

**Interim Report  
of the  
Advisory Committee  
for the Proposed  
Rutgers University College of Applied and Professional Studies (CAPS)  
October 2, 2001**

**Background**

The CAPS Advisory Committee was appointed by President Lawrence after consultation with the University Senate. In his charge to the Committee, President Lawrence quoted a recent Kellogg Commission report that stated “public research universities must be leaders in a new era of not simply increased demand for education, but rather of a change so fundamental and far-reaching that the establishment of a true ‘learning society’ lies within our grasp.” In particular, he asked the Advisory Committee to address emergent relationships between the College of Applied and Professional Studies (CAPS), the proposed new unit, and existing academic units and to explore a number of issues, including involvement of existing faculty, academic freedom, infrastructure and library support services, admissions, articulation, and others.

The Advisory Committee met with and was charged by the President on May 29, 2001 and then met twelve more times between June 12 and October 2 to discuss the eight charges from the President and to formulate recommendations (see Appendix 1 for a list of the charges). In addition to the revised CAPS proposal that was discussed at the April meeting of the University Senate, the Committee was given the January 2001 version of the proposal that provided considerably more detail and included a five-year business plan. Although not included among the Committee’s formal recommendations, we did suggest that much more of the material in the January proposal be included in the next revision of the CAPS proposal. The focus of the Committee was on the eight formal charges from the President and not directly on the CAPS proposal itself.

**Introduction**

The Advisory Committee first considered the more fundamental questions of the need for and desirability of establishing a new Rutgers unit with a focus on off-campus, adult-oriented professional education. The establishment of such a new academic unit raises many philosophical questions, operational concerns, and a fair degree of uncertainty. Nevertheless, the committee unanimously concluded:

- Throughout the State of New Jersey there are documented needs for increased delivery of applied and professional programs at the upper division and post-baccalaureate level.
- As the State University of New Jersey, Rutgers has the responsibility and obligation to address these needs with the highest quality program delivery.
- These needs can be best served through the creation of a new academic unit within Rutgers University. The mission of this new unit is providing applied and professional education to upper division and post-baccalaureate adult learners at off-campus locations.

- Although administratively separate, this new unit should make the maximum possible use of existing expertise within Rutgers for all aspects of its operation.
- Given budget realities, this unit must be self-sustaining and ideally revenue generating.

In reaching these conclusions, the Advisory Committee recognizes that there are two interrelated forces driving the establishment of CAPS. One is the university's mission to provide educational programs for the citizens of New Jersey and the recognition that the university is not currently meeting the demands of adults for applied and professional programs. The second is that the university can benefit financially by offering these new programs. If financial incentives are the primary driving force, then an independent CAPS unit almost completely separate from the rest of the university is likely to be the best structural model. The Advisory Committee, however, believes that the educational mission should be the primary driving force and that a for-profit subsidiary would be inappropriate. We are persuaded that CAPS should draw extensively on expertise within Rutgers for all aspects of its operations. This integrated approach is likely to be somewhat more difficult to implement than a unit separated from the rest of the university. However, we believe that it offers the best opportunity to meet the university's educational mission and to deliver the highest quality programs.

The Advisory Committee also recognizes that most of our peer institutions have begun to refine or restructure existing continuing education or extension units to better prepare the institution for meeting the emergent new requirements of the working adult professional (see Appendix 2). Two trends are particularly noteworthy. In the first, existing schools of continuing education are being refined and expanded to assume greater responsibility for degree completion and professional masters' programs. On the other hand, a number of our peers are also experimenting with the establishment of separate for-profit units. As is the case with our peer institutions, CAPS must define its own structure given Rutgers' unique circumstances.

### *Charge 1*

***Suggest ways to ensure academic freedom and appropriate oversight of programs. The potential role of tenured/tenure-track faculty and their relationship to the proposed school as a way to address these issues should be considered as well as other suggestions.***

This charge involves consideration of several issues including but not necessarily limited to:

- How to ensure the highest quality in CAPS programs via appropriate oversight mechanisms.
- How to ensure academic freedom within CAPS.
- The role of tenure-track faculty in both of the above.

Academic freedom and an advancement and rewards system based solely on merit are essential for any institution of higher education in fulfilling its mission to advance the body of knowledge and provide education of the highest quality to its students.

The normal mechanism for ensuring both quality and academic freedom is the tenure system. Tenure provides a powerful shield, protecting faculty from arbitrary and capricious action by administrators. Tenure protects the free exchange of ideas, however provocative they may be, and ensures that faculty can challenge the status quo free from potential retribution. The freedom afforded by tenure allows faculty to focus on academics and provides the opportunity to develop new courses and related instructional materials. Finally, the mechanism for progression through

rank as it exists in the promotion and tenure process ensures that advancement is based upon merit and professional achievement and produces a senior faculty of the highest quality.

