



University Senate

## **Report of the University Structure and Governance Committee on charge S-1604**

### **Charge S-1604 Process for Unit Mergers or Other Structural Changes -**

**Continued:** Consider and recommend a procedure, timeline, template and process for merger or dissolution of, or making structural changes to, non-academic units that have a broad educational impact. Refer to the [Senate report and recommendations on Charge S-1403, Process for Unit Mergers or Other Structural Changes](#), (included as Appendix 2) when considering this charge. Respond to Senate Executive Committee by December 2017. [Issued April 2016. Reissued March 2017]

### **Background**

There are times in the life of an institution that a need exists to combine, dissolve or make changes to units, departments or schools. The integration of legacy UMDNJ as well as the merging of Rutgers Nursing and Law schools in the recent past and the processes by how these changes were made, prompted the Senate to adopt the report on charge S-1403, included as Appendix 2 at the end of this report. The growth of the university system requires the Rutgers community to adapt to changing times and trends in higher education as well as our desire to evolve as our aspirational peers in the AAU have and will continue to do so. Consequently, changes from the way that Rutgers was organized historically to that of a 21<sup>st</sup> century dynamic and vibrant institution require that we re-think our organizational and conceptual structure from time to time. This includes our academic and administrative units, our personnel and software structures and systems. In 2014 the University Structure and Governance Committee (USGC) developed a set of recommendations and templates to provide a framework for working with all our various stakeholders when a change of this nature was initiated. The Senate developed a series of questions relevant to assess how changes are proposed, who is consulted and what steps are to be taken to ensure that all principles of shared governance are followed while being aware of the often time sensitive nature of these changes and the needs of the academic and administrative leadership to make these changes. This report is designed to create processes sensitive to the timeliness of the changes while allowing for a deliberative approach to their consideration.

### **Considerations**

In discussing this charge the USGC took into consideration that the university system is diverse. Changes that would be appropriate in one geographical area would not necessarily work in the others. Our discussion centered around the fact that it is important to consider that information systems, staff structures and unit configurations can and do have a broad educational impact on our institution. The changes to our human capital management (HCM) systems, email and calendaring, student information systems (SIS) and enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems affect all parts of our university system. USGC further considered:

- The appropriate balance between our responsibilities as a Senate to speak for all of our constituencies versus the needs of administrative units to have autonomy and the ability to be agile and flexible?
- How the Senate ensures that all stakeholders are consulted?
- How the Senate can ensure that there is a process in place for seeking counsel and feedback when initiatives are proposed.
- How we define university wide services, and broad educational impact.
- How we strike the balance between broad educational impact and those local impacts.

The committee also discussed our recent report on charge S-1403 Process for Unit Mergers or other Structural Changes. Charge S-1604 is a natural extension of that charge. That report included the creation of a template to be used to assess requests for changes. That report is included as Appendix 2. The template created for S-1403 was slightly modified to align with requests to include changes to administrative and business units. These minor modifications to our previously approved report, S-1403 mimics the original process with the simple additions of the inclusion of business and administrative units.

## **Resolution**

### **Be it resolved that the Rutgers University Senate recommends:**

1. Administrative, business or other non-academic units engaged in or considering a major structural change, establishment, merge, dissolution, major service or system change or major restructuring of services, systems and units within the university community should submit a proposal following the procedures in Appendix 1 to this report, to the Senate Executive Committee.
2. The Senate Executive Committee will decide if the change is major and appropriate for Senate consideration, and, if so, will follow the process below:
  - A. All work will be subdivided by the Senate Executive Committee among the appropriate standing committees of the Senate. Committees will report back to the Executive Committee and subsequently the full Senate, either endorsing or recommending against any change.
  - B. Adhere, where possible and in good faith, to the template and a minimum timeline and for all changes to be properly vetted. This template includes dates and milestones. Upon receipt of the completed template (if satisfactory, as determined by the Senate's Executive Committee) with supporting documentation, the Senate will strive to make a determination on the request within 4-6 Senate meetings.
  - C. Ensure that all relevant stakeholders have been consulted before any change takes place and report on these consultations.
  - D. The Rutgers University Senate will deliberate, and vote based on the information provided. The President will then submit the Senate's report to the responsible executive for the administrative or business division.

