

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS**  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

**February 12, 2019**

12:00 p.m. - open session / 12:05 p.m. - closed session / 1:00 p.m. - open session  
Winants Hall, 7 College Avenue, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Agenda

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT
3. ROLL CALL (taken while meeting continues)
4. RESOLUTION TO CONDUCT CLOSED SESSION – February 12, 2019
5. CLOSED SESSION
6. RESUMPTION OF OPEN SESSION
7. MATTERS PRESENTED BY THE PRESIDENT
8. PRESENTATION BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE RUTGERS CANCER INSTITUTE OF NEW JERSEY
9. COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS – January 29, 2019
  - a. Proposed Recommendation for Award of Honorary Degrees and Commencement Speaker at Rutgers University-Newark in May 2019
10. COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AFFAIRS – January 31, 2019
11. COMMITTEE ON AUDIT – January 10, 2019
12. COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS – January 30, 2019
13. COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND FACILITIES – January 29, 2019
  - a. Proposed Resolution Approving the Rutgers Center for Adult Autism Services Workday Program Building on the Douglass Campus\*
  - b. Proposed Resolution Approving Phase 3 Projects for the Administrative and Student Information System Initiatives\*
14. CONSENT AGENDA
  - a. Approval of Minutes of the Board of Governors – December 6, 2018
  - b. Committee on Academic and Student Affairs – January 29, 2019
    - (1) Faculty Appointment Recommendations
    - (2) Faculty Promotion Recommendations
    - (3) Administrative Appointment Recommendation
    - (4) Proposed Resolution Appointing the Initial Holder to the William P. Alston Chair for the Philosophy of Religion\*
    - (5) Proposed Resolution Approving Revisions to University Policy 10.1.5: Research Centers and Institutes\*
    - (6) Proposed Resolution Establishing the Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies Degree Program at the School of Arts and Sciences\*
  - c. Committee on Health Affairs – January 31, 2019
    - (1) Minutes of the University Behavioral Health Care Leadership Meetings of October 23, 2018 and November 20, 2018
    - (2) Proposed University Behavioral Health Care Staff Appointments, Reappointments and Clinical Privileges of November 20, 2018 and December 18, 2018
15. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION AND UNIVERSITY TREASURER
  - a. Joint Committee on Investments – December 21, 2018
16. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
17. OLD BUSINESS
18. NEW BUSINESS
19. ADJOURNMENT

\* Attachment



**RESOLUTION**  
**APPROVING THE RUTGERS CENTER FOR ADULT AUTISM SERVICES**  
**WORKDAY PROGRAM BUILDING ON THE DOUGLASS CAMPUS**

**WHEREAS**, the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology (GSAPP) currently provides on-campus services and programs to children and teens with autism; and

**WHEREAS**, autism and autism spectrum disorder are among the fastest-growing developmental disabilities in the United States; and

**WHEREAS**, GSAPP strives as part of its core mission to provide a continuum of services by building new programs that will now serve adults with autism; and

**WHEREAS**, in order to do so GSAPP proposes building a new facility located on the Douglass Campus that will provide the opportunity for adults with autism to work independently within a university setting; and

**WHEREAS**, the new center will also provide education and clinical training for Rutgers students working with those challenged by autism spectrum disorder; and

**WHEREAS**, the cost of the Project is estimated to be \$9.5 million paid for through philanthropy; and

**WHEREAS**, the Project was presented to the Committee on Finance and Facilities on January 29, 2019 and the Committee recommended the Board of Governors of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, approve the Project, with spending authority up to the currently available funding limit of \$9.5 million.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Finance and Facilities, the Board of Governors of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, approves the Project Summary describing the project, with spending authority up to the currently available funding limit of \$9.5 million; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the University administration, acting through the Executive Vice President for Strategic Planning and Operations and Chief Operating Officer, in consultation with the Vice President of Facilities and the Office of General Counsel, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for construction of the Project.

Attachment: Project Summary

Board of Governors  
Rutgers, The State University  
of New Jersey  
February 12, 2019

## **PROJECT SUMMARY**

Rutgers Center for Adult Autism Services  
Workday Program Building

Rutgers University – New Brunswick

January 29, 2019

### **Introduction**

The Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology (GSAPP), which currently provides on-campus services and programs to children and teens with autism, seeks to build a new facility to accommodate programs that will begin serving adults with autism. This is the anticipated first phase of a multi-phase initiative.

The proposed Rutgers Center for Adult Autism Services (RCAAS), when fully realized, will provide the opportunity for adults with autism to live and work independently within a university setting. The new Center will provide education and clinical training for Rutgers students working with those challenged by autism spectrum disorder. The first phase of this development is construction of a new Workday Program Building.

### **Program**

Autism and Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) are among the fastest-growing developmental disabilities in the U.S., with an estimated 1 in 68 individuals affected nationally and 1 in 41 affected in New Jersey. Experts and families agree that there is a national crisis in the lack of services, including vocational, recreational, life skills, and residential services, for adults with ASD. After aging out of the K-12 school system, many face significant challenges in securing comprehensive support programming. Most states maintain waiting lists for adult services, and it is estimated that there are well over 100,000 individuals with developmental disabilities in the U.S. awaiting residential placement. The shortage of highly trained health, mental health, and allied care professionals, along with the dearth of quality services for adults with ASD around the world, is a well-documented and growing problem. Like the rest of the nation and the world, New Jersey is at a critical juncture. The Rutgers Center for Adult Autism Services intends to demonstrate how universities can become key leaders in integrating academic education, research, hands-on student training, and comprehensive community inclusion of adults with ASD.

The Center will have two core components: a Workday Program, providing approximately 30 adult participants with job training, jobs, life skills, and recreational opportunities, and a

Residential Program, providing residence and services for adult participants who could work on campus and live in an integrated apartment-style building alongside graduate students. Each phase is operationally and financially independent.

### **Scope**

The project consists of the development of a new one-story 10,000 gross square foot Workday Program Building on the Douglass campus. The building would serve as a location where approximately thirty (30) adult clients would be dropped off then picked up daily, with participants spending the day on vocational activities around campus. The new facility includes multi-functional gathering space, vocational training space, administrative offices for faculty and clinical staff, and support spaces. The building is to be built at the location of the former Corwin Dormitories on Nichol Avenue, between Comstock Street and Dudley Road.