Despite the central role of tenure in ensuring both academic freedom and excellence, there are at least two reasons why most CAPS faculty should have term, rather than tenure-track, appointments. First is the need for flexibility, i.e., the need for CAPS to be able to respond rapidly and effectively to changes in demand for its programs. To succeed as a self-sustaining (ideally revenue-generating) unit, CAPS must have the ability to respond appropriately when programs are no longer in high demand or are providing little or no collateral service. CAPS must thus be able to easily shrink or even eliminate programs. Second, the difficulty in obtaining new state-funded faculty positions constitutes a powerful limitation on the introduction of tenure positions within CAPS. Such positions could be a future encumbrance upon resources now currently allocated to existing academic units. Although the Committee recognizes that these reasons make it impractical for CAPS to have a substantially tenure-track faculty, the Committee believes that existing tenured and tenure-track Rutgers faculty should be constructively engaged in all academic aspects of CAPS, particularly in issues of academic freedom and program quality.

We believe that prudent, constructive efforts should be made to find solutions that allow for the establishment of CAPS, while providing mechanisms that will help ensure program quality, responsible faculty action, and an atmosphere of academic freedom within CAPS. The following recommendations seek to provide an appropriate balance among several interdependent issues of academic freedom, the faculty promotion and reappointment process, and involvement of tenured faculty in these essential quality control mechanisms.

**(1) We recommend that, wherever possible, tenured faculty be involved in the recruitment and appointment of CAPS faculty.**

The probability of recruiting a high quality faculty can be increased through the introduction of tenured faculty into several processes. It is possible, for example, to enhance the likelihood of hiring high quality core instructional staff by including tenured faculty from related disciplines on faculty search committees. During the planning year, the new school will likely engage in searches for a dean and as many as eight full-time non tenure-track faculty, several of whom are likely to serve as program directors. Search committees, each constituted with a majority of tenured faculty from cognate disciplines, can help ensure that a high quality core faculty is recruited.

**(2) We recommend that CAPS involve tenured faculty in its reappointment and promotion committee(s). Specifically, we recommend that (a) there be an objective reappointment and promotion process for CAPS faculty that mirrors as closely as possible the process for tenure-track faculty and (b) that appropriate tenured faculty constitute a majority of the CAPS appointment and promotion committees.**

Recruitment of top-caliber instructional faculty will be possible only if these individuals have an opportunity for advancement in rank. CAPS faculty would be judged on the same criteria as other Rutgers faculty (scholarship, instruction, service), but with significant weight assigned to quality of instruction and service, and lesser weight assigned to scholarship. This is not to say that CAPS faculty will not engage in research; scholarly activity and professional currency will be expected. Faculty evaluations, however, will need to reflect the high priority placed upon instruction and service. To implement this, there will need to be an objective reappointment and promotion process for CAPS faculty that mirrors as closely as possible the process for tenure-track faculty (same criteria and procedures, albeit with different weights).

CAPS faculty reappointment and promotion decisions must be objectively based, in priority order, upon the quality of contributions in the classroom, the quality of service, and the quality of scholarship. Tenured faculty should be involved in the ongoing review and reappointment of CAPS full-time and part-time faculty. Faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion committees should exist for each broad program area developed within CAPS, and appropriate qualified tenured faculty from throughout the university should constitute majority membership on these committees.

**(3) We recommend that CAPS faculty be represented by a collective bargaining agent.**

Issues of academic freedom in CAPS could be supported in several ways. Although it is expected, for example, that most CAPS faculty will be given term appointments, CAPS faculty should be represented by a collective bargaining agent. While the establishment of tenure-track positions can clearly encumber scarce university resources, there seems to be no particular obstacle to CAPS operating successfully with faculty who are represented by a bargaining agent. To the extent that the faculty has been adequately represented through the establishment of jointly negotiated processes and procedures, CAPS faculty would be afforded the same protections against arbitrary and capricious action.