3. The template used for academic units will now include administrative and business units. Structural changes will now be included in changes in systems and staffing or organizational structure that have a broad impact on the university community including student information systems, HR, scheduling and unit organizational divisions to name a few. The template should reflect these changes so that the Senate can provide one set of documents for the unit to work on regardless whether an academic or administrative.
4. The executive responsible require that units review changes to the structure and staffing after approved to determine if stakeholders served are adversely impacted by the change. This review should occur within 6 months of the execution of the changes. The responsible executive will report the results of the review to the University Senate.
5. The President inform the executive in charge of administrative and business units of this process.

### **University Structure and Governance Committee 2017 – 2018**

Oliver, Jon, NB Staff, Chair  
Alidou, Ousseina, SAS-NB (F)  
Brunson, Rodney, SCJ Dean (A)  
Cahill, Michael, Law-C Dean (A)  
Chulak, Daniel, SEBS (S)  
Dane, Perry, At-Large Camden (F)  
Delnevo, Christine, Interim Dean, SPH (A)  
DiVito, Timothy, Camden Staff  
Dutta, Debasish, NB Chancellor (A)  
Esposito, Adrienne, NB Staff  
Fagan, Julie, SGS (F)  
Fellenz, Chazz, Newark Staff  
Ganesh, Jaishankar, SB-C Dean (A)  
Graber, Judith, SPH (F)  
Greenberg, Michael, EJBSPPP Acting Dean (A)  
Lugg, Catherine, GSE (F)  
Mahon, Gwendolyn, SHRP Dean (A)  
Mammis, Antonios, NJMS (F)  
Marconi, Claudia, SAS-NB (S)  
Moran, Elizabeth, NJMS (F)  
Pappas, Tina, NB Staff  
Parsa, Houshang, Alumni Association  
Patel, Anish, EJBSPPP (S)  
Patel, Meet, SAS-NB (S)

Puhak, Robert, FAS-N (F)  
Reinfelder, Ying, SGS (F)  
Rivera, Alicia, RBHS Staff  
Shinbrot, Troy, Engineering (F)  
Swalagin, Ken, Senate Executive Secretary (non-Senator)  
Thomas, Andrew, NJMS (F)  
Van Ryzin, Gregg, Interim Dean SPAA (A)

### Appendix 1

#### Senate Questionnaire for Establishment, Dissolution, Merging, or Major Restructuring of Academic, Administrative or Business Units.

<b>SUMMARY INFORMATION</b> <i>(If space does not permit, put answers on a separate document and attach to this form)</i>	
1. Name and Title:	
2. Who is requesting this change?	Rutgers University Central Administration The faculty of the school/department/unit The administration of the school/department/unit Mandated by state legislation Rutgers University Senate Other:
3. Describe and provide the justification for the proposed creation, modification, dissolution, or restructure:	
4. Unit Type:	Academic Unit Administrative Unit. Research Center or Institute. Other:
5. Date for proposed change:	
6. How does this change align with the university strategic plan?	
7. Are there statutory or contractual requirements that this change take place?	Yes  No
8. Is there a uniform process and procedure being harmonized? If so, describe in detail.	Yes  No
9. If a structural change, will the name of the affected entity(ies) change? If new, what is the proposed name?	Yes  No

## IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS

10. What is the impact of the restructuring on enrollments?	
11. How will the restructuring affect other programs or areas of the university?	
12. Will leadership be impacted and if so, how?	
13. Is this proposed change to align the university consistent with industry best practices or a new innovative approach to solving a problem?	Yes No
14. Is the size, complexity, and cost of the administrative structure in the preliminary proposal sent to the Senate comparable to those of the administrative structures in peer schools or disciplines?	Yes No
15. If this is an administrative unit responsible for providing for undergraduate and/or graduate instruction, provide documentation that will help inform the Senate regarding related curriculum issues and how they will be addressed.	
16. Are there any accrediting bodies involved? If so, what information and processes do they require?	
17. How have each of these stakeholder groups been engaged in the process of this change?	Yes No
18. Briefly describe the personnel matters associated with this change and how will they be addressed.	
19. If this is a structural change, how does the proposed structure compare to those at comparable institutions of higher education.	
20. Please name the stakeholders. (e.g. students, faculty, staff, or any sub category therein, work study, etc.)	
21. Briefly describe the operational matters associated with this change and how will they be addressed.	