As part of development of the site, the remaining vacant Corwin residential buildings will be demolished.

### **Benefits**

The primary benefit of the project is enhancement of program delivery at GSAPP. This unique program may be the first of its kind in higher education in the country.

### **Financial**

The total cost of the project will not exceed \$9.5 million. Included in this figure are demolition of vacant Corwin residential buildings, site improvements, and the new Workday Center Building. The capital costs are covered by donor funding.



**RESOLUTION**  
**APPROVING PHASE 3 PROJECTS FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND STUDENT**  
**INFORMATION SYSTEMS INITIATIVES**

**WHEREAS**, the integration of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey necessitated a migration to an enterprise-wide information technology platform; and

**WHEREAS**, University-wide efficient, effective, and responsive business practices and systems are foundational elements of the Rutgers Strategic Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the University's move to a Responsibility Center Management budgeting approach effected changes to existing budget processes and the supporting infrastructure; and

**WHEREAS**, the University must provide reliable and accessible information to our academic and administrative leadership; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Governors approved Phase 1 projects for the Administrative and Student Information Systems Initiatives on April 3, 2015 and Phase 2 projects on June 15, 2016; and

**WHEREAS**, Phase 2 will continue completion of active projects in each functional area, including Financial Management, Budget and Planning, Procurement, Expense Management, Student One Stop Shops, and Human Resources/Payroll Service Center, to ensure a successful implementation of Phase 2 project objectives; and

**WHEREAS**, the administration has planned projects for Phase 3 encompassing April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 as described in Exhibit A; and

**WHEREAS**, the scope of the projects for Phase 3 would include implementation of additional modules as it relates to Financial Management, Budget and Financial Planning, Research Administration, and Procurement, as well as implementation of Oracle's cloud-based Human Resources system, implementation of an enterprise-wide Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system on a new Salesforce platform, and implementation of a new Student Information System; and

**WHEREAS**, Phase 3 will also include business process and organizational review and implementation for Human Resources and Payroll Services and the Student Experience Improvement Initiative; and

**WHEREAS**, the estimated costs for Phase 3 of the Administrative and Student Information Systems Initiatives project is \$40.17 million, which will be funded in the short to medium-term using commercial paper or other debt instruments; and

**WHEREAS**, on January 29, 2018, following a presentation and discussion of the Phase 3 projects identified above and as further described in Exhibit A hereof, the Committee on Finance and Facilities agreed to recommend approval by the Board of Governors for the Phase 3 projects, with spending authority not to exceed the funding limit of \$40.17 million, to be funded through the aforementioned sources.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Finance and Facilities, the Board of Governors of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, approves the Phase 3 Projects of the Administrative and Student Information Systems Initiative for a cost not to exceed \$40.17 million.

Attachment: Exhibit A – Administrative and Student Information Systems: Phase 3 Projects

Board of Governors  
Rutgers, The State University  
of New Jersey  
February 12, 2019

## Administrative and Student Information Systems Initiatives

### Phase 3 Budget Proposal Summary

|                      | Phase 3 Request    |                     |                     |
|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Project              | FY 19 (6 Months)   | FY20                | TOTAL Phase 3       |
| HR/Payroll           | \$1,513,602        | \$6,504,882         | \$8,018,484         |
| SEII                 | \$1,772,516        | \$8,788,672         | \$10,561,188        |
| Research             | \$338,043          | \$363,285           | \$701,328           |
| Financial Management | \$436,621          | \$673,035           | \$1,109,656         |
| Budget Office        | \$225,348          | \$248,756           | \$474,104           |
| Procurement          | \$655,553          | \$1,360,361         | \$2,015,914         |
| CRM                  | \$3,023,468        | \$11,944,788        | \$14,968,256        |
| Chart of Accounts    | \$576,175          | \$1,744,438         | \$2,320,613         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>         | <b>\$8,541,325</b> | <b>\$31,628,218</b> | <b>\$40,169,543</b> |



**RESOLUTION  
APPOINTING BRIAN LEFTOW  
AS THE INITIAL HOLDER OF  
THE WILLIAM P. ALSTON CHAIR  
FOR THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION**

**WHEREAS**, the university is committed to the advancement and application of knowledge in philosophy and the humanities; and

**WHEREAS**, in 2016 the University established the William P. Alston Chair for the Philosophy of Religion thanks to generous gifts from the John Templeton Foundation and an anonymous donor to honor the late William P. Alston, a towering figure in 20th century philosophy of religion, who taught at Rutgers from 1971 to 1976; and

**WHEREAS**, Brian Leftow is one of the most prominent philosophers of religion of his generation and an important historian of medieval philosophy; having served as the Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion at Oxford University for 16 years; whose research has made major contributions to philosophy of religion and to the history of medieval philosophy, including having published more than 100 scholarly articles and two major books, *Time and Eternity* (Cornell University Press) and *God and Necessity* (Oxford University Press); and co-edited two additional books *Aquinas: Questions on God* and *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm* (both published by Cambridge University Press); and

**WHEREAS**, Brian Leftow has been recommended for the William P. Alston Chair for the Philosophy of Religion by Dr. Peter March, Executive Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences–New Brunswick; Dr. Christopher J. Molloy, Interim Chancellor of Rutgers University–New Brunswick; Dr. Barbara A. Lee, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; and Dr. Robert L. Barchi, the President of the University; and

**WHEREAS**, on January 29, 2019, the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs reviewed and endorsed the appointment of Brian Leftow to the William P. Alston Chair for the Philosophy of Religion and recommended approval by the Board of Governors.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs, the Board of Governors of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, appoints Dr. Brian Leftow as the inaugural holder of the William P. Alston Chair for the Philosophy of Religion commencing September 1, 2018.

