

Report of the Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee on the personnel ramifications of the proposals in the *Report of the Task Force on Undergraduate Education*.

**Part I: Faculty implications
January 3, 2006**

The FAPC was issued the following charge:

Consider the potential effects on faculty, staff, and administrative personnel of the proposals on the structure of undergraduate education, the student experience, learning communities and campus life, and faculty and student responsibilities of the Task Force on Undergraduate Education, as well as alternative proposals submitted by members of the university community. Make recommendations, as necessary, on the appropriate roles of the campus (or college) deans, the dean of the College (or School) of Arts and Sciences, the Vice President for Undergraduate Education, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and their academic and student-life staffs; on the transition process to a new set of reporting relations; on appropriate incentives for faculty to become more connected with undergraduates; and on possible changes to tenure and promotion forms. As time permits, consider other aspects of the Task Force recommendations that are of particular concern to members of the Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee.

This report deals with *potential effects on faculty* and issues recommendations *on appropriate incentives for faculty to become more connected with undergraduates; and on possible changes to tenure and promotion forms.*

A separate report deals with reporting relationships.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The FAPC tabulated the *incentives proposed by the TUE and endorses most of them*. However, the FAPC believes the incentives proposed by the TUE are not adequate and that the report of the Taskforce on Undergraduate Education fell short in addressing the issue of rewards and incentives, an issue that they recognized as being crucial. The FAPC believes that the issue of faculty participation is central to the success or failure of the proposed transformation and recommends that effective incentives, some of which will carry additional costs, be put into place. The committee formulated additional recommendations in three categories as follows:

- *Recognition and promotion incentives* including annual departmental recognition awards for PTLs, annuals, TAs and GAs; amending Forms 1a-e to include all the additional faculty responsibilities; reaffirming the 10-year rule for promotion to PI and modifying the process to make it easier to assess the candidate's contributions; requiring a minimum of attention to undergraduate teaching for promotion to PII for faculty with IDR appointments.
- *Monetary incentives from existing funds* including endorsing and expanding on the TUE recommendation that a portion of merit funds should be set aside for contributions to undergraduate education; recommending that a substantial portion of the president's FASIP funds should be used for awards on undergraduate Teaching and Service; using differential criteria for FASIP awards that would shift from mostly Research for Assistant Professors towards Teaching and Service for Associate and Full Professors
- *Incentives requiring new funds*, including release time for the development of new courses; funds to each department for meritorious awards for faculty, TAs and GAs; allotment of out-of-cycle salary adjustments for faculty who receive major national recognition in undergraduate teaching; competitive grants and/or summer salary to develop new courses; development of an initiative similar to the Aresty Research Center for all undergraduates.

FAPC REPORT

The FAPC is concerned about the implementation of some, if not most, of the taskforce's recommendations without additional resources in instructional staff. Faculty should be aware that most of the proposals carry a tab of significantly additional workload.

In addition, the committee believes that the success or failure of the major outcomes intended by the proposals of the TUE hinges on the level of faculty involvement, especially if limited additional resources materialize. It is also realized that there needs to be a cultural change and that any incentives should have such a goal in mind. In an environment in which the less undergraduate teaching a faculty member is called to do, the higher the perceived value of that faculty member, a cultural change is necessary to connect faculty, especially faculty active in research, to undergraduate students. It is therefore necessary to create such an environment in which teaching will be perceived as being appreciated. This is not currently the case.

In our opinion the thrust should be towards two highly compatible goals that support each other:

- to connect teaching with research and
- to elevate the prestige of teaching

While it is necessary to provide incentives and rewards to faculty who excel in teaching, even if they are not as successful in research, it is even more important to provide incentives and rewards for involvement in teaching for faculty who are highly successful in their research. Else the edge of the university over other institutions in the state will not be utilized to increase the attractiveness of Rutgers for undergraduate studies.

On page 27, under the heading of Corollaries of the Fundamental Principle, the Report states: *"It is the responsibility of our administration to provide ... an incentive system that encourages faculty participation in undergraduate education..."*

This committee believes that there is an earlier first necessary step namely to remove the disincentives to such participation. Indeed the report recognizes the existence of such disincentives. This committee agrees with the formulation in the Taskforce's report on page 76, namely that:

"...faculty in New Brunswick/ Piscataway do not perceive teaching and, especially, service to be valued at the university. Although instructions for promotion and tenure include references to the value of teaching and service, the main criterion for tenure is scholarship. Departments at Rutgers–New Brunswick/Piscataway may define criteria for merit increases within the framework set for general teaching/research faculty. However, some departments may choose to make research the only or the major criterion for merit increases for faculty, thereby creating a tangible disincentive for faculty members to spend time on teaching and service."