<p>22. If there are applicable unit bylaws, did you follow them during the consultation and deliberation process?</p>	<p>Regarding operational matters?  Yes  No  Regarding size and staffing of modified units  Yes  No</p>
<p>23. Did you follow each unit's bylaws during the consultation and deliberation process?</p>	<p>Yes   No</p>
<p>24. How does the size and staffing (including faculty) of the merged unit compare to i) the individual units prior to the merger; and ii) comparable units at aspirant AAUs?</p>	
<p>25. What stakeholders have been consulted?</p>	
<p>26. What is/are their position(s) on the matter?</p>	
<p>27. What other stakeholders might be involved and/or impacted?</p>	
<p>28. What impact will the restructuring have on the individual unit budgets?</p>	
<p>29. How will the budgets be reconciled upon restructuring?</p>	

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

30. What are the costs involved in restructuring?	
31. What are the financial benefits if any?	
32. What are approximate cost projections for the merger?	
33. What are expected long-term savings?	
34. If money is being taken from a budget reserve to help cover merger costs, then what are the expected short- and long-term impacts of that diminishment of the budget reserve?	
35. What are the costs of not restructuring, if any?	
36. What is the proposed budget for this structural or service change?	
37. If money is being transferred from another budget, what is the impact on the debited budget?	
38. What is the budgetary impact of this proposed change? Please attach your business plan and budget.	
39. What are the financial impacts on the university and the affected units?	
40. Is there any other information that should be known here concerning this proposed change? If so, provide in detail.	
41. Are there any potential conflict of interest issues in the above proposal? If so, provide in detail.	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>



Rutgers University Senate

## Report of the University Structure and Governance Committee

**Charge: S-1403, Process for Unit Mergers or Other Structural Changes:** Consider whether the University Senate should establish a general procedure, timeline, template and process for merging, dissolution or making structural changes to any university unit. Consider how such a process could assist the university and units in working in a deliberate, consultative and rational way so that all issues, impacts, concerns and benefits can be properly considered on a timely basis. Make recommendations on time limits and process.

### Background:

The integration of legacy UMDNJ and the university's invitation into the Big 10 and its academic counterpart, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), has provided the opportunity for improving the structure and effectiveness of the schools and units within Rutgers. The integration of legacy UMDNJ and Rutgers enacted by state legislation effective July 1, 2013 has necessitated restructuring of some of the units to reduce or eliminate programmatic and curricular redundancy.

In January 2011, Executive Vice President Furmanski submitted to the chair of the Rutgers University Senate a proposal to transform the Department of Nursing in Camden into an independent School of Nursing. The Senate was tasked with assessing the proposal and expected to decide whether or not to endorse the proposal by April 1, 2011.

At its January 24, 2014 meeting, the University Senate was asked to consider, in a compressed timeframe, a proposal prepared by William L Holzemer, Dean, College of Nursing – Newark and New Brunswick and Susan Salmond, Dean, School of Nursing – Rutgers Newark (legacy UMDNJ) to merge their respective units into a single school with the proposed name of the Rutgers School of Nursing. The Executive Committee of the Senate asked each Senate committee to evaluate the proposal and to provide a report with questions and concerns. All committees agreed to the merger (or did not disagree) in principle.

On March 31, 2014, the University Senate was asked to consider a proposal prepared by Joanne Robinson, Dean, Rutgers School of Nursing – Camden and Marie O'Toole, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Stratford Campus, Legacy UMDNJ School of Nursing to integrate the Legacy UMDNJ School of Nursing (Stratford) program with the Rutgers School of Nursing – Camden. In her communication to the Senate office, Dean Robinson indicated that she and Dean O'Toole wished to present this proposal to the Board of Governors for approval at the June 2014 meeting. The Senate Executive Committee, on behalf of the University Senate, deliberated quickly and conditionally endorsed this proposed merger.

In all three cases, the Senate noted a timing problem (i.e., lack of timely notification to the Senate, forcing an unnecessarily constricted time frame for action by the Senate) and strongly indicated it should not be repeated. Thus to assist units considering any structural changes, the University Senate has considered a mechanism to streamline and carefully consider each request.

### **Considerations:**

The Rutgers University Strategic Plan includes five foundational elements which are the core values of the university. These elements include:

- Strong Core of Sciences and Humanities
- Inclusive, Diverse, and Cohesive Culture
- Effective and Efficient Infrastructure and Staff
- Financial Resources Sufficient to Fund Our Aspirations
- Robust Shared Governance, Academic Freedom, and Effective Communication

Robust shared governance is an element essential to making Rutgers a top-tier AAU institution and contributing member of the CIC. Effective communication is critical at an institution as large as Rutgers so that decisions and directions happen in an inclusive environment to the benefit of Rutgers and all of its communities.