Board of Governors  
Rutgers, The State University  
of New Jersey  
February 12, 2019



**RESOLUTION  
APPROVING REVISIONS TO  
UNIVERSITY POLICY 10.1.5: RESEARCH CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**

**WHEREAS**, the current version of University Policy 10.1.5: Research Centers and Institutes, was approved by the Board of Governors of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, by Resolution dated July 1, 2013 and has been in effect since that date; and

**WHEREAS**, following an ongoing review of the state of research centers, bureaus, and institutes across Rutgers University by the Committee on Academic Planning and Review, finalized on March 23, 2017, a number of recommendations were made for the improved effectiveness and clarity of the processes and procedures involved in the classification, creation, review, renewal, suspension, and dissolution of a center or institute, including the elimination of the "bureau" designation; and

**WHEREAS**, recommended edits to Policy 10.1.5 include information pertaining directly to centers that were included in the Policy on the Suspension or Discontinuance of Programs, Departments, and Centers previously approved by the Board of Governors on May 10, 1991, whereby University Policy 10.1.5 now supersedes that Board of Governors policy; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed revisions include the detailing of policy-level information regarding the proposal, review, renewal, suspension, and dissolution of centers and institutes within University Policy 10.1.5 and the movement of the procedural steps for these items to the document *Guidelines and Procedures for Center and Institute Proposals and Periodic Progress Reports*, which will now be stored on the website of the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning, and thusly referenced within University Policy 10.1.5; and

**WHEREAS**, potential alterations to University Policy 10.1.5 were incorporated into a revised policy by the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and have been reviewed, and further revised, by the Chancellors of the University, the University Senate, the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning, and broadly across the Rutgers University community; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed revisions have been well received by the administration, faculty, and staff of the University and noted for their improved lucidity; and

**WHEREAS**, on November 13, 2018 and January 29, 2019 the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs of the Board of Governors reviewed the revised University Policy 10.1.5: Centers and Institutes and recommended its approval by the Board of Governors.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs, the Board of Governors of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, approves the attached revised University Policy 10.1.5: Centers and Institutes, effective immediately.

Attachment: Proposed Revised University Policy 10.1.5: Centers and Institutes

Board of Governors  
Rutgers, The State University  
of New Jersey  
February 12, 2019

## RUTGERS UNIVERSITY POLICY

**Section:** 10.1.5

**Section Title:** Academic Matters

**Policy Name:** Research Centers and Institutes

**Formerly Book:** 1.3.5

**Approval Authority:** Board of Governors

**Responsible Executive:** Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs **Responsible Office:** Office of Academic Affairs

**Originally Issued:** 1959

**Revisions:** 2/1996; 07/1/2010; 7/1/2013

**Errors or changes?** Contact: [polices@oaa.rutgers.edu](mailto:polices@oaa.rutgers.edu)

|                                      |   |                              |  |                              |                   |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b><u>Policy Name:</u></b>           | <u>Centers and Institutes</u>                                 |                              |  |                              |                   |
| <b><u>Section #:</u></b>             | <u>10.1.5</u>   | <b><u>Section Title:</u></b> | <u>Academic Matters</u>  | <b><u>Formerly Book:</u></b> | <u>1.3.5</u>      |
| <b><u>Approval Authority:</u></b>    | <u>Board of Governors</u>                                     | <b><u>Adopted:</u></b>       | <u>1959</u>  | <b><u>Reviewed:</u></b>      | <u>02/12/2019</u> |
| <b><u>Responsible Executive:</u></b> | <u>Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs</u>             | <b><u>Revised:</u></b>       | <u>02/1996; 07/01/2010; 07/01/2013; 02/12/2019</u>   |                              |                   |
| <b><u>Responsible Office:</u></b>    | <u>Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning</u> | <b><u>Contact:</u></b>       | <u>Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning</u><br><u>848-932-7305</u><br><u><a href="https://oirap.rutgers.edu">https://oirap.rutgers.edu</a></u> |                              |                   |

### 1. Policy Statement

The University is a center for innovative research. The University shall from time to time establish additional research centers and institutes, which may be supported by University budgetary resources, special provision from State appropriations (particularly in the case of such units created as a result of specific legislation), endowment funds, external grants or contracts, and/or some combination of these. Each research center and institute has its own mission statement, and as appropriate, a set of bylaws, procedures, or statement of governance.

### 2. Reason for Policy

This policy describes the processes by which ~~research~~ Centers and Institutes are established, and ~~where a current listing of University research centers and institutes may be obtained~~<sup>1</sup> approved, monitored, renewed, and dissolved. This policy also identifies the ~~governing bodies~~ individuals and entities that have authority over the missions and policies of University ~~research~~ Centers and Institutes. This policy supersedes the May 10, 1991 Board of Governors-approved Policy on the Suspension or Discontinuance of Programs, Departments, and Centers with respect to Centers only.

### 3. Who Should Read This Policy

- Chancellors and Vice Presidents
- Deans, directors, and department chairs
- Faculty members
- Academic administrators

### 4. ~~Related Documents~~Resources

- Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning (<https://oirap.rutgers.edu/>)

### ~~5. Contacts:~~

~~— Office of Academic Labor Relations  
— 848-932-7174~~

### 5. Definitions

Centers and Institutes are organizational forms designed to further the University's instructional, research, and public service missions in ways that are not addressed through traditional structures, such as departments, schools, and colleges. Going forward, an Institute will differ from a Center in that it will have a broader mission than a Center, will have wider interests than is characteristic of a focused Center, and may include several smaller units within it.

### 6. The Policy

Centers and Institutes (C&Is) are valued and encouraged at Rutgers University as vibrant and highly productive components of the University community. ~~C&Is represent more dynamic structures and provide administrators with greater flexibility and opportunity to adapt to economic and academic competitive pressures. The purpose of this policy, which was primarily informed by recommendations of the Rutgers Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) report on Centers, Bureau's and Institutes (November 3, 2009)~~ Centers and Institutes (March 23, 2017), is to provide specific procedures central to the creation, review, and renewal or dissolution of for the classification, creation, review, modification, and dissolution of C&Is, with the goals of to enhance ing their operation, management, support, and impacts.

