difficult to quantify. (B) Who makes the final decision?

[\(Paraphrased\): Ongoing maintenance costs are built into budgets through the Chancellor's office and Tony Calcado's office. For further details, I defer to Tony. Regarding \(A\), that is exactly right. PI's should communicate with their Dean or VC of Research and come up with a number.](#)

I can address your recent question of what constitutes maintenance versus renovation, and differences in responsibility for maintenance and renovation. The burden for renovation costs fall to the leader of the unit. Facilities are responsible for maintenance. They can be difficult to tease apart and involve ongoing conversations between the campus CFO and Tony Calcado.

3. What is involved in the decision-making process to determine the fate of specific facilities and infrastructure (i.e., fix or demolish and rebuild, or repurpose to office space)?

IP&O maintains a database that catalogues the condition of an existing structure using a number of variables. Strategic priority needs are then aligned with existing available funds, and potential solutions are presented to the chancellor units for input into a final determination.

Committee follow-up: How often is that database updated? Can it be shared with faculty for a specific building? This would allow faculty to provide their ground-level insight into the infrastructure issues and identify where potential discrepancies the understandings of IP&O and researchers exist.

(Paraphrased): I defer this question to Tony Calcado.

Appendix II: Transcripts from communications with Nevin Kessler and Donna Thornton, Rutgers University Foundation

Response to questions posed to Nevin Kessler, President, Executive Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, and Donna Thornton, Vice President, Alumni Relations, Communications and Annual Giving

1. Please provide us with an assessment of how much money is donated each year (on average) that is not specifically restricted versus restricted, the sources for each pool (i.e., alumni donations, private companies, etc.), and a summary of the restrictions. For the unrestricted donations, how are the decisions made for their distribution?

On average, annual unrestricted giving to Rutgers over the past 5 years totals \$206,000 (approximately 1%) out of total annual average giving to the University of \$187M. In addition, donors designate restricted, discretionary gifts for the benefit of deans, and other academic unit heads, but the amounts are diminutive.

Sources of giving for unrestricted are predominantly alumni and friends (82%) with the remainder coming through corporations, primarily through their matching gift programs.

Unrestricted gifts are allocated to Presidential Strategic Initiatives and general university purposes. The President and the Executive Vice President of Finance and Administration, and University Treasurer make the decision on how the funds are used.

Sources of giving for restricted funds are more diversified with 60% from alumni and friends, 24% from foundations and 16% from corporations. Restricted funds are funds given by donors restricted to a specific program, unit, or purpose such as scholarship, research, instruction, or capital projects. Restrictions can be quite detailed within these broad categories.

2. Regarding the status of University research facilities (including maintenance and upgrades of existing infrastructure), what data do you need to assist you in your fundraising efforts to support University research?

At Rutgers, like most research universities, academic fund raising priorities are determined by the Deans, and communicated to the Foundation by the Chancellors and President. Academic units that identify creating new research facilities, or upgrading existing ones, and are determined to be fund raising priorities, need to provide a description of the research facilities, specific funding opportunities (named spaces, equipment, etc.)

and the impact of the research to be conducted within the facilities to the Foundation.

3.How are fundraising efforts prioritized and coordinated across the university?

Fund raising priorities are identified by the Deans, and communicated to the Foundation through the Chancellors and President.

Chief advancement officers are assigned to all the schools at RU-NB, and most of the schools at RU-N, RU-C, and RBHS. Working with the central development functions, these school-based fund raisers organize the support that they need to implement their fund raising priorities. They leverage central Foundation resources in prospect research, donor relations, communications and marketing, crowdfunding, corporate engagement, foundation relations, alumni relations, and senior foundation leadership. Every major gift donor and many potential donors are assigned prospect managers. Every fund raiser is assigned a certain number of donors and potential donors whose relationships with the university they are expected to manage. They are responsible for coordinating any and all fund raising related contact by Rutgers. For corporations, we are very proactive in our outreach to them through our new Corporate Engagement Center, a joint effort between the Office of Research and Economic Development, and the Foundation. At the point that a potential donor is in conversations with a unit about a gift, and until the gift is closed, no other unit is allowed to approach that donor for a gift.

4.What resources do you need to fundraise to further improve the University's research mission? What strategies could be implemented to obtain these resources?

At this point, most of the academic units have a sufficient number of professional fund raisers to engage donors in conversations about philanthropy, including support for research initiatives. Additional resources could be helpful in increasing private gift revenue in support of research in our Corporate Engagement Center, which focuses on raising research funding (both contractual and philanthropic) from corporations. Additional resources for Foundation Relations which supports fund raising from private foundations for all three universities and RBHS could also be helpful. Each of these units has asked for at least one additional professional fund raiser.