The University Senate has been asked to consider the proposed creation and merging of various units since 2011 with little or no time for careful deliberation and consideration of issues, despite multiple attempts to raise awareness and explicit requests for appropriate notification. This creates an environment in which mistakes or a lack of planning can have a considerable cost, both financial and in human capital. To properly avoid a negative impact on the university and its community, a standardized process should be established and clearly articulated regarding the merger, dissolution, and/or structural changes to any units within Rutgers. This process should be carefully constructed to allow proper deliberation of all related issues.

The “new” Rutgers encompasses the legacy UMDNJ units, adding a layer of complexity, a new influx of students, faculty and staff, as well as the integration of the culture and processes of both institutions. The invitation into the Big 10, with the inclusion of Rutgers in the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), provides the opportunity to better understand how these peer institutions practice shared governance. All of these factors provide the appropriate opportunities to assess the best practices of these other institutions, emulate those that will work in the Rutgers environment, and reaffirm those legislative powers that already have been vested in the University Senate by Rutgers’ Board of Governors.

As per University Senate bylaws and University Policy, the merging, dissolution, creation or restructuring of any unit within the university will be subject to study and regulation by the

University Senate. The requests for change, whether by the unit or units involved, or by the administration, for strategic, economic or other specified reasons, are to be submitted to the University Senate for study and approval. [The term “unit” is a source of ambiguity (e.g. academic and non-academic levels) and requires clarification. Within this report, the focus will be on academic units, while recognizing the need for consideration regarding non-academic units.]

The Senate derives its legislative powers from University Policy 50.2.2, University Senate – Duties and Powers. Click on the following link to view the policy in its entirety. (<http://policies.rutgers.edu/view-policies/governance-legal-matters-%E2%80%9393-section-50>). In summary, 50.2.2 is somewhat ambiguous with regard to the power the Senate holds in determining the merging, changing, or dissolving units. (See section A vs. Section B of 50.2.2, as follows)

In Section A of 50.2.2, it states:

*“The Senate shall concern itself with all academic and non-academic matters pertaining to the mission of the University. Taking into account the diverse functions of the separate units of the University, it shall establish minimum standards respecting admission, scholarship and honors. The Senate shall also regulate formal relationships among academic units within the University, including the organization of the disciplines, recommend norms for teaching loads, and establish the University calendar. The Senate shall in addition have such other powers as the Board of Governors may delegate to it. “*

Here, the term “regulate” denotes the clear authority of the Senate to authorize or reject changes in the structure of academic units and the university itself.

In section B of 50.2.2 it states:

*“The Senate shall advise the President on matters of broad educational and research policy, which matters include but are not limited to: (a) budget priorities and allocations and general planning, (b) the establishment or dissolution of colleges, schools, divisions, institutes, and similar educational units, (c) special affiliations and programs, (d) regulations affecting students and faculty, such as those concerning academic freedom, equal opportunities, and personnel practices and procedures, and (e) such changes in educational and research policy as are covered in the University Policy Library. The Senate may also initiate action on these matters. The President of the University shall act on such matters only after having received the advice of the Senate or after giving the Senate a reasonable time in which to present its views...”*

Sections A and B define regulatory and advisory authority of the Senate, separately and respectively, causing some ambiguity. The university would be better served by removing any such ambiguity and codifying the role of the Senate in these matters.

## Whereas

The University Senate is:

- i) the one body that encompasses all of our communities, including every campus, unit, and constituency group (e.g. faculty, students, staff, and alumni)
- ii) deliberative, and
- iii) at the heart of the foundational elements of the University's Strategic Plan

## Be it resolved that The Senate recommends:

**Recommendation 1:** The University Senate's legislative powers regarding regulation of units within Rutgers should be clearly articulated in Sections A and B of University Policy 50.2.2. Section A remains unchanged. In section B, insert the phrase "*The Senate holds regulatory authority that is within the purview of shared governance such as the establishment, dissolution, merging, or major restructuring of colleges, schools, institutes, and other units, as listed in Rutgers University policy 10.1.2*". following phrase (e) (line 7), remove phrase (b) (line 3), and reformat the sections accordingly, as follows (changes are underlined):