#### A. Classification of C&Is

For the purposes of this policy, C&Is<sup>2</sup> are classified according to their level of approval and reporting relationship. ~~The following categories of C&Is are as follows:~~

- ~~2. Board of Governors Centers and Institutes. The mission of a C&I, or similar unit which is organized independently of a school, college, or Faculty and which has been created by the Board of Governors upon recommendation of the President of the University shall be such as is specified in the instrument of creation approved by the Board. The mission of each research center or institute established by action of the~~

---

<sup>1</sup> ~~Sources of information in the policy have been obtained from: University of Wisconsin — Madison C&I Policy, Northwestern University C&I Policy, Rutgers University — C&I Report (Nov. 2009).~~

<sup>2</sup> ~~An Institute differs from a center in that it would have a broader mission than a Center, have wider academic interests than is characteristic of a focused research center, may include several Centers within it, and may include members from other higher education institutions.~~

~~Legislature of the State of New Jersey shall be such as is specified in the establishing legislation and referenced in the minutes of the Board provided that such research center or institute is accepted and approved by the Board of Governors and Board of Trustees. The mission of each research center or institute established by authority of the President of the University shall be such as is specified in documents submitted to the Board of Governors prior to such Presidential authorization and referenced in the minutes of the Board.~~

- ~~1. **Board of Governors-level CI:** Initial approval or termination of the CI is by the Board of Governors (BOG), upon the recommendation of the President. CIs at this level will typically be organized independently of a school or college, be supported by a significant endowment or other long-term financial resources, and/or be established by action of the federal or State of New Jersey Legislature. The CI Director reports to the President or the President's designee.~~
- ~~3.2. **Presidential-level CI:** Initial approval and renewal or termination of the CI is by the President, and the Director reports to the President or the President's designee. The President will seek the advice of the University Senate before deciding to approve or terminate CIs in this category. Typically, these CIs will have a substantial number of members from more than one decanal unit.~~
- ~~2. **Statewide Centers and Institutes.** Statewide C&Is are major initiatives of the University, jointly sponsored by two or more schools or units, or by School(s) in collaboration with an external institution. They require the approval of the President and the Board of Trustees through its University Affairs/Research Committee.~~
  - ~~a. Statewide centers/institutes have the following characteristics:~~
    - ~~2. Multiple locations: All statewide centers/institutes are intended to have a physical presence at multiple Rutgers campuses. Campus locations of the center/institute are closely associated with a School at that site.~~
    - ~~3. Statewide leadership: Statewide centers/institutes are led by an Executive Director, appointed by the EVPAA or Chancellor, acting in consultation with the Deans. Local Directors are appointed by and report to the Executive Director.~~
    - ~~4. Consistent business practices: Statewide centers/institutes shall maintain consistent business practices across the center/institute, and shall, to the maximum extent possible, present themselves to the external community as a single, seamless unit.~~
  - ~~b. Application to form a new statewide center/institute will be in the form of a proposal as described in Section B.1, mutually agreeable to all involved parties and formally submitted to the University Office of Academic Affairs. Proposers are strongly advised to seek the informal approval of the Deans and the senior management of the University before undertaking this task.~~
  - ~~c. Proposals must be pre-approved by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), Chancellor of Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) or the Chancellor of the Camden or Newark campus. The proposal is then submitted to the President and the Board of Trustees through its University Affairs/Research Committee for final approval.~~
- ~~3. **Chancellor- or Senior/Executive Vice Presidential-level CI:** Initial approval and renewal or termination of the CI is by the President and a Chancellor or Senior/Executive Vice President, and the Director reports to the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee, or a Senior/Executive Vice President. The President will seek the advice of the University Senate before deciding to approve or terminate CIs in this category. Typically these CIs have members from more than one decanal unit.~~

~~2.4.~~

**2. University Centers and Institutes.** Initial approval and renewal or termination of such a C&I is by the Vice President of Research and Economic Development (VPRED). Initiation of these C&Is can also be driven by the VPRED. The director reports to the VPRED. University C&Is will have a substantial number of members from more than one decanal unit and more than one discipline. At least two of the PIs must come from different departments or decanal units. A University C&I will have an internal structure which may include corporate memberships and/or sponsored research contracts, as well as public support (for example from NSF, NIH, DoD etc.). C&Is can apply for this classification through VPRED, and those that are accepted by a central committee can apply for internal support in the form of startup grants and administrative and management staff support from VPRED to fulfill the C&I's mission. These C&Is will be considered Public-Private Partnerships which have a partnership-based, focused approach, to improve the Rutgers research infrastructure. Decanal-level CI: Initial approval and renewal or termination of the CI is by a Chancellor, upon the recommendation of the Dean, and the Director reports to the Dean(s). Typically, these CIs will be almost completely comprised of members from a single decanal unit, but not from just a single department in that unit. Also included in this category are the Centers and Outlying Stations/Farms of the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station (NJAES) that are under the administrative authority of the Executive Director of the NJAES.

**5. Decanal Centers.** Initial approval and renewal or termination of such a center is by the dean of that unit and the director reports to this dean. Typically, these centers will be almost completely comprised of faculty from a single decanal unit, but not from just a single department in that unit. Also included in this category are the Centers and Outlying Stations/Farms of the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station (NJAES). These are stakeholder driven research, service and outreach centers that come under the administrative authority of the Executive Director of the NJAES.

**3. Departmental-level CI:** Initial approval and renewal or termination of the CI is by the Dean of the unit to which the department belongs, upon the recommendation of the department chair, and the Director reports to the department chair. Typically, these CIs will be almost completely comprised of members from a single department.

**4. Departmental Centers.** Initial approval and renewal or termination of such a center is by the department chair and the dean of the unit to which the department belongs, and the director reports to the department chair. Typically, these centers will be almost completely comprised of faculty from a single department.

**5. The use of the titles "Rutgers" Center and "Rutgers" Institute should be reserved for these entities that are officially recognized by the University.**

CIs that have membership across Chancellor, Decanal, or departmental units may by special arrangement report to more than one supervisor. In cases where membership would suggest more than two supervisors, the CI Director may report to the next highest level of supervision.

The use of the "Rutgers" name in the title of Centers and Institutes is encouraged, particularly for CIs at the Decanal-level of approval and above.

Joint and other Inter-institutional CIs with other institutions of higher education may be proposed at any level reporting relationship, but require the approval of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

## **B. Creation, Review, and Renewal or Dissolution of C&Is**

The Office of the Vice President of Research and Economic Development (OVPRED) can provide assistance and support in the Creation, Review, and Renewal or Dissolution of C&I's (existing or planned). All new centers and institutes should notify the OVPRED in the initial planning stages. Contact that office for more information.