And they conclude: “Against this backdrop, the task of reengaging faculty in teaching and service and in more active participation in undergraduate education beyond the classroom is not easy.”

The Taskforce uses the phrase “*faculty participation should be encouraged*” several tens of times throughout their report. In some of these places, suggestions are also made on how faculty could be encouraged. The FAPC compiled these suggestions, added several others, debated each one, and developed the recommendations that are appended to this report (Appendix A).

The FAPC decided that it is helpful to first identify in the TUE report the level of participation required by the faculty, collectively and individually, for the goals of the TUE to be successfully implemented. These additional requirements set by the TUE seem to fall in four major categories:

- 1) Participation in ten (10) new one-time committees
- 2) Participation in eighteen (18) new standing New Brunswick/ Piscataway committees
- 3) Participation in new standing committees within units
- 4) Individual effort

It is reasonable to assume that the usual suspects (some of whom composed the TUE report and some of whom are the ones currently taking apart its controversial aspects) will staff (1) and (2)¹. This is not the case with items (3) and (4) that demand participation on a much wider scale. In particular, all faculty are asked to undertake at least some of the following additional responsibilities on a continuous and sustained basis:

- Staff a school-wide admissions committee in their unit
- Staff a school-wide committee on Faculty-Student Engagement in Research Experiences in their unit
- Make admission decisions in their unit
- Participate in preadmission and postadmission recruiting activities
- Advise students in their unit
- Mentor undergraduates in research
- Develop and teach courses in Experiential Learning
- Develop and teach new courses
- Participate in Learning Communities
- Develop ways to assess the effectiveness of current programs

Some of these proposals are deemed as adding significant workload to the faculty, especially without additional resources in teaching staff. In particular:

- The proposed experiential courses, which by necessity would be limited to small classes
- The proposed weekend courses would either be forced on faculty or will be taught by PTLs.

¹ A complete listing is appended to this report in Appendix C

Mentions of incentives and rewards are interspersed throughout the report, usually along with the proposal of additional responsibilities. The bulk of these recommendations, however, occur from page 155 onward, under Student and Faculty Responsibilities for Undergraduate Education.

Most of the individual recommendations there are sound (Appendix B), and the FAPC is happy to adopt them. However, the listing is more of responsibilities and less about incentives. In addition, the listing mixes suggestions of very different specific weights. While we would agree that free theater tickets and lunch vouchers might push some faculty over the threshold to attend a play or have lunch with students, they do not rise to the level of incentives.

Indeed, the main thread of these recommendations is that “*faculty involvement (is) recognized as a responsibility of the academic units*” (page 156). It is assumed that, since the same dean who is responsible for the students is the one who makes promotion and award decisions for the faculty, directing chairs and faculty to undertake additional responsibilities would succeed. There is something to be said about a direct order, but it should be realized that most often than not the recipient would be a tenured faculty member and that deans have strict guidelines for their recommendations in both promotion and FASIP. Thus, if these guidelines are not altered, there will only be limited effectiveness of the incentive and reward structure.

The FAPC based its deliberations on two assumptions:

- The basic promotion and, especially, tenure criteria will not, and should not, shift significantly from those consistent with the character of Rutgers as a major public research university; *unlike the TUE report, however, it made sense to us to look at tenure and promotion separately*
- No massive infusion of financial resources seems to be forthcoming from the State; nevertheless, if undergraduate education is to become a priority, some reprioritization and internal reallocation should be anticipated

Thus, if for most faculty the criteria for promotion would remain unchanged, any incentives should be mainly monetary and such monetary incentives should come mainly from existing funds. Reprioritization of funding should be consistent with the relative importance of achieving the goals of the Taskforce report.

Based on the above, the committee made recommendations in three groupings²:

- Recognition and promotion incentives
- Monetary incentives from existing funds
- Monetary incentives requiring new funds

² A complete listing can be found in Appendix A

- **Recognition and promotion incentives:**

These include annual departmental non-monetary teaching excellence awards for PTLs, annuals, TAs and Gas, and amending Forms 1a-e to include the additional faculty responsibilities as well as recommending other possible amendments.