**(4) We recommend that CAPS involve tenured faculty in its instructional programs.**

Although CAPS will develop programs to be offered at off-campus sites, there are likely to be Rutgers faculty in related areas who may be interested in participating in CAPS. To maintain program quality and academic freedom within CAPS, such participation should be encouraged whenever possible, and mechanisms with sufficient flexibility should be developed to facilitate this type of integration. Tenured faculty from other units who are in related fields and have expertise in a relevant subject may be willing to participate in CAPS program curriculum development, curriculum review, faculty search committees, or to teach in a CAPS program. In some cases, joint appointments of tenured faculty between CAPS and other units of the university or fixed-term “visiting” appointment of tenured faculty to CAPS might be desirable. To ensure that such faculty would not be permanently drawn away from their research activities, such participation would normally be limited to three years. Participation would be entirely voluntary on the part of the faculty members in such cases, who would always have the option of returning to their home department at any time. Such participation by faculty should not draw resources away from on-campus programs and should be used as a way to provide added value to those programs. In cases where there may be few or no tenured faculty in a particular CAPS program area, faculty from cognate disciplines should serve on program curriculum committees.

**(5) We recommend the establishment of an Executive Board with broad policy responsibilities.**

The quality of each academic program carrying the Rutgers name shapes the perceived value of every other Rutgers program. To uphold our firm commitment to high standards across the university, the programs of every school and faculty are subject to regular, explicit, and detailed review and approval by appropriately constituted academic bodies. Similarly, appointments and promotions within the standing faculty take place under rigorous conditions specified in a university-wide procedure. Arguably the means toward these vital ends must differ in the context of the academic environment CAPS would serve. In comparison with traditional academic units, CAPS must be particularly agile in responding to changing academic opportunities. The exigencies of the competitive marketplace, however, for applied professional education do not obviate the need for rigorous procedures to ensure academic quality.

To this end, an Executive Board should be established. The Board would have several functions:

- Review and approve all academic programs and curricula.
- Provide regular review of and advice on improving the academic and financial performance of existing programs.
- Approve appointments and renewals of CAPS core faculty.
- Provide academic advice on proposed new initiatives to the CAPS dean.
- Provide liaison with other units in cases where CAPS programs draw upon courses and faculty of these units.
- Ensure that existing Rutgers faculty with appropriate expertise be included in the planning for all new degree programs.
- Set the general education requirements for CAPS programs.

Membership of the Executive Board should be drawn from a variety of schools within the university and should include faculty from traditional academic units, full-time faculty from CAPS, and academic associate deans holding tenured faculty positions. For reasons of workability it could not include representatives of all or even most such schools. A majority of the Executive Board should be tenured.

**(6) We recommend that CAPS programs ensure instructional quality through accreditation, teaching evaluation and program oversight mechanisms consistent with procedures elsewhere in Rutgers, with due emphasis on teaching evaluations and faculty development.**

The quality of CAPS programs is best ensured in the long term by attaining and maintaining accreditation. Each program should be required to seek accreditation from the appropriate professional accrediting authority within a reasonable time frame, normally no less than five years and no longer than ten. Failure to gain accreditation should be a major element in the consideration to continue or discontinue a particular program, regardless of financial status. Teaching excellence should be measured in the same manner as elsewhere in Rutgers, using course evaluation and student feedback. Given the predominance of the teaching mission in CAPS, however, we recommend that student outcomes be given greater import in the overall assessment and evaluation of programs by the CAPS dean and the Executive Board, and that ongoing faculty development programs be conducted.

Five-year program reviews that existing academic programs undergo afford an additional mechanism to ensure the evolution and development of a high quality initiative. All CAPS major programs should be required to undergo comprehensive five-year self-studies subject to external review.

### *Charge 2*

***Explore our existing transfer articulation agreements and the admission of upper division students. Are changes needed to accommodate the adult and place bound learner targeted by CAPS?***

At the undergraduate level, CAPS is intended to be an upper-division academic unit offering applied and professional programs only. As such, CAPS will consider for admission only students who have completed an associate degree or who can present completion of 60 credits in good academic standing. All CAPS students will thus be transfer students, many from New Jersey community colleges. Moreover, since CAPS will not offer liberal arts courses or lower-division

applied and professional courses, students will need to have completed all lower division general education requirements and prerequisite professional courses for their desired CAPS program before enrolling in CAPS. For all these reasons, it is very important that CAPS negotiate with the community colleges to modify existing articulation agreements in order to give students a clear “roadmap” of what they must do in order to transfer successfully to CAPS upon completion of their associates degree. The precise changes needed in the articulation agreements, however, cannot be specified at this time; they will depend on the CAPS general education requirements and the programs CAPS decides to offer at various sites.

In addition to setting the requirements for transfer into CAPS from the community colleges, it is also important to specify the requirements for transfer of students, majors, and courses between CAPS and on-campus Rutgers units.

