

# Graduate Education at Rowan University

## Graduate Executive Council Report

Spring 2008

### Introduction

At a time when Rowan University is considering major changes to its graduate program offerings, it is important to review the campus mission statement:

*A leading public institution, Rowan University combines liberal education with professional preparation from the baccalaureate through the doctorate. Rowan provides a collaborative, learning-centered environment in which highly qualified and diverse faculty, staff, and students integrate teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and community service. Through intellectual, social, and cultural contributions, the University enriches the lives of those in the campus community and surrounding region.*

The mission statement clearly indicates that as a public institution, Rowan University provides liberal education and professional preparation at both undergraduate and graduate levels. For many years, undergraduate education was necessary and sufficient to demonstrate the mastery of a field of study, and the receipt of a bachelor's degree qualified a holder for just about any position within related degree areas. However, it is clear in today's highly competitive environment that undergraduate education is necessary, but no longer sufficient, in many fields of study. An increasing number of employers demand their new employees have graduate education, even requiring their existing employees to update their skills through continuing graduate education by obtaining certificates of graduate study, additional masters' degrees, or taking a doctoral program.

Graduate education brings many tangible and intangible benefits to an institution: a higher caliber of students as well as faculty; greatly increased levels of research, scholarly, and creative activity on campus; and a more visible local, regional, national, and international reputation for the University, not to mention improved infrastructure for labs, library holdings, and other physical facilities that aid in learning.

This whitepaper outlines a structural and fiscal model for graduate education and the Graduate School at Rowan University. As charged, the Graduate Executive Council studied multiple formats, benchmark institutions, and financial models for providing efficient, flexible, high-quality graduate programs for the region. The Graduate Executive Council realizes that the importance of and need for graduate education at Rowan University has never been greater, yet we also understand current economic realities make providing high-quality comprehensive graduate education increasingly more difficult. Therefore, this whitepaper addresses what the Graduate Executive Council believes is the next best step in how Rowan University delivers graduate education.

## Why Study Rowan University's Graduate Programs

This whitepaper offers the next step in discussing graduate education at Rowan University, a discussion that has been ongoing since the Aslanian Group's 2006 study of Rowan's graduate programs (see Appendix B for the complete report). Many of the concerns raised in the Aslanian Group's report to Rowan University officials in terms of graduate education at the University still exist nearly 2 years later.

Chief among the concerns the Aslanian report outlined are even though Rowan is in a favorable position to do well in graduate education, the name is not as well known as other regional universities, specifically Drexel and Villanova, with potential strong competition in the future from Stockton. Moreover, the Aslanian study proposed the two major reasons why graduate students were not considering Rowan was because of the campus location (too distant) and no program in an area of interest.

The Graduate Executive Council supports many of the ideas put forward in the Aslanian Group's 2006 study, and believes that the current administration review the Aslanian study to help shape elements of graduate study at Rowan.

In November 2007, the newly formed Graduate Executive Council met with Dean Horacio Sosa, Interim Dean of the Graduate School, and the College Deans to discuss the direction of graduate education at Rowan University. Concerns regarding graduate education have been expressed at various levels of the University community about what would happen to the existing Graduate School structure and its processes. After the departure of the Dean of the Graduate School, the unit was assigned to the College of Continuing and Professional Education (CPCE). Further compounding the University's concerns were the dissolution of the existing Graduate Council and its reorganization into a new structure, the Graduate Executive Committee (GEC).

During this November 2007 meeting between the academic deans and the GEC, the deans challenged the Graduate Executive Council to come up with a new structure for graduate education at Rowan University. The following research represents the GEC's study and findings from the deans' challenge.

**Appropriate Benchmarks for Graduate Programs at Rowan University** In its monograph, *Organization and Administration of Graduate Education*, The Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), a prominent professional organization subscribed to by many colleges and universities across the US, defines the common administrative structures in place at many, if not most, American graduate schools. The CGS document states clearly that

**The most common feature of these structures is the presence of a Graduate Dean or other Academic Officer overseeing all or most graduate governance, admissions and enrolled student support service activities.**

In Appendix A, six benchmark models for graduate education are listed. Three of the six models show research activities as included with the responsibilities of the Graduate Dean. We

recognize that this is not included in Rowan's future structure, although it has been in the past. Two of the six models the GCS presents have several assistant or associate deans reporting to the Dean of Graduate Studies or Dean of the School or College. This model seems most appropriate for very large institutions. That leaves only one CGS-recognized model, Sample A in Appendix A, appropriate for Rowan University. Sample A is the model -- with minor variations over time -- that Rowan has been employing since its inception.

Beyond the CGS report, the Graduate Executive Council reviewed several college and university graduate programs to determine appropriate benchmark institutions from which Rowan could develop a consistent format for graduate education. During the November 2007 GEC meeting with the deans and in a second meeting in early December 2007 between the GEC and Provost Houshmand, programs such as the University of Maryland, UCLA, Drexel, and other large institutions were suggested as potential models for delivering graduate education.

The GEC reviewed the graduate program models at the University of Maryland, UCLA, Drexel, Cornell University, and Syracuse University to see if any were appropriate for delivering graduate education at Rowan. As noted, these are very large research institutions, and the GEC determined that these programs, while highly recognized as quality institutions, currently exceed Rowan's size, expectations for, and investment in graduate education.

The Graduate Executive Council then turned its attention to examining graduate education at similar institutions as benchmarked in US News and World Report (see Appendix B). Here is a summary of the GEC's findings from the US News and World Report data:

- Most of the institutions on the US News list are small to midsize institutions
- Out of 15 institutions named, only 2 – TCNJ and the SUNY system – are public. The remaining benchmarked institutions are private.
- Out of the 15 benchmarked institutions, 5 of the 15 have a traditional CGS-outlined structure.
- Out of the 15 benchmarked institutions, 8 either are located within their respective academic colleges or have a graduate school structure within the colleges.
- Out of the 15 benchmarked institutions, 8 have similar or larger graduate student enrollments compared to Rowan.
- Most listed have alternative delivery programs available.
- None reported to a continuing education program or continuing education structure.

In addition to the US News data, the Graduate Executive Council studied current regional models for graduate education for the latest developments in how nearby institutions addressed graduate study. The following points reflect a critical summary of our findings:

- **The College of New Jersey** has a Dean of Admissions to whom undergraduate and graduate admissions functions report. There is also an Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies as well as three academic deans listed as working with graduate programs and a Graduate Programs Council of 12 representatives from academic programs. There are only 20