The committee believes that measures such as these are necessary but not sufficient. To make any significant headway in making faculty reprioritize their time and energy, *substantial concrete promotional ramifications* should be associated with undergraduate teaching. The committee proposes introduction of a mostly positive impact of undergraduate teaching on promotion to PI and of a mostly negative impact to the lack of such teaching on promotion to PII by reaffirming in word and in deed the 10-year rule and elevating the prestige of teaching by including it among the “*most significant criteria*” for promotion to PII so that minimum attention to undergraduate teaching will be required for promotion to PII.

- **Monetary incentives from existing funds:**

This essentially means re-distribution of FASIP funds³. It also has to be realized that any recommendation will, in effect, limit the latitude that departments enjoy at this time. The Taskforce limited their recommendation to an admonition to departments⁴. This committee does not see the feasibility of a group of faculty creating incentives for themselves to increase their own workload. Several recommendations were made in this direction including establishing a quota system in FASIP distribution for Teaching and Service and differential criteria for FASIP awards depending on rank.

- **Incentives requiring new funds:**

New funds are required for release time, meritorious awards, out-of-cycle salary adjustments, competitive grants and/or summer salary and additional compensation to faculty willing to teach weekend courses. The development of an initiative similar to the Aresty Research Center for all undergraduates would be a very effective use of new funds.

2005-06 University Senate Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee

Gould, Ann, Cook (F), Co-Chair

Panayotatos, Paul, GS-NB (F), Co-Chair - Executive Committee Liaison

Barbarese, Joseph, GS-C (F)

Boylan, Edward, FAS-N (F)

Breton, Michael, Assoc. VP for Research & Sponsored Programs (A)

Cannon, Roger, Engineering (F)

Carr, Deborah, GS-NB (F)

Coit, David, Engineering (F)

Dennis, Roger, Camden Provost (A)

Deutsch, Stuart, Law-Newark Dean (A)

³ May require the agreement of the AAUP

⁴ “*Departments might consider revising their merit pay guidelines*”

Fishbein, Leslie, FAS-NB (F)
Hart, Joseph, MGSA (F)
John, Christopher, UC-NB (S)
Klepac, Nancy, Law-C (S)
Leath, Paul, At-Large NB (F)
Lee, Barbara, SMLR Dean (A) - Administrative Liaison
Lipman, Jarrett, MGSA (S)
Mandelbaum, Jennifer, GS-NB (F)
Markert, Joseph, PTL-NB (F)
Nelson, Kuna, NCAS (S)
Puniello, Francoise, Douglass (F)
Rabinowitz, Samuel, SB-C (F)
Schein, Louisa, FAS-NB (F)
Schock, Kurt, NCAS (F)
Simmons, Peter, Law-N (F)
Turner, Franklin, GSE (S)

APPENDIX A: Recommendations by the Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee

A1. Recognition and promotion incentives:

Recommendation I: Widely publicize to departments and/or units that it is a good practice to give annual non-monetary teaching excellence awards separately for PTLs and annuals on one hand and for TAs and GAs on the other.

Justification: Such awards can be used to boost resumes of PTLs who have mostly teaching in their CV, or TAs and GAs who have not yet built a strong research CV. Such awards are currently being given in Camden with much success. GAs are included in addition to TAs as they should also be encouraged to get involved in directing the research of undergraduates, with the approval and supervision of their mentors.

Recommendation II: Widely publicize to departments and/or units the recommendations of senate resolution on charge S-9913 (Review of Teaching Assistant Training, February 2001, <http://senate.rutgers.edu/tatrain.html>).

Justification: Lack of proper discipline-specific training in their own departments for TAs who teach undergraduate sections, negatively impacts on the quality of their teaching.

Recommendation III: The tenure and promotions forms (Forms 1a-e) should be amended so that all the additional faculty responsibilities would have their specific lines under “Teaching.”

Justification: Clearly if the additional responsibilities constitute a part of the faculty member’s teaching responsibilities, it should be so reflected in the record⁵. At the same time, care should be taken so that faculty members who have no opportunity for such involvement not be penalized.

The committee believes that measures such as the ones recommended above are necessary but not sufficient. To make any significant headway in making faculty reprioritize their time and energy, substantial concrete promotional ramifications should be associated with undergraduate teaching for faculty with IDR appointments. The committee proposes mostly positive impact of undergraduate teaching to promotion to PI and mostly negative impact to the lack of such teaching to promotion to PII as follows:

Recommendation IV: Reaffirm in word and in deed the 10-year rule for promotion to PI. Modify the rule to be more explicit about undergraduate education and in particular emphasize non-classroom engagement. Devise a different solicitation letter for external referees and include Form 1a-e and the candidate’s Teaching Portfolio in the material sent to them.