**(7) We recommend that the CAPS general education requirements be set by the CAPS Executive Board.**

The general education requirements at Rutgers professional schools are generally and appropriately rather different from those at the liberal arts or multipurpose colleges. Since the Executive Board should be involved in formulating CAPS programs and requirements from the outset, we do not feel that an interim set of general education requirements (i.e., University College NB general education requirements, as suggested in the revised CAPS proposal submitted to the Senate in April 2001) is needed.

**(8) We recommend that transfer of students, majors, and courses between CAPS and on-campus units be restricted as follows:**

- Students applying to other RU collegiate units should not be offered automatic admission into CAPS; students should have to apply for admission into CAPS.
- Transfers between CAPS and an on-campus school should require the same application review as any other transfer from one campus to another.
- On-campus undergraduate students should not be able to major in a CAPS program unless the major is jointly offered by CAPS and an on-campus unit; other on-campus students wishing a CAPS major should be required to transfer to CAPS.
- Whether CAPS courses fulfill on-campus major or collegiate general education requirements should be left entirely up to the faculty or fellows of the individual on-campus units.

**(9) We recommend that the articulation agreements with the community colleges be modified to facilitate transfer of students from those colleges into CAPS.**

Negotiation with the community colleges should begin as soon as CAPS has set its general education requirements and the lower-level prerequisite requirements for its initial programs. As noted above, the articulation agreements should let community college students know precisely which courses they must successfully complete in order to be admitted to the CAPS program of their choice.

### *Charge 3*

*Review the initial proposed program mix and suggest ways to enhance, clarify, or further refine these programs. Provide a suggested process for developing an entirely new degree area where few if any experts may exist within the Rutgers community.*

A variety of programs were mentioned in both the initial CAPS proposal as well as subsequent revisions. These include, among others, potential programs in: (a) administration of justice, (b) aviation, (c) extension services (jointly with extension faculty), (d) hotel and hospitality management (jointly with School of Business-Camden), (e) applied computing and Internet technologies, (f) leadership (jointly with extension faculty), (g) real estate and land development, and (h) recreation management with turf and course specialties (jointly with Cook CPE).

The Advisory Committee believes that, in considering potential programs, serious effort was made to identify, in a preliminary way, regional workforce and degree completion demand. The recent survey, sponsored by the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, of the state's two-year colleges was an important source of data, as were workforce demand data available through both the state and Rutgers. On the basis of the data presented to us, we believe that the above mix of programs appears reasonable, but without more detailed market analysis, we are not in a position to further refine the list or to make judgments about the relative need for the various suggested programs. More important, we cannot judge the academic suitability of the proposed initial programs without more detailed program proposals.

The Advisory Committee recognizes that the CAPS proposal is intended to provide vision, structure, and guidelines in how to best establish a new academic structure; it is not intended to substitute for detailed preliminary program proposals. Development of such program proposals should be the responsibility of the CAPS administration, faculty, and Executive Board.

The development of detailed CAPS preliminary program proposals will entail several special challenges. First of all, these proposals will need to be developed when CAPS is in its infancy, with a new Dean, probably unfamiliar with Rutgers, and a skeletal faculty. Unlike the case of proposals developed by existing units, the CAPS dean will not have the benefit of input from an established, tenure-track faculty. Finally, a number of the proposed programs are in areas where there is little, if any, expertise in existing Rutgers units. Our recommendations seek to address these challenges, as well as to ensure the highest quality CAPS programs.

**(10) We recommend that the CAPS Executive Board and other appropriate tenured faculty members and academic administrators be involved early and to a major extent in the development of all preliminary program proposals for CAPS programs.**

Proposals for new programs put forward by existing Rutgers units are developed by established faculties and academic deans, all tenured or tenure-track and familiar with the university and its programs. Only then do the proposals proceed upward via the approval process outlined below. The recommended involvement of the Executive Board and other appropriate tenured faculty and administrators in the initial stages of program development will help to ensure that CAPS program proposals are developed with appropriate input from tenured/tenure-track faculty, that CAPS has the benefit of relevant expertise within existing Rutgers academic units, and that areas of possible conflict with other units are identified in a timely manner. We further recommend that the CAPS dean circulate a list of potential program ideas to all academic deans as a mechanism for identifying faculty who may assist in developing program proposals, as well as a mechanism for identifying potential conflicts before a given proposal is developed.