### **1. Creation of a C&I**

- a. A basic requirement for the establishment of a new C&I is that it not unreasonably duplicate activities already performed elsewhere in the University. For example, to

~~create a C&I almost entirely comprised of faculty from a single department would require justification of why its purpose is distinct from that of the department.~~

- ~~b. To begin the approval process, the faculty member (s) seeking approval for a C&I must develop a proposal that addresses the following topics, and should include, but not be limited to, the following: C&I Name; Director Name, Title, Department and School Affiliation; Purpose and Mission; Opportunity/Justification; Current Activities; Organizational Structure and Governance; Public-Private Partnerships; Financial Support; Program Description; Administration of Grants; Staffing; Membership Policies; Faculty Participation; Space; Endorsements; Evaluation; Impacts; Timeframe; and Life Cycle. Detailed information regarding the content of each of these sections can be found on the VPRED website: [vpr.rutgers.edu](http://vpr.rutgers.edu).~~
- ~~c. Based on the category of the C&I, as described in Section A, a proposal for the creation of a new C&I prepared according to section B.1 is then submitted for approval to either a department chair, dean, EVPAA, VPRED or Chancellor. If the C&I is approved, the supervisor (person to whom the center/institute Director reports) submits a letter of approval up through the academic chain of command to the EVPAA, VPRED or Chancellor, with a copy sent to the Committee on Academic Planning and Review, and the C&I Director. The letter of approval should contain a summary of the proposal including the justification for establishing the C&I, a plan for its funding, staff, and space needs, the length of time for which the C&I is approved (typically not to exceed five years), the criteria and conditions under which the C&I can be evaluated for renewal, along with the full proposal as an attachment.~~
- ~~d. The Director, who is appointed by either a department chair, dean, EVPAA, VPRED or Chancellor, will report to and serve at their pleasure.~~
- ~~e. While C&Is can differ widely in their scope, at a minimum, each should place on its website the mission, membership policies, infrastructure resources, list of faculty with their research interest and additional affiliations, and annual report of the C&I.~~
- ~~f. The EVPAA, VPRED, Chancellors, and deans who supervise a substantial number of C&Is, should form and meet on a regular basis with a council of directors of C&Is reporting to that supervisor.~~

## ~~2. Review, Renewal or Dissolution of a C&I~~

- ~~a. C&I operations will be approved for 5 year terms. Six months prior to the renewal/termination date of a C&I, those C&Is requesting renewal should submit to their supervisor a report which demonstrates how the C&I has achieved the goals and met the expectations outlined in the initial proposal for the formation of the C&I and has satisfied the criteria and conditions for renewal given when the C&I was approved.~~
- ~~b. The report should contain the goals and expectations of accomplishments if the C&I is renewed, and any changes in the mission or other information about the C&I appearing in the proposal for the original establishment of the C&I or the prior 5 year evaluation.~~
- ~~c. Supervisory review of the report should consider the central questions of whether or not the center is fulfilling its mission, if improvements are needed, and if the center should persist. The supervisor then has three options: (i) Terminate or renew the C&I without additional review; (ii) seek an internal review of the C&I to provide additional information before deciding; or (iii) request that the C&I undergo an external review chosen, (similar to a strategic review of a department) before making a decision. If option (ii) is chosen, this policy strongly recommends that outside letters of evaluation be solicited, just as in faculty promotions or review of grant proposals. This can provide a peer review of the reputation and accomplishments of a C&I relative to~~

~~external organizations with similar goals. If option (iii) is requested, (perhaps if the result of option (ii) is inconclusive), approval is needed from the EVPAA, VPRED or Chancellor, with the review to be supervised by the Committee on Academic Planning and Review, and funded by the EVPAA, VPRED or Chancellor.~~

- ~~d. After any additional input is obtained and a final decision is made, the supervisor of the C&I submits a letter either terminating or renewing the C&I, up through the chain of command to the EVPAA, VPRED or Chancellor, (or Board of Governors, if appropriate), with a copy sent to the Committee on Academic Planning and Review, and the C&I Director.~~
- ~~e. If the C&I is renewed, the letter should contain a justification for the renewal (including any internal or external review reports), any changes in funding, staff, or space, the length of time for which the C&I is renewed, (not more than five years), and the criteria and conditions under which the C&I will be evaluated for further renewal.~~
- ~~f. If the C&I is dissolved, the dissolution should not infringe contractual obligations to faculty and staff. As such, dissolution of a C&I requires a plan to reorganize human resources, and institutional, external funding, and infrastructure issues within the organizational framework of the University. This plan must be spelled out in the termination letter of the C&I, along with a justification for termination (including any internal or external review reports).~~
- ~~g. The review, renewal or dissolution process described above applies to all C&Is (new and existing), unless such a process conflicts with existing contracts or agreements. In the case of C&Is with such conflicts, the C&I should still be reviewed and the contracts/agreements evaluated. This gives an objective basis for possible renegotiation of contracts that could benefit both the C&I and the University.~~
- ~~h. Since many existing C&Is do not have an explicit renewal/termination date, (and hence there is no date to start the review process), a date shall be set by the supervisor that takes into consideration the length of time the C&I has already been in existence, but that is no more than five years in the future.~~

### **3. ~~Renaming Centers~~**

~~Proposals to rename centers must be approved by the relevant administrative unit. Center names should not overlap with those of existing departments, schools, colleges, centers, or other units.~~

### **4. ~~Reorganizing or Restructuring Centers~~**

~~Proposals to reorganize or restructure centers should be approved by the administrative unit and/or by the school/college dean, and then forwarded to the responsible EVPAA, VPRED or Chancellor. Reorganizations may include combining two or more centers into one, creating umbrella structures, splitting a center into two or more separate centers, or other significant restructuring. Appropriate endorsements should accompany the request. If restructuring appears to result in the creation of a new center, then it must be approved by according to the guidelines outlined in Section B.1.~~

### **5. ~~Listing of Centers and Institutes.~~**

~~A current listing of major research centers and institutes shall be maintained by the University Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning, together with a record of any such unit which has been disestablished by action of the Board of Governors or, as appropriate, by action of the EVPAA, VPRED or Chancellor with the approval of the President. The listing of major research centers and institutes is available at <http://www.rutgers.edu/research/centers-institutes>.~~