B. The Senate shall advise the President on matters of broad educational and research policy, which matters include but are not limited to: (a) budget priorities and allocations and general planning, ~~(b) the establishment or dissolution of colleges, schools, divisions, institutes, and similar educational units,~~ (b) special affiliations and programs, (c) regulations affecting students and faculty, such as those concerning academic freedom, equal opportunities, and personnel practices and procedures, and (d) such changes in educational and research policy as are covered in the University Policy Library. The Senate holds regulatory authority that is within the purview of shared governance such as the establishment, dissolution, merging, or major restructuring of colleges, schools, institutes, and other units, as listed in Rutgers University policy 10.1.2. The Senate may also initiate action on these matters. The President of the University shall act on such matters only after having received the advice of the Senate or after giving the Senate a reasonable time in which to present its views...

**Recommendation 2:** The administrator(s) desiring the "*establishment, dissolution, merging, or major restructuring of colleges, schools, institutes, and other units, as listed in Rutgers University policy 10.1.2*" shall submit a proposal to the Senate Executive Committee. The form of the proposal will be determined by the Senate Executive Committee, as outlined in Appendix A "*Senate Questionnaire for Establishment, Dissolution, Merging, or Major Restructuring of Colleges, Schools, Institutes, and Other Units, as listed in Rutgers University Policy 10.1.2*"

The Senate Executive Committee will decide if the change is major, and, if so, will follow the process below:

- i) All work will be subdivided by the Senate Executive Committee among the appropriate standing committees of the Senate. Committees will report back to the Executive Committee and subsequently the full Senate either endorsing or recommending against any change.
- ii) Adhere, where possible and in good faith, to a minimum timeline for all changes to be properly vetted. This includes dates and milestones. Upon receipt of the completed questionnaire (if satisfactory, as determined by the Senate's Executive Committee) with supporting documentation, the Senate will strive to make determination on the request within 4 Senate meetings, but no longer than 6 meetings.
- iii) Once the Senate has fully deliberated and voted, the President will submit the Senate's report to the Board of Governors.

**Recommendation 3:** The President will inform Chancellors of this required process regarding the *establishment, dissolution, merging, or major restructuring of colleges, schools, institutes, and other units, as listed in Rutgers University policy 10.1.2.*

**Recommendation 4:** The Senate's University Structure and Governance Committee will re-evaluate the process and outcome of implementation in two years.

**Recommendation 5:** Senate Executive Committee will issue a charge to the University Structure and Governance Committee to evaluate and develop a related process for non-academic units that have broad educational impact.

## **Appendix A**

### ***Senate Questionnaire for Establishment, Dissolution, Merging, or Major Restructuring of Colleges, Schools, Institutes, and Other Units, as listed in Rutgers University Policy 10.1.2***

1. Indicate your name and title
2. Who is requesting this change?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Rutgers University Central Administration
  - \_\_\_\_\_ The Faculty of the school/department/unit
  - \_\_\_\_\_ The administration of the school/department/unit
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Mandated by state legislation
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Rutgers University Senate
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Specify)
3. Describe the proposed creation, modification, dissolution, or restructure.
4. What type of unit(s), is this?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Unit
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Administrative Unit
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Research Center or Institute
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Specify)
5. Will the name of the department, unit or school change or remain the same? If new, what is the proposed name of the respective unit(s)?
6. Describe the reason for this change.
7. When would you like this proposed change to take place?
8. Is there statutory or contractual requirement that this change take place?
9. Is there a uniform process and procedure being harmonized? If so, describe in detail.
10. If this is an academic unit responsible for undergraduate and/or graduate instruction, can you provide documentation that will help inform the Senate regarding related curriculum issues and how they will be addressed?
11. How will the name of the combined, dissolved or changed unit or school appear on diplomas? Will students be allowed to choose the school name to appear on their diploma if they are currently enrolled in one of the existing units?
12. Are there any accrediting bodies involved? If so, what information and processes do they require?