**(11) We recommend that proposed CAPS degree programs go through the same approval process as other new program proposals that are developed by existing academic units.**

The typical process for new program development is an internal review within the appropriate collegiate unit. It is at this preliminary level that units should explore resources and relationships within the university (and in appropriate instances, outside the university) to develop in a conceptual way the best program proposal possible. Normally, faculty deans work closely with their chief campus academic officer to assess the appropriate nature of the proposal, availability of resources, enrollment potential, etc. Units work with the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning (OIRAP) to anticipate questions and issues of relevance. OIRAP not only provides advice on the program approval process, but then arranges and conducts an on-site expert peer review of the program with the aid of an external consultant, who prepares a report against a set of program approval guidelines. The proposing unit then prepares a response to the report that is given scrutiny by OIRAP and the University Vice President for Academic Affairs before being presented by the Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning to the Cabinet. Once endorsed by the Cabinet, the proposal is then presented to the Educational Planning and Policy Committee of the Board of Governors for additional review, prior to submission to the entire Board. The normal program approval process generally takes months, often a full academic year, sometimes longer.

The internal program review process is designed to ensure that care is given to the design and development of new programs and that resource issues are properly addressed and sufficient attention is given to potential enrollment and service. New programs offered through CAPS must navigate the same review process to ensure sufficiently well developed proposals.

**(12) We recommend that CAPS be authorized to award degrees in professional studies to differentiate it from existing liberal arts and professional schools.**

To appropriately differentiate these and other programs that may be developed at CAPS both at the baccalaureate degree completion and master degree levels, CAPS should offer unique degrees in order to further separate CAPS programs from those of existing academic units. Specifically, we recommend that CAPS be authorized to offer the Bachelor in Professional Studies (BPS) and the Master in Professional Studies degree (MPS) only. We believe that these new degrees would appropriately distinguish the applied and professional nature of the CAPS program.

**(13) We recommend that, in developing new programs with few internal existing resources, CAPS utilize program planning committees that have representation of tenured faculty from cognate disciplines.**

One of the particularly challenging tasks faced by CAPS will be the development of new programs in areas where there may be limited existing expertise. Aviation and Real Estate and Land Development are two such examples. In developing new major programs, CAPS should establish a curriculum planning committee for each new program proposed. Each of these program planning committees would have representation of tenured faculty from academic units most closely aligned with the new program area. The role of these program planning committees would be to develop the proposed new curriculum and to work with external consultants to insure the creation of a high quality program. The process is similar to that developed by the School of Business-Camden for its newly approved Hotel and Hospitality degree. The program planning committee would complete a preliminary program document that would be forwarded to the CAPS dean and Executive Board.



**Charge 4**  
***What resources or mechanisms need to be in place to assure quality support services for CAPS students and programs?***

The ability of CAPS programs to remain attractive and competitive will depend on the strength of services that support the academic programs-- computing, library, advising, and other infrastructure support as well as CAPS ability to market successfully its programs to potential students. Because CAPS will be a self-sustaining and revenue generating unit, and its programs will be offered off-campus, the need for quality support services that address the specific and unique needs of CAPS students in off-campus locations is critical. While there may be operations that can capitalize on existing Rutgers infrastructure (such as current library resources), a support service infrastructure unique to CAPS will need to be maintained. The Advisory Committee has considered the infrastructure support outlined in the CAPS proposal that includes such items as personnel for marketing, secretarial, advising, site management, and computing support and concurs that these activities are important for CAPS success. Additionally, appropriate facilities and equipment to support the programs need to be included. As a result, we make the following recommendations.

**(14) We recommend that the costs of quality support services be built into the budgeting model for CAPS.**

While there are numerous basic support costs that must be part of the CAPS budget, such as secretarial support and facilities infrastructure, the Advisory Committee considers the following support services a priority for the delivery of quality programs.

Computing support to ensure that instructional systems, websites, and electronic communications are maintained for CAPS is required. Links to RUNet and other resources such as NJedge.net are key to both the academic and administrative function of CAPS. Staff and infrastructure (network, equipment, software, maintenance) should be built into the budget.

Library/information services need to be designed to meet the needs of distance learners and delivered primarily through the network. While CAPS students will have access to all of the Libraries' electronic and print resources, most CAPS programs will require the acquisition of resources that go beyond what is ordinarily acquired, such as specialized trade and professional literature. Additionally, a librarian whose responsibilities include the coordination of all distance education support, such as onsite instruction in the use of information resources for course-related work and life-long learning, development of online reserve readings and tutorials, e-mail reference and consultation, and technical programming, will ensure that information support is well coordinated and responsive to student and faculty needs.

Academic advising and counseling will be an important function for CAPS students and will require the professional support of individuals who are familiar with adult education. As CAPS students may be entering the program with professional experience and/or transferring from other programs, personnel with portfolio assessment expertise will be necessary to allocate academic credit and advise on programs.