## **C. Principles Governing Shared Department/C&I Responsibilities for Faculty**

1. Due to the shared responsibility between departments and C&Is, a C&I faculty search should be initiated jointly with the dean where tenure of the incoming faculty would reside. Before an offer is made, there must be an agreement between the units involved, specifying the distribution of the line weight, space allotment, start-up cost (see also F&A distribution), and the responsibilities of the incoming faculty to the department and to the C&I.
2. Members of C&Is require action by both the C&I and the home department in cases of merit and promotion. According to the rules of the University, "a personnel action may be initiated for a faculty member by his/her primary department (that is, the department in which the faculty member has tenure) or by the secondary department, SBR unit, or degree-granting program in which the individual has a significant or principal assignment. In both instances the primary department shall have responsibility for the personnel action in consultation with the secondary department, unit or program as described herein."
3. There are two reasons that a C&I member can lose membership. One is due to a negative review of her/his contribution to the mission of the C&I; the other is due to dissolution of a C&I. If membership ceases, faculty would lose the portion of their line and/or salary that is provided by the C&I, which has to be replaced by the unit responsible for tenure. It is therefore important that decanal units budget so that salary is available if C&I membership ends. Members that revert 100% to a unit different than the C&I, would also need to be physically relocated if the C&I needs to reassign space and resources.
4. Faculty workloads should be consistent with a balance of research and instruction in departments and C&Is. In addition, whether a faculty member is in a department or a C&I, the same criteria should be applied in determining whether a reduction in teaching obligations is appropriate in light of a faculty member's research responsibilities and accomplishments.

## **D. Distribution of Facilities and Administration (F&A)**

1. Principles for F&A Distribution
  - a. Typically, 50% of the F&A return is available for distribution to units (i.e., decanal units, departments, and C&Is), with the remainder reserved for the central administration. Any special distribution arrangement should recognize contributions of the dean, the department, and the C&I to which the faculty member belongs.
  - b. F&A distribution arrangements should be based on ongoing responsibilities of the various units. Specific factors to consider include: (i) space provided; (ii) administrative support for grant management; (iii) technical support for laboratory and computer equipment; (iv) access to shared equipment; (v) fellowships and TAs for graduate students; (vi) programmatic initiatives in support of research (e.g., support of seminar series, conferences, post-docs, visitors); (vii) bridge funding for PIs between grants; and (viii) unanticipated short term personnel needs.
  - c. The proposed F&A arrangement must be approved by the VPRED. The agreed-upon special F&A distribution must be made clear to the receiving unit, as well as the costs they are then responsible for paying. The special distribution arrangement should be time-limited (no more than 5 year increments) and is subject to review and approval by VPRED for renewal.
  - d. In cases of faculty membership in both C&Is and decanal units, the proportion of the financial benefit from F&A return depends on the extent of contributions by the C&Is

~~and departments to the recruitment and retention of faculty members and on the research programs, activities, and infrastructure provided by each. The final review and approval of the arrangement is to be made by the VPRED.~~

- ~~e. Faculty submitting grant proposals through a C&I must demonstrate a strong intellectual connection to the work of the C&I. This can be monitored by requiring membership in a C&I (if F&A distribution is involved) to be subject to approval by the administrator who oversees the creation and renewal/termination of the C&I in consultation with the appropriate department chair and center director. Note that an initial list of members and their contributions is part of the initial proposal to create a new C&I.~~
- ~~f. When starting C&Is, a long term source of funds should be identified by the Dean, EVPAA, VPRED or Chancellor if F&A is used to partially fund tenure-track faculty salaries~~

## **E. ~~Guidelines for Annual Reports~~**

- ~~1. The Director of each C&I shall be responsible for the preparation of an annual report to be submitted to their supervisor, with copies to the appropriate Dean(s), and up through the academic chain of command as required.~~
- ~~2. Any centers that have ceased operation or that have been formally discontinued will be reported as such. Any center that has had a change in structure that wasn't already reported will be reported at this time. Any center that was created but not approved and comes to the attention of the dean through this process, will be considered for approval at this time upon completion of the requirements in Section B.1 of this policy.~~
- ~~3. The required information for the annual report, including benchmarks, can be found on the VPR website.~~

## **B. Creation of a Center or Institute**

- 1. A basic requirement for the establishment of a new CI is evidence that it is not unreasonably duplicative of activities already performed elsewhere in the University.
- 2. Establishment of a new CI begins with the development of a proposal that outlines the mission, goals, expected outcomes, and other basic information. Guidelines for preparing the proposal may be found at:  
<https://oirap.rutgers.edu/PDFs/CentersandInstitutesGuidelines.pdf>  
Directors, supervisors, and the CI approvers specified in Section A. (1-5), will be notified of any significant changes that are proposed to the Guidelines and Procedures for Submission.
- 3. Based on the category of the CI, as described in Section A, a proposal for the creation of a new CI is submitted for approval to either a Dean, Chancellor, appropriate Senior/Executive Vice President, the President, and/or the Board of Governors. If approved, the notification of approval will include the length of time for which the CI is approved (up to a five-year term), and the criteria and conditions under which the CI will be evaluated for renewal.
- 4. If a Center or Institute proposal is approved, a copy of the proposal, with approvals, must be sent to the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning for its records.

## **C. Review and Renewal, Suspension or Dissolution of a Center or Institute**

1. The Director of the CI shall be responsible for the preparation of a progress report at a time frame determined with the appropriate CI approver (as specified in Section A.(1-5)), in consultation with the Director's supervisor. While CIs will generally follow an established cycle of review, progress reports and/or reviews may be initiated by the CI approver or the Director's supervisor at any time. Guidelines for information to include in the progress report and the procedures for its submission and review may be found at <https://oirap.rutgers.edu/PDFs/CentersandInstitutesGuidelines.pdf>
2. CI operations will be approved for up to a five-year term. Six months prior to the renewal/termination date of a CI, the CI Director requesting renewal of the CI should prepare a self-assessment report that demonstrates how the CI has achieved the goals and met the expectations outlined in the initial proposal for the formation of the CI, and has satisfied the criteria and conditions for renewal given when the CI was approved or last renewed.
3. Upon review of the progress report, the CI approver, in consultation with the Director's supervisor, has three options: (i) renew, suspend, or dissolve the CI without additional review; (ii) seek an internal review of the CI to provide additional information before deciding on the outcome; or (iii) request that the CI undergo an external review before making a decision.
4. After all specified input is obtained, the CI approver, in consultation with the Director's supervisor, makes a decision to renew, suspend, or dissolve the CI. For CIs classified as Board of Governors-level, Presidential-level, or Chancellor- or Senior/Executive Vice Presidential-level (see Section A. (1), (2), and (3) above), the President will seek the advice of the University Senate before deciding to dissolve the CI. In the case of Board of Governors-level CIs, the BOG should be sent a notice of renewal, or a request for suspension or dissolution for their approval.
5. If the CI is suspended or dissolved, the suspension/dissolution must consider contractual obligations and employment agreements with the faculty and staff associated with the CI, and determine how these will be fulfilled.
6. The outcome of the review should be shared with the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning for its records.
7. Since many existing CIs do not have an explicit renewal/termination date, (and hence there is no date to start the review process), a date shall be set by the CI approver, in consultation with the CI Director's supervisor, that takes into consideration the length of time the CI has already been in existence, but that is no more than five years in the future. Ad hoc reviews may be initiated by the CI approver, in consultation with the CI Director's supervisor, at any time.