13. What is the impact of the restructuring on enrollments?
14. How will the restructuring affect other programs or areas of the university?
15. If the leadership team of each unit is merged, how will the new leadership be decided?
16. Is the size, complexity, and cost of the administrative structure in the preliminary proposal sent to the Senate comparable to those of the administrative structures in peer schools or disciplines?
17. What steps were taken to ensure that faculty members were involved in all aspects of the restructuring process?
18. Have the faculty been consulted in an open forum and have they had an opportunity to vote for or against this change?  
 Yes.  
 No.
19. If yes, what is the result of the vote?
20. Describe the precautions taken to ensure that votes were confidential.
21. How will faculty reappointments, promotions, or other personnel matters be handled?
22. How does the size and staffing (including faculty) of the merged unit compare to i) the individual units prior to the merger; and ii) comparable units at aspirant AAUs?
23. Did you follow each unit's bylaws during the consultation and deliberation process?
24. What stakeholders have been consulted? (Please list).
25. What is/are their position(s) on the matter?
26. What other stakeholders might be involved and/or impacted?
27. What impact will the restructuring have on the individual unit budgets?
28. How will the budgets be reconciled upon restructuring?
29. What are the costs involved in restructuring?
30. What are the financial benefits if any?
31. What are approximate cost projections for the merger? What are expected long-term savings?

32. If money is being taken from a budget reserve to help cover merger costs, then what are the expected short- and long-term impacts of that diminishment of the budget reserve?
33. What are the costs of not restructuring, if any?
34. Is there any other information that should be known here concerning this proposed change? If so, provide in detail.

### **University Structure and Governance Committee (USGC) Members, 2014-15**

Oliver, Jon, NB Staff, Co-Chair  
Puhak, Robert, FAS-N (F), Co-Chair  
Admani, Saad, RBS-N (S)  
Ahmed, Sultan, NJMS (F)  
Anderson, Ellen Zambo, SHRP (F)  
Aubry, Marie-Pierre, SAS-NB (F)  
Delnevo, Christine, Alumni Association  
DiVito, Timothy, Camden Staff  
Eastman, Wayne, At-Large N (F)  
Edward, David, Newark Staff  
Ganesh, Jaishankar, SB-C Dean (A)  
Gomes, Richard, PTL-N (F)  
Holzer, Marc, SPAA Dean (A)  
Hughes, James, EJBSPPP Dean (A)  
Janniger, Edmund, SPAA (S)  
Karamichael, Kenneth, NB Staff  
Kocak, Jordan, EJBSPPP (S)  
Krishnamurthi, Bharath, Engineering (S)  
Mahon, Gwendolyn, SHRO Dean  
Mitra, Akash, SEBS (S)  
Mitchell, Sean, FAS-N (F)  
Moran, Elizabeth, RBHS At-Large (F)  
Oberdiek, John, Law-C (A)  
O'Connell, Claire, SHRP (F)  
Schulberg, Justin, SAS-NB (S)  
Settles, Alex, RBS:N/NB (F)  
Shulman, Jacob, SAS-NB (S)  
Swalagin, Kenneth, Senate Executive Secretary (Non-Senator)  
Svasti, Luke, SAS-NB (S)  
Triner, Gail, GS-NB (F)

## **University Structure and Governance Committee (USGC) Members, 2015-16**

Oliver, Jon, NB Staff, Co-Chair- EC Liaison  
Puhak, Robert, FAS-N (F), Co-Chair – EC Liaison  
Ahmed, Sultan, NJMS (F)  
Anderson, Ellen, SHRP (F)  
Delnevo, Christine, Alumni Association  
DiVito, Timothy, Camden Staff  
Eastman, Wayne, At Large-N (F)  
Edward, David, Newark Staff  
Esposito, Adrienne, NB Staff  
Ganesh, Jaishankar, SB-C Dean (A)  
Holzer, Marc, SPAA Dean (A)  
Hughes, James, EJBSPPP Dean (A)  
Janniger, Edmund, SPAA (S) – EC Liaison  
Mahon, Gwendolyn, SHRP Dean (A)  
Maruna, Shadd, SCJ Dean (A)  
Moran, Elizabeth, RBHS At Large (F)  
Oberdiek, John, Law-C Dean (A)  
O’Connell, Claire, SHRP (F)  
Palmer, Daniel, Law-N (S)  
Parisi, Nicholas, SAS-NB (S)  
Pusukur, Bharani, Engineering (S)  
Scott, Kathleen, SAS-NB (F)  
Settles, Alexander, RBS:N/NB (F)  
Sharp, Jane, GS-NB (F)  
Shinbrot, Troy, Engineering (F)  
Swalagin, Ken, Senate Executive Secretary (non-Senator)  
Thomas, Andrew, NJMS (F)  
Williams, Alexandra, SAS-NB (S)