Justification: Promotion to Associate Professor, which also carries tenure, should continue to be based mostly on Scholarship as it is currently; similarly for promotion to

⁵ Correlates with TUE recommendation: *Form 1-a of the promotion and tenure instructions should be revised so that work with students outside classrooms, in learning communities and other activities, has weight alongside classroom teaching.*

PII which is a rank designating national and international scholastic recognition (with the proviso of the recommendation that follows). Thus the only possibility for positive incentives for undergraduate teaching through promotion is for promotions from Associate to Full⁶.

The committee also agreed that the Associate Professor level is one of the most appropriate places for incentives for involvement in undergraduate teaching in an attempt to change the outlook of faculty who, after being told for six years they should minimize such involvement in order to achieve tenure, are expected to adapt overnight.

The general impression among faculty is that promotion via the 10-year rule is rather rare. Indeed, the data indicate that there are 161 Associate Professors in New Brunswick / Piscataway who are eligible for promotion under the 10-year rule. Yet their average time at rank is 19 years. The statistical data over the last five years indicate that the rate of failure for promotion to PI under the 10-year rule is 427% of the rate of failure for standard promotions to PI. It is generally recognized that one of the major difficulties of getting promoted under that rule lies with the external letters of recommendation. The committee recommends that more specific language is included in the solicitation letters for external letters of reference and that the choice of external referees is also consistent with the 10-year rule promotion criteria. Form 1a-e and a Teaching Portfolio would need to be included in the material sent to the external referees so that they can form an opinion on the quality of the candidate's in-class teaching and non-classroom engagement.

Recommendation V: Since the purpose of the proposed transformation is to connect teaching to research, elevate the prestige of teaching by including it among the "most significant criteria" for promotion to PII⁷.

Justification: National and international recognition for scholarship will continue to be the *sine qua non* for promotion to PII. Currently, anything sort of atrocious teaching practices is not taken into account for promotion to PII in either a positive or negative manner. Even non-existent undergraduate teaching is not considered an impediment to promotion. Under the proposed change teaching will only count positively in exceptional cases, such as national awards for teaching, but a minimum attention to undergraduate teaching will be required for promotion to PII for faculty with IDR appointments.

Recommendation VI: The committee agrees with the recommendations of the Taskforce that the VPUE sits on the President's Cabinet and on the PRC and recommends that the role of the VPUE on the PRC be substantive. In particular it recommends that it becomes part of the VPUE's responsibilities to formulate and voice an opinion on the teaching component of every promotion packet for faculty with IDR appointments discussed at the PRC.

⁶ It is not clear what TUE intends with the recommendation that (teaching and mentoring) *evaluations should become a more standard element in appointment and promotion dossiers*. It is probably safe to assume that a boost of the role of teaching in promotions is advocated.

⁷ Requires action by the BoG

- **A2. Monetary incentives⁸ from existing funds:**

This essentially means re-distribution of FASIP funds⁹. It also has to be realized that any recommendation will, in effect, limit the latitude that departments enjoy at this time. The Taskforce limited their recommendation to an admonition to departments (*Departments might consider revising their merit pay guidelines*). This committee does not see the feasibility of a group of faculty creating incentives for themselves to increase their own workload.

Recommendation VII: The FAPC endorses the TUE recommendation that: *Deans and their chairs should set aside a portion of merit funds for use in acknowledging departments' and their faculty members' strong and ongoing contributions to undergraduate education, in both classroom and nonteaching work* and recommends that it be expanded as follows:

Deans and their chairs should set aside an equitable portion of merit funds for use in acknowledging departments' and their faculty members' strong and ongoing contributions to undergraduate education, in both classroom and nonteaching work. Both the percentage thus set aside as well as the eventual distribution of FASIP awards broken down by the different criteria should be publicized to the faculty¹⁰.

Recommendation VIII: A substantial portion of the president's 5% of FASIP funds should be used for awards on undergraduate Teaching and Service

Justification: These two recommendations will create a separate fund for which the faculty will have to compete through Teaching and Service activities

Recommendation IX: Use differential criteria for FASIP awards shifting from mostly Research for Assistant Professors towards Teaching and Service for Associate and Full Professors.

Justification: Similar to Recommendation IV: Assistant Professors should continue to be encouraged to focus their energies on Scholarship. After tenure a message needs to be sent, loud and clear, to the effect that the rules have changed. If the criteria remain unchanged, faculty who have been told for six years they should minimize undergraduate teaching involvement in order to achieve tenure, are expected to somehow adapt overnight with no incentive.

