



CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING - 116 COLLEGE AVENUE - NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08901-1165
PHONE: (732) 932-7466 - FAX: (732) 932-1845
EMAIL: curiosity@cat.rutgers.edu - URL: <http://cat.rutgers.edu>

3 January 2006

To: Senate Executive Committee

From: Gary A. Gigliotti
Chair, University Structure and Governance.

Re: Report to Executive Committee for 4 January 2006

The USG committee has come to a number of conclusions concerning the Task Force on Undergraduate Education. The most recent Senate meetings, On 18 November 2005 and 9 December 2005 lead to no real changes in the Committee's consensus on the major issues before us, but some positions were clarified. We took no formal votes, especially during our last meeting of 9 December which was sparsely attended, but below, I will indicate my opinion about the strength of each of the positions discussed.

A. The committee would vote unanimously on the Senate floor for these positions.

1. There should be one Arts and Sciences unit in New Brunswick/Piscataway.
2. There should be one set of admissions standards for that unit.
3. There should be one core curriculum for Arts and Sciences students.
4. There should be one honors program supported by Arts and Sciences.
5. There should be a new Vice President of Undergraduate Education. This office will be funded appropriately to support its broadly based mission. The VPUE will be a member of the President's Cabinet.
6. The current colleges in New Brunswick/Piscataway should be designated as Residential Colleges, each headed by a Dean.
7. The New Brunswick Faculty Council (NBFC) should be configured to help attain the goal of bring faculty and students closer together. The NBFC should be representative of all faculty at NB, as it currently is, but with an expanded mission and an appropriate structure to be an active force in improving undergraduate education at NB as outlined in the Task Force report.

8. The NBFC should continue to report to the EVPAA, but on a day-to-day basis would be expected to interact more closely with the VPUE, (and the vice president of student affairs) and the Vice President of Research and Graduate Education.

B. A majority of the committee would support the following points:

1. There was considerable discussion about the Vice President of Student Affairs. The USG committee feels that the VPSA should report to the VPUE in some fashion, and a majority would most likely support this position. But, there is support for the position that the VPSA should be free-standing and report to the EVPAA. I believe the USG committee is flexible on this matter.
2. A majority of the USG committee would support the position that the Deans of the Residential Colleges will report directly to the new VPUE. But, there are dissenters to this position, who believe the Residential College Deans should report to the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences.

C. These positions are not clear enough for me to state the outcome of a vote of the USG committee:

1. Should the VPUE should serve on the PRC. We had a number of discussions of this point, and there was no clear consensus. The argument that having another administrator on the PRC, diluting the percentage of faculty on the committee and expanding the committee's size, was a telling one for many in leaning against this position. But, other's felt that giving undergraduate education a voice on the PRC would be worth the cost.
2. What names should be given to the new School of arts and Sciences and the Residential Colleges? The USG committee has finessed this question up to now. A member of the USG committee has asked that we consider calling the new school "Rutgers College", but this does not seem to have broad support. Some have argued that the new school be called, The School or Arts and Sciences, with no formal name, as is done at many institutions similar to Rutgers. Similarly, some have objected to the fact that the name "Rutgers College" would disappear under most proposals. This contentious and difficult naming issue needs more discussion in our committee.
3. The role of the Residential Colleges as learning communities has strong support, but we have had considerable discussion about just what a learning community is in the context of the Task Force report, and what kind of funding would be necessary to make such a concept

implementation committees, but the committee needs more discussion on just what is expected in this area. The work of other senate committees will be useful to us in this area.

Please let me know if any further information is needed. I have kept this report brief so that we can clearly see the points of strong agreement, and facilitate bringing them to the floor of the Senate for approval as soon as possible.