The other area for potential investment is training in fund raising for faculty. Faculty are often in the best position to help identify potential

donors, and to help explain the importance of their research to solving some of society's greatest challenges. To help them be effective in this role, training is necessary. We have made some investments in training faculty in RBHS. It is our intention to make this training available to faculty members at the other universities and programs across the university. Obtaining additional resources at this time is challenging, as the Foundation has been asked to hold the line on any budget increases in FY'20. Reallocation of existing resources is another strategy, and over the past 5 years, the Foundation has reallocated a number of positions to fund new programs and services. Over time, as the endowment assessment fee and gift assessment fee generate additional annual revenue, I will propose designating resources for additional fund raising positions in these two units, and training for faculty.

5.What are the relationships of the alumni associations to the Rutgers Foundation?

There are a number of alumni associations affiliated with the Foundation through the Rutgers University Alumni Association (RUAA), whose board chair is alumnus Joe Lemkin RC '90. The RUAA is the only university-wide alumni association and reports to the Foundation. (The Board is staffed by Donna Thornton.) All alumni associations, regional clubs and special interest groups at Rutgers are required to affiliate through the RUAA, including the RAA (Rutgers Alumni Association) and AADC (Associate Alumnae of Douglass College). The foundation and alumni association are fully integrated, working to engage our alumni and friends, and to solicit them for support of Rutgers University.

6.How are the connections between the Media and Communications Office(s) and the Foundation being fully leveraged to maximize the impact of research successes on fundraising efforts?

The Foundation works closely with a number of media and communications offices across the universities to promote philanthropy in support of research. The most visible outcome of that collaboration can be found in each edition of Rutgers, the alumni magazine. The Foundation has its own communications and marketing group that supports the efforts of the Foundation and Alumni Association to promote the research programs of our faculty and students. Recent gift announcements supporting research can be found

here. <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1VwvkNID1dH3H8uV5q-RaaDU8o9q53WQP5wukCnvnP14/edit?usp=sharing>

7. How are specific relationships between individual units and the Foundation established?

The Foundation supports the fund raising priorities of the university, and its units. It is organized to support the chancellor led units, where most of the academic and research programs reside. It is less well organized to support the university-wide initiatives that currently report to Senior Vice President Barbara Lee. Efforts will be made in future years, and as resources become available, to do more to staff university-wide research enterprises.

Professional fund raisers are assigned to academic units in collaboration between the unit, its Chancellor, and the Foundation. There is an expectation that the units pay 50% of salary and fringe benefits of assigned fund raisers, and provide a suitable work space, and adequate administrative support. One of the major factors in justifying this level of investment is the quality and number of potential major gift prospects who have identified a unit, and its work, as a priority in their philanthropy. Hiring a talented fund raiser to work on behalf of a unit, with little to no identified prospects, is very difficult.

Any unit wishing to garner fund raising support should contact its Chancellor's Office, and the Vice Chancellor for Advancement for the respective university or RBHS, to discuss options.

8. How can we help assure that all units have equal potential to get their message to philanthropists?

As part of planning for the next campaign, set to quietly launch on July 1, 2019, each school and chancellor led unit will be asked to identify their fund raising priorities. In addition to school- and Chancellor-based processes for establishing unit-based priorities, the Foundation is leading a "Big Idea" generation process that is designed to identify significant opportunities for philanthropists to support transformational, multi-disciplinary ideas generated by our faculty, and supported by its leadership. The Foundation will focus on both unit-based fund raising priorities and the Big Ideas in its communications with its philanthropists. Every unit has equal potential to participate in these processes.

9. How can researchers from specific units work with the Foundation to solicit donations to support facilities and infrastructure related to research? What are the restrictions on fundraising at the unit level?

Before promoting a specific unit's work in an effort to raise money for it, the Dean and Chancellor need to identify it as a fund raising priority and share that information with the Foundation.

10. How can the funds resulting from such efforts - made at the unit level - be subject to reduced administrative costs?

The Foundation's budget has a number of revenue sources. One of the sources, providing approximately \$5.5 million of its annual operating budget, is the gift assessment fee. Rutgers, like most major public research universities, has implemented this fee on all gifts as a way of helping to underwrite the cost of fund raising. It is not a fee for service. All gifts, with the exception of those provided by current and retired faculty and staff, are subject to the gift assessment fee.

11. How can specific units work with the Alumni Association and Rutgers Foundation to target particular alumni with donation requests to maintain existing research infrastructure?