⁸ Monetary recommendations also address the TUE recommendations on page 73: "A useful model for rewarding faculty commitment to undergraduate education is available from the Academy of Distinguished Teachers at the University of Texas-Austin..... Distinguished teachers—5 percent of the tenured faculty—are recognized and receive extra pay (<http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/academy/>). Other strategies can be implemented to promote faculty commitment to working with undergraduates beyond the classroom.Funds can be allocated for teacher scholars recruited to serve as mentors to colleagues, to give public presentations on teaching, to advance "good" practices, and to work with student academic leaders on the campuses. Funds should also be made available for the development of innovative and long-term teaching projects, especially those that are explicitly connected to learning communities."

⁹ May require the agreement of the AAUP

¹⁰ As per University Senate resolution On Charge S-0006 <http://senate.rutgers.edu/fapfasip.html> that has been adopted by the administration

- **A3. Incentives requiring new funds:**

Recommendation X: Approve release time for the development of new courses necessitated by adoption of the report recommendations.

Recommendation XI: Funds to each department earmarked for full-time faculty meritorious awards

Recommendation XII: Funds to each department earmarked for meritorious awards for PTLs and annuals

Recommendation XIII: Funds to each department earmarked for meritorious awards for TAs and GAs.

Justification for XII & XIII: With PTLs, annuals and TAs currently teaching more than half of undergraduate courses, allocation of funds to boost these salaries through some merit system is essential to the goal of reemphasizing undergraduate education. Separate funding sources should be identified for each of the three categories to ensure consistency. Such funding is crucial to the recruitment and retention of excellent teachers at all levels.

Recommendation XIV: Allot out-of-cycle salary adjustments for faculty who receive major national recognition in undergraduate teaching.

Justification: Article XXIII of the AAUP / Admin Agreement allows for the following: “The University may, at its discretion, increase the salary of an individual member of the bargaining unit to respond to a bona fide outside offer or to provide immediate recognition for an unusual professional achievement.” To excel at undergraduate teaching is truly a substantive professional achievement and it should be rewarded with out-of-cycle salary adjustments to give recognition to the importance and impact of this of this accomplishment. This award is also flexible since it can be adjusted to be appropriate to the achievement.

Recommendation XV: the FAPC recommends that competitive grants and/or summer salary are made available to develop new courses necessitated by adoption of the report recommendations.

Recommendation XVI: Provide additional compensation to faculty willing to teach weekend courses.

Justification: These courses should be equivalent to those offered on weekdays. Some “overtime” would make sense and could be a powerful initiative.

Recommendation XVII: The FAPC recommends the development of an initiative similar to the Aresty Research Center for all undergraduates.

- **A4. Additional recommendation**

Recommendation XVIII: Adopt recommendations 1-3, 5-9, 11, 13, 16-26 of the Taskforce listed in Appendix B. It should be noted, that in several cases the committee has gone further with recommendations stated above than the TUE recommendations that are being adopted.

APPENDIX B: Summary of rewards and incentives proposed by the Taskforce

1. *Incentive and reward systems should be created to encourage sustained participation by faculty and staff in these learning communities¹¹.*
2. *...the vice president for undergraduate education will need to have the resources to compensate members of these curriculum committees with summer research moneys and released time¹².*
3. *Faculty teaching in the core could receive steps as part of the merit pay program;*
4. *Faculty who regularly teach in the core could be designated as “Core Faculty” and their pedagogical work could be recognized in the promotion process;*
5. *A presidential award could be made annually to faculty who develop particularly innovative courses for the core¹³.*
6. *The vice president for undergraduate education should develop incentives to encourage departments and programs to offer their courses, and wherever possible their majors, so that students can fulfill the requirements in the evening and/or the weekends¹⁴.*
7. *More faculty members should become involved in traditional preadmission and postadmission recruiting activities, and the university should incorporate participation in such activities into its reward structure¹⁵.*
8. *...we believe that we can do more, through our reward structures and through the ways we establish “cultural” expectations for new faculty, to create an environment where faculty expect and look forward to participating in the work of undergraduate education beyond the classroom¹⁶.*
9. *The new Aresty Undergraduate Research Program We would like to see these programs expanded, where practicable, to other interested students.*
10. *We also want to see faculty involvement recognized as a responsibility of the academic units. it will be the school deans who have the primary responsibility for identifying and enabling appropriate faculty to make those contributions.*
11. *• Deans should ask their departments to give more attention to the work of faculty outside the classroom..... Sending signals that the campus values and rewards faculty who work with undergraduate students outside regular courses will have broad implications for cultural change.*
12. *• Deans need to make a specific commitment each year to providing faculty to the*

¹¹ Page 11

¹² Page 44

¹³ Page 45

¹⁴ Page 52

¹⁵ Page 113

¹⁶ Beginning on 155

General Honors Program, to learning communities, to mentor programs, etc. Departments should expect, as part of their regular work in undergraduate education, to provide a specific number of faculty each year.