#### **D. Shared Departmental/CI Responsibilities for Faculty**

With rare exceptions, faculty tenure resides in an academic department, not in a CI. Because of this shared responsibility, a CI faculty search must be done jointly with the department and dean where the incoming faculty member's tenure will reside. Before an offer is made, there must be an agreement between the units involved that specifies the distribution of the faculty member's time allocation, salary allocation, space allotment, start-up cost, and responsibilities to the department and the CI. The University's commitment to the joint hire must include a commitment by the appropriate dean and other responsible parties to cover 100 percent of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member's salary should the appointment of the faculty member revert 100 percent to the department.

#### **E. Renaming Centers and Institutes**

Proposals to rename CIs must be approved by the CI approver, in consultation with the CI Director's supervisor. CI names should not overlap with those of existing departments, schools,

colleges, CIs, or other units. In the case of Board of Governors-level CIs, the Board of Governors should be sent a notice of the name change request for their approval. Approved nomenclature changes must be reported to the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning.

#### **F. Reorganizing or Restructuring Centers and Institutes**

Proposals to reorganize or restructure CIs must be approved by the CI approver, in consultation with the CI Director's supervisor. Reorganizations may include combining two or more CIs into one, creating umbrella structures, splitting a CI into two or more separate CIs, or other significant organizational restructuring, including changes in the CI's reporting structure. Appropriate approvals by each level of review should accompany the request. If restructuring appears to result in the creation of a new CI, then it must be approved according to the process outlined in Section B of this Policy.

#### **G. Listing of Centers and Institutes**

A current listing of Centers and Institutes shall be maintained by the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning, together with a record of any such unit which has been suspended or dissolved by action consistent with this policy. Changes in CI Directors, their contact information, and/or CI website URLs must be reported by the CI supervisor, or their designee, to the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning for updating of the current listing.

**Center and Institute Proposal Information**  
**(To be posted on VPR website)**

1. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **C&I Name.** The center's name should convey the center's focus clearly, even to those outside the field. If the proposed name is similar to that of another unit (an existing school, college, department, academic program, or center), a letter of endorsement from the existing unit with the similar name should be appended to the proposal.~~
2. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Director Name, Title, Department and School Affiliation.** Include this information for all founding members as well.~~
3. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Purpose and Mission.** What is the proposed purpose and mission for the new center? Explain why this activity could not be as successfully carried out in an existing department or center. Clearly identify the ways in which the proposed center will advance those goals and priorities of the University and/or the school or department as applicable.~~
4. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Opportunity/Justification.** Describe the combination of intellectual capital, research environment, and external factors that creates favorable conditions for the center's success. Provide a justification and explanation of the need for creating the C&I. Departmental centers are required to justify and explain why its purpose is distinct from that of the department.~~
5. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Current Activities.** Describe interdisciplinary research, teaching and outreach collaborations already underway that provide a foundation on which to build the center's activities.~~
6. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Organizational Structure and Governance.** How will the center be organized? Will it operate within a department, within a school or college, as a unit of the Graduate School, or across multiple schools and colleges? If it is interdisciplinary, how will interactions among departments and schools/colleges be managed? What will be its governance and administrative structure? How will its leadership be identified and to whom will its leadership report? What are the proposed responsibilities of the director? By what process is the director appointed, evaluated, and/or reappointed? For centers that will be active in more than one school or college, the proposal must specify how the deans will coordinate responsibility for center oversight and review. Ideally, a lead school will be specified. If the center will operate such that there is no single lead dean, then the proposal should make the organizational structure and lines of responsibility very clear. Will there be internal/external advisory boards. If so, provide information on the types/names of members you will recruit for participation and why. Draft by-laws that include the above information should also be provided.~~
7. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Public-Private Partnerships.** What public/private partnerships do you already have in place (i.e. federal/state funding, corporate contracts, etc.)? What are the opportunities for public-private partnerships? What role will these partners play in the proposed C&I? What contributions will they make and what benefits will be generated as a result of such partnerships?~~
8. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Financial Support.** What is the budget needed for the center and what will be its funding source? If the identified support is lost, what are the prospects for continuation of the center? Please note in particular whether state funds, particularly new state funds, will support the center.~~
9. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Program Description.** Describe the planned research, teaching, outreach and public/private partnership programs of the center, target audiences and timeline for implementation.~~
10. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Administration of Grants.** When faculty members who participate in a center succeed in securing grants associated with the center's mission and activities, will the grants be administered by the center or the faculty member's home department? Will it be possible to share administration and in what cases could that be appropriate? What process will be used to assign or share credit for extramural funding between the center and the Principal Investigator's department?~~
11. ~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Staffing.** It is important to identify faculty and staff who plan to participate in the center's activities. By what mechanism is the participation of new members solicited? Where the interests of centers and departments intersect, it may be important to clarify how activities of participants (faculty and~~

staff) are allocated or credited among participants' various units, or to have procedures for engaging interested parties in discussion of this topic. How will administrative support be provided? Is it adequate to support the mission of the center? If an existing campus unit or an academic department will provide such support, include this information in the letters of endorsement appended.

12. — **Membership Policies.** Describe the policies and requirements for approving both internal and external members, including the responsibilities and benefits of membership.

13. — **Faculty Participation.** Provide an initial list of participating faculty and expected contributions.

14. — **Space.** Where will the center's staff and activities be housed? Is the space adequate? If there is a need for more space, what plans exist to accommodate this need? Have the departmental/sponsoring unit and school/college facilities staff been consulted? If an existing campus unit or an academic department will provide such space, include this information in the letters of endorsement appended. Has the Office of Space Management been consulted and informed of the space to be used by the Center?