The Foundation and Alumni Association have access to a database that contains the records of over 900,000 individuals and organizations who are donors or potential donors to Rutgers. The Foundation invests in keeping this data as up-to-date as possible. Recently, we screened our data to identify the organizations and causes that our alumni and friends support beyond Rutgers. This information is being captured in the database in ways that allows our staff to search the records for individuals and organizations that support specific areas of philanthropy. Our staff also conducts over 4,750 visits per year with donors and potential donors where they learn about their philanthropic interests. This information is also recorded in such a way that it is searchable. Using this data, we target individuals and organizations who may have an interest in funding specific areas.

12. Can facilities maintenance monies come out of an endowment or other funds raised by the foundation? If so, how and if not, why?

Virtually all the gifts of endowment managed by the University are restricted in their use by an agreement between the Foundation and the donor. If a donor has agreed to allow some of the earnings of the endowment that they created to be used for maintenance, it can be used for that purpose. If

the endowment is restricted for something other than maintenance in the endowment agreement, it cannot be used for that purpose.

The same is true for virtually all the money donated to Rutgers to support its current operations. Each dean, chancellor, and the President's Office, receive some unrestricted gifts that they could reallocate for maintenance, but the amount of money is quite small, and the demand on this type of discretionary funding far exceeds the supply.

Generally, donors think it is the University's and State's responsibility to maintain the buildings and facilities that they build. Very few donors are willing to fund maintenance. They prefer to fund scholarships, programs, and chairs.

Appendix III RGPEC Committee Members

2018-2019 Academic Year

Kustka, Adam, UC-N (F), Chair
Carson, Tyler, SGS (S)
D'Anna, Suzanne, SHP (F)
DeFilippis, James, EJBSPPP (F)
Farmbry, Kyle, GS-N Acting Dean (A)
Gabriel, Sherine, RWJMS Dean (A)
Goodman, Robert, SEBS Dean (A)
Guo, Grace, Pharmacy (F)
Han, Zheng-Chao, SAS-NB (F)
Hartman, JeanMarie, SEBS (F)
Hatefi, Arash, Pharmacy (F)
Holzemer, William, Nursing Dean (A)
Jarrín Montaner, Olga, CBI-RBHS (F)
Joergensen, John, Law-N (F)
Junboonta, Nattawan, GSE (S)
Kelly, Michael, RWJMS (F) – <i>EC Liaison</i>
Kettle, John, At-Large Newark (F)
Kukor, Jerome, SGS Dean (A)
Lema, Nicole, SAS-NB (S)
Lewis, Jan, FAS-N Dean (A)
Lutz, Carol, SGS (F)
Mazurek, Monica, SGS (F)
Mena-Segovia, Juan, CBI-Newark (F)
Molloy, Christopher, SVP Research – <i>ex officio</i>
Neubauer, Judy, AVP Regulatory Affairs – <i>ex officio</i>
Oleske, James, Other Units RBHS (F)
O'Neill, Karen, SGS (F)
Pardlo, Gregory, GS-C (F)
Rosen, Robert, RWJMS (S)
Rothpletz-Puglia, Pamela, SHRP (F)
Takhistov, Paul, SEBS (F)
Van Stine, Michael, GS-C (S)
Yang, Chung, Pharmacy (F)

2019-2020 Academic Year

Kustka, Adam, UC-N (F) – Chair
Chaudhary, Abha, SPH (S)
D’Anna, Suzanne, SHP (F)
DeFilippis, James, EJBSPPP (F)
Dool, Richard, SCI (F)
Fischer, Christiane, SGS (S)
Goodman, Robert, SEBS Dean (A)
Guo, Grace, Pharmacy (F)
Hana, Masanori, Engineering (F)
Hartman, JeanMarie, SEBS (F)
Hatefi, Arash, Pharmacy (F)
Holzemer, William, Nursing Dean (A)
Jarrín, Olga, Other Units – RBHS (F)
Joergensen, John, Law-N (F)
Kaye, Rachel, NJMS (F)
Kettle, John, Newark At-Large (F)
Kukor, Jerome, SGS Dean (A)
Lamar, Valentine, GS-N (S)
Lutz, Carol, SGS (F)
Mazurek, Monica, SGS (F)
Mena-Segovia, Juan, Other Units-N (F)
Miranti, Paul, RBS:N/NB (F)
Molloy, Christopher, NB Chancellor (A)
Neubauer, Judy, AVP Regulatory Affairs, <i>ex officio</i>
O’Rourke, Kevin, SMLR (S)
Oleske, James, Other Units – RBHS (F)
Pardlo, Gregory, GS-Camden (F)
Silver, Deborah, SGS (F)
Simonds, Adrienne, SHP (F)
Stopyra, Chase, SHP (S)
Takhistov, Paul, SEBS (F)
Van Stine, Michael, GS-C (S)
Bauzyk, Erin (S)