13. • *Deans should ask from chairs, as part of their annual reports, a cataloging and discussion of their department's and faculty's outside-the-classroom work with undergraduates.*
 14. • *Deans and their chairs should set aside a portion of merit funds for use in acknowledging departments' and their faculty members' strong and ongoing contributions to undergraduate education, in both classroom and nonteaching work.*
 15. *(Departments might consider revising their merit pay guidelines so that attention to undergraduates assumes substantial status.)*
 16. • *Form 1-a of the promotion and tenure instructions should be revised so that work with students outside classrooms, in learning communities and other activities, has weight alongside classroom teaching.*
 17. • *Deans and their faculties should revise their standards for teaching excellence so that outstanding achievement in undergraduate education involves both excellence in classroom teaching and evidence of strong commitment to undergraduates' intellectual lives beyond the classroom and laboratory.*
 18. • *Deans should provide expanded support to departments, programs, and individual faculty members for curricular and teaching enhancements.*
- ... we can and should encourage efforts to elevate the visibility and prestige of teaching and to underscore for undergraduates the complementarities between teaching and research.*
19. • *The president should convene a set of prestigious scholars from a wide range of disciplines and secure their commitment to participate in significant ways in their department's introductory courses and in the proposed learning communities.*
 20. • *All departments should be expected to mount careful and vigorous faculty mentoring and teaching evaluation programs.*
 21. • *The resulting evaluations should become a more standard element in appointment and promotion dossiers.*
 22. • *Deans and department chairs should devote more attention to the cultivation and preparation of nominations for university and school teaching awards.*
 23. • *The president should mount a more visible campaign of publicity each year to celebrate the winners of the university teaching awards.*
 24. • *Schools and departments should be encouraged to establish awards or other recognition programs to celebrate their outstanding teachers.*
 25. • *Free tickets to campus events for faculty-student groups—concerts, sports, theatrical performances—should be readily available from a central location.*
 26. • *Dining halls should be easily accessible for faculty; and faculty should be provided vouchers for meals with students.*

APPENDIX C: New Committees Proposed by the Taskforce

The following committees are proposed by the Taskforce, either as faculty committees or committees with “*strong faculty participation*”:

(1) Proposals for ten (10) new one-time committees

- *Executive Vice President Furmanski should form implementation groups early in the fall 2005 semester that listen carefully and respond fully to the campuswide discussions. Four implementation committees are necessary:*
 - *Core Curriculum*
 - *Learning Communities/Student Life*
 - *Admissions*
 - *Structure*
- The Taskforce also suggests:
 - Thus we urge that a Committee on Assessment be appointed as part of the implementation process.*
- In addition they state:
 - A campus task force should be formed by the vice president for undergraduate education to consider ways of making the cultural richness of the campus and of the New Jersey-New York area a part of the education of undergraduates at Rutgers.*
- *The report also recommends ... new task forces to deal with important issues that were beyond the scope (and time) of the TUE:*
 - *Task Force on Design and Maintenance*
 - *Task Force on Adult and Nontraditional Learners in New Brunswick/Piscataway*
 - *Task Force of Mental Health Professionals*
 - *Task Force on Undergraduates and Cultural Enrichment*

(2) Proposals for eight (8) new New Brunswick/ Piscataway standing committees

- *This report recommends a newly empowered position, the vice president for undergraduate education, and new committees, all with strong faculty involvement:*
 - *Committee for Coordination and Improvement of Counseling*
 - *Coordinating Council on Academic Support/EOF Faculty Support Committee*
 - *Core Curriculum Implementation Committee*
 - *Forum on Faculty-Student Interactions*
 - *New Brunswick/Piscataway-wide Faculty Admissions Committee*
 - *New Brunswick/Piscataway General Honors Program Committee*
 - *New Brunswick/Piscataway Learning Communities Coordinating Committee*

On page 16 and page 144 a *standing committee on Student Life* is also proposed.