**(15) We recommend that academic support services personnel be integrated into appropriate CAPS committees and other organizational structures.**

The successful delivery of academic support for CAPS will depend on mechanisms that facilitate the responsiveness of these services to current and changing CAPS needs. In order to ensure that they work effectively, personnel involved in the design and delivery of these services should be integrated into appropriate CAPS committees, as well as other university structures, to leverage activities between CAPS and other university units.

#### *Charge 5*

***What mechanisms are needed to minimize the perception of or the possibility of potential competitive programmatic overlap with existing academic units? How may mutually beneficial collaboration be encouraged and developed between CAPS and our existing academic units?***

Although the mission of CAPS differs from the mission of existing academic units at Rutgers, both these units and CAPS can benefit in important ways from each other. Some traditional academic units, for example, may wish to work collaboratively with CAPS to offer new off-campus programs, which could enhance the resources available to on-campus programs. These units also may wish to use selected CAPS faculty to teach on-campus courses. Likewise, CAPS, a new Rutgers unit, can benefit from the strong reputation of the Rutgers units, such as GSE, SCILS, SSW, Nursing, GSM and SMLR, who have offered off-campus credit courses and programs for a decade or more.

The possibilities for mutually beneficial collaborations are particularly strong among the three University College units and CAPS since the missions of both the University Colleges and CAPS focus on providing educational opportunities to adult students. Some students seeking admission to CAPS, for example, may need to take lower division liberal arts courses offered by FAS faculty to UC students, or they may wish to take upper level liberal arts elective courses offered to UC students.

There is also the possibility of collaboration and cooperation between CAPS and University Extension, particularly for those extension programs that offer continuing professional education. Collaboration with CAPS may help extension programs identify new sources of students, additional areas for program development, and additional instructional talent. And CAPS can benefit from the strong relationships between extension programs and their constituencies, who may wish to obtain baccalaureate or advanced degrees.

The structure we envision for Rutgers programs aimed at adult learners is thus one in which CAPS takes maximal advantage of expertise within existing academic units and is tied to those units by a network of mutually beneficial collaborative efforts. This model for CAPS is clearly more administratively complex than a CAPS almost completely separate from the rest of the university. As noted elsewhere, however, the Advisory Committee believes that the integrated model will best serve the university's educational mission and provide off-campus applied and professional programs of the highest quality. We believe, furthermore, that the ability of CAPS to draw on the expertise within a major research university is what can distinguish CAPS programs from those offered by for-profit institutions.

Clearly, therefore, some overlap between the activities of traditional academic units and CAPS may be beneficial. On the other hand, it is important that dysfunctional competition or disputes over the locus of programs be avoided. For this reason, we have developed several recommendations.

**.(16) We recommend that CAPS and existing units within Rutgers be encouraged to work together when mutually beneficial interactions are likely to occur.**

Existing schools may choose to work with CAPS or make use of infrastructure developed by CAPS; but in all such cases, it will be voluntary and the result of mutual agreement. When faculty in traditional units have expertise that relates to a CAPS program, cooperative efforts should be developed to use that expertise to help maintain the highest quality programs. This will require some flexibility within the University so that, for example, tenure-track faculty might be transferred to CAPS for fixed periods of time and their evaluation and promotion criteria appropriately altered during this period of service.

If CAPS identifies the need for a program in an area that is closely related to the educational activities of another Rutgers academic unit, CAPS will confer with the dean and faculty of that unit about the unit's willingness to either offer the program itself or work collaboratively with CAPS to offer the program. Should the unit decide within a reasonable time to offer the program itself, it will be permitted to do so. Should the unit not take action to plan and offer the program within a reasonable time, CAPS may initiate the program.

It is expected that disputes as to which unit or units should offer new programs will be resolved by the faculty and deans of the affected units. Should this not be possible, the disputes will be resolved by the University Vice President for Academic Affairs. Any new programs, whether developed by CAPS or some other academic unit, must go through the traditional academic review process, including approval by the President's Cabinet, the Board of Governors, and the Commission on Higher Education.

Rutgers University should develop and implement a coherent and transparent marketing strategy for all its programs that are oriented toward adult learners. Any potential student who wants to take courses or major in a program oriented toward adult learners should have access to information about all such programs in an easy-to-use format.