15. — **Endorsements.** Here, it is important to address two issues: shared, similar or overlapping interests, and shared resources. This process assumes that relevant units have received drafts of the plan and that concerns are addressed or accounted for in the final version submitted for approval. Letters of endorsement may be appended to the plan. Issues to address include:

a. — Does the center's function or organization overlap the efforts of departments, schools, colleges, or other centers at the university?

b. — Does the center have the support of those who may be affected by it? The plan should provide evidence that all interested units are aware of plans for establishing the center and were afforded an opportunity to comment on the plan to establish the new entity. Early communication may help in discovering individuals with similar interests and in fostering their participation.

c. — Will the center draw on another unit's resources? ("Resources" include staff, courses, and space as well as faculty time). If so, those units should be asked to provide a memo of support for the endeavor, and in it, to articulate a shared understanding of their contribution to the center.

d. — Proposals should include written comments on the proposal, and endorsements from department chairs, deans, directors, and/or key faculty who will provide essential support for and who have an interest in the new center.

16. — **Evaluation.** What is the proposed evaluation process for the center? The process should reflect the size and breadth of the center's activities. Explain the goals and expectations of accomplishment (these must involve clear outcomes and measurable impacts and they will serve as key elements in the review at the time renewal is considered).

17. ~~**Impacts.** Will the new C&I draw new kinds of exceptionally talented faculty and students? Is the focal area critically important to the success of the University? Is it potentially transforming? Will it allow Rutgers to become the leading program among peer institutions? Does it impact on others beyond those participating in the initiative itself? Does it increase the potential for conducting higher levels of research? Does it increase the potential for securing major grant funding?~~
18. ~~**Timeframe.** Describe the proposed timeframe for securing the requested commitments and moving forward with establishment of the center.~~
19. ~~**Life Cycle:** Growth or discontinuation. C&Is should have clearly defined missions that address specific goals. The issues that stimulate creation of these units will evolve, and it's important to consider the ongoing need for the center. The proposal should address the expected life cycle for the center: Under what circumstances should it cease to exist? For example, centers should be closed when faculty cease to participate, when new leaders cannot be identified, when external resources that support the center are no longer available, or when its original purpose is no longer relevant. The proposal must include specific "sunset" provisions appropriate to the center being proposed.~~

**Annual Report Information**  
(To be posted on VPR website)

C&I Annual Reports should include, but not be limited to, the following information. Additional information may be requested by the reporting unit.

- a. ~~Changes from prior year.~~ An assessment of changes from the prior year in the center's status with regard to the basic characteristics of a successful University research center outlined above.
- b. ~~Progress.~~ A summary of progress toward the objectives cited in the prior year's annual report.
- c. ~~Objectives.~~ Updated short- and longer-term objectives.
- d. ~~Quantitative benchmarks.~~ (See VPRED website for more information on benchmarks.)
  - a. ~~In a center's initial annual report, a listing of quantitative benchmarks should be accompanied by retrospective tables providing historical performance.~~
  - b. ~~In subsequent annual reports, the center's current year performance with respect to its quantitative benchmarks should be added to the data compiled for prior years.~~
- e. ~~Financial Status.~~ A year end budget showing all sources of income (i.e. grants, service fees, membership fees, F&A return, etc.) and expenses. Revenue and expense projections for the upcoming year.
- f. ~~Publications.~~ A listing of publications that are a part of the center's programs.
- g. ~~Awards and proposals.~~ A summary of the center's research awards and proposals. (These data can be provided by the Office of Sponsored Research.)
- h. ~~Public-Private Partnerships.~~ A summary of public and private partnerships; indicate any resources (both financial and intellectual) that these partnerships have generated.

**Benchmarks (Examples)**  
(To be posted on VPR website)

**Faculty**

Center publications: number; index of quality/impact

Citations of center publications

Intellectual property disclosures, patents, licenses, start-ups

Center faculty who are members of the national academies or comparable bodies

Center faculty awards from professional societies

Other center faculty honors/recognition

**Collaborations**

Internal: departments/schools represented by faculty involved in collaborative research

Public-Private Partnerships: academic institutions, industrial partners, federal laboratories, other external entities involved in collaborative center research

**Education**

Educational programs leading to a degree

Courses which are part of a degree program

Training programs

Other educational programs, including symposia and colloquia for internal and external audiences

**Outreach**

Industrial/external relations programs

Educational outreach programs (e.g., high school students, teachers)

Service to society

**Funding**

Externally funded research awards

Total center award activity (including awards to center-affiliated faculty that are an integral part of the center's program but are administered by the department)

Research funded by University or center funds

Research expenditures

Research proposals submitted

**Resources**

Diversity of funding sources

Amount of discretionary funds

Personnel

Facilities and assets

**Tangible return to Rutgers**

Fiscal return

Support for students/fellows (doctoral, postdoctoral, undergraduate)

Shared research facilities

Intellectual property



**RESOLUTION**  
**ESTABLISHING THE BACHELOR OF ARTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES**  
**DEGREE PROGRAM AT THE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

**WHEREAS**, the School of Arts and Sciences at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, seeks to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies degree program; and

**WHEREAS**, an interdisciplinary Environmental Studies major will prepare students for a broad range of careers or graduate studies; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed degree program has been reviewed by an external consultant who has recommended its approval, and resources to launch the program are in place; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed program has been approved by the Faculty and the Executive Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences Peter March, Interim Chancellor of Rutgers University–New Brunswick Christopher J. Molloy, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Barbara A. Lee, and University President Robert L. Barchi; and

**WHEREAS**, on January 29, 2019, the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs reviewed the proposal establishing the Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies degree program, and recommended its approval by the Board of Governors.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs, the Board of Governors of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, approves the establishment of the Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies degree program, to be offered by the School of Arts and Sciences; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Board of Governors affirms that the aforementioned degree program, under the standards of the Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994, does not exceed or change Rutgers' mission, does not require significant new resources, and does not raise significant issues of duplication with existing New Jersey programs; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that, upon approval by the Board of Governors of the Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies degree program, the proposal be forwarded to the New Jersey Presidents' Council for action.

Board of Governors  
Rutgers, The State University  
of New Jersey  
February 12, 2019