**(17) We recommend that CAPS work with each of the three University Colleges to determine the extent to which CAPS infrastructure and programs could be used to further the adult education mission of UC, and vice versa.**

CAPS and the three UCs target the adult learner, but do so through a different mission. There are obvious benefits to adult students that CAPS and the UCs, working together, should explore. Proactive efforts at collaboration, cooperation, and coordination between CAPS and the UCs will result in comprehensive and seamless educational opportunities for adult learners throughout the state. For example:

- Joint marketing of opportunities and programs for adult students at Rutgers University.
- Ease in transferring from UC to CAPS and from CAPS to the UCs, depending on articulation agreements reached by the governing bodies (i.e., faculties and/or fellows) of each of the colleges.
- Facilitating the completion of distribution requirements by CAPS students through courses offered (or, in the case of UC-NB, brokered) through the UCs
- Cooperating in the development of portfolio assessment that might be standardized between the UCs and CAPS.

**(18) We recommend that ongoing professional off-campus programs within the university (e.g., GSE, SSW, GSM, SCILS, SMLR, GS-N, Nursing, Public Administration) continue to have the same autonomy that they now enjoy.**

Many Rutgers professional schools operate off-campus academic programs serving professionals throughout the state. Each of the academic units now operating such programs (including, but not limited to: GSE, SSW, GSM, SCILS, SMLR, GS-N, Nursing, Public Administration) must be able to continue to operate them as they currently do. Each of these academic units will continue to decide what to offer, when, and through what particular delivery mechanism. Scheduling for these off-campus programs should continue to be under the jurisdiction of the respective academic units, as well as faculty appointments, compensation, fiscal accountability, and academic support. These units should consider whether CAPS can provide an additional service mechanism through which new innovative programs may be developed cooperatively.

**(19) We recommend that CAPS not offer liberal arts courses or lower-level applied and professional courses.**

Prospective CAPS students needing general education or pre-requisite courses should be directed to one of the Rutgers University colleges or to a community college.

**(20) We recommend that any Arts and Sciences courses offered at any of the CAPS off-campus sites be offered under the auspices of the appropriate University College and that the instructors in these course be supervised by the relevant FAS department.**

Since the University Colleges do not have faculties, the UC Dean would have the task of negotiating with the appropriate FAS department on his or her campus to provide and supervise the instructors for such off-campus courses, as the UC-NB Dean now does in the case of Saturday classes. This will help to ensure that such courses provided to adult students off-campus meet the same standard as courses offered on-campus.

### *Charge 6*

***What are the characteristics necessary in a successful CAPS Dean?  
Define and describe the job and an appropriate search process.***

The task of attracting a Dean will be particularly challenging. In rapid order the CAPS dean will be expected to:

- Establish CAPS as a high quality academic unit.
- Forge cooperative and mutually beneficial alliances with existing professional schools, and work collaboratively with existing deans and faculties.
- Provide vision and direction to an entirely new faculty, encouraging high quality instruction, student support, and a commitment to quality, innovation, and flexibility.
- Develop alliances with community colleges and a distributed learning network that not only could support CAPS programs, but that could also serve existing off-campus programs for those units wishing to take advantage of CAPS infrastructure.
- Integrate CAPS into the fabric of the university as a university-wide resource for academic units on all three campuses.
- Achieve the business goals and expectations for CAPS, i.e., CAPS must be self-sustaining within several years, and preferably generate resources for redistribution elsewhere within the university.

Clearly, selection of the right candidate is critical to CAPS success. The successful candidate will set the tone for collaboration, business perspective, and commitment to quality that will last far beyond his or her tenure in that position. Accordingly:

**(21) We recommend that the President establish a decanal search committee with broad university representation.**

The CAPS dean should embody the following characteristics:

- An earned academic doctorate from an accredited university.
- Demonstrated academic leadership and a record of success in an academic environment.
- Knowledge of higher education issues and trends, particularly as they concern adult professionals.
- A record of successful college teaching.
- A record of innovation in the development, and implementation of distributed and distance programs.
- Experience as an academic administrator including planning, budget management, and staff supervision.
- Demonstration of entrepreneurship.

The option for tenure should be available.

The search committee should consist of representatives selected from the tenured faculty ranks, professional school deans, and the administration, with the majority from the former two categories. The selection of the first CAPS dean will be critical to the successful development of the college and should require deliberation by more than one academic officer. Accordingly, the search committee recommendation(s) should be presented to both the University Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Continuous Education and Outreach, who will then present a joint recommendation to the President.

#### ***Charge 7***

***Explore the possible relationship between CAPS and Rutgers University Extension. Are there Extension faculty who may be able to contribute to CAPS programs without negatively impacting their own mission? Are there other ways in which CAPS and Extension may cooperate to their mutual benefit?***

Rutgers Cooperative Extension (RCE) and CAPS have several similarities and can synergistically provide educational opportunities for New Jersey residents. RCE maintains a physical presence in every New Jersey county. The faculty and staff deal directly with over one million state residents (off-campus) each year. The programmatic focus of RCE is to help keep New Jersey agriculture viable and competitive, encourage productive futures for youth, strengthen families, teach financial awareness, enhance environmental resources, and improve food safety and nutrition. The Office of Continuing and Professional Education is allied with RCE and is a self-supporting, entrepreneurial enterprise that offers short courses and conferences to teach and reinforce skills needed for modern agribusiness, environmental management, the life sciences, and youth and community development.

**(22) We recommend that close cooperation should be pursued between CAPS and University Extension, including, but not limited to:**

- Advertisement and cross-promotion of programs: RCE is in direct contact with the constituency CAPS seeks to serve.
- Use of RCE faculty: RCE off campus programs do not currently lead to the awarding of a degree. However, some of the programmatic initiatives of RCE may form the basis for a CAPS degree-granting program, with input from Extension faculty.
- Use of RCE facilities: RCE off-campus stations are currently tied into or will shortly be tied into the main Rutgers campuses through voice-video links. These facilities may serve as locations from which courses can be shared with other off-campus locations or at which CAPS may take advantage of some on-campus course.
- Use of tenured RCE faculty: Senior extension faculty have been awarded tenure through the same rigorous process at the university as other tenured colleagues, with an emphasis upon service and teaching. They may prove to be valuable assets to CAPS committees dealing with hiring and promoting CAPS faculty. In addition, RCE faculty and staff have very practical knowledge and skills. They can serve to help guide program development as well as participate in instructional activities.

In addition to the resources available to CAPS through Rutgers Cooperative Extension, several professional schools have extension programs and extension faculty. Collaborative relationships between CAPS and these professional schools (such as GSE, SCILS, SMLR, GSM) can benefit both the professional schools and CAPS. Professional school extension programs, for example, have existing constituencies that can help CAPS recruit degree-seeking students. Faculty and instructors teaching in extension programs may be a source of instructors for CAPS credit courses, and vice versa. Joint marketing by CAPS and professional schools could increase enrollments in courses offered by either or both units. Professional extension programs could be an incubator for future CAPS degree programs. And cooperative relationships between professional school extension faculty and staff could help facilitate eventual collaboration between CAPS and the credit-bearing programs offered by professional schools at Rutgers.

***Charge 8***

***Suggest a name for the new unit that does not cause confusion with existing Rutgers colleges or schools.***

The Committee recognizes there is some sensitivity to the use of RU-CAPS. Nevertheless, the Advisory Committee has not identified a name for the new school that would be better than CAPS. Confusion with University College can be minimized through consistent reference to the new college as the College of Applied and Professional Studies, Rutgers University (i.e., CAPS or CAPS-RU, rather than RU-CAPS).

Ray Caprio – Co-chair  
Martha Cotter  
Marianne Gaunt  
Harry Janes  
Michael Mundrane  
Rosa Oppenheim  
Mary Ann Scoloveno

James Miller – Co-chair  
Emmet Dennis  
Haym Hirsh  
Barbara Lee  
Andrew Norris  
Sam Rabinowitz

## **Appendix 1**

### **Listing of Presidential Charges**

#### Charge 1

Suggest ways to ensure academic freedom and appropriate oversight of programs. The potential role of tenured/tenure track faculty and their relationship to the proposed school as a way to address these issues should be considered as well as other suggestions?

#### Charge 2

Explore our existing transfer articulation agreements and the admission of upper division students. Are changes needed to accommodate the adult and place bound learner targeted by CAPS?

#### Charge 3

Review the initial proposed program mix and suggest ways to enhance, clarify, or further refine these programs. Provide a suggested process for developing an entirely new degree area where few if any experts may exist within the Rutgers community.

#### Charge 4

What resources or mechanisms need to be in place to assure quality support services for CAPS students and programs?

#### Charge 5

What mechanisms are needed to minimize the perception of or the possibility of potential programmatic overlap with existing academic units? How may mutually beneficial collaboration be encouraged and developed between CAPS and our existing academic units?

#### Charge 6

What are the characteristics necessary in a successful CAPS dean? Define and describe the job and an appropriate search process.

#### Charge 7

Explore the possible relationship between CAPS and Rutgers University Extension. Are there Extension faculty who may be able to contribute to CAPS programs without negatively impacting their own mission? Are there other ways in which CAPS and Extension may cooperate to their mutual benefit?

#### Charge 8

Suggest a name for the new unit that does not cause confusion with existing Rutgers colleges or schools.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Comparative Listing of Public AAUs and regional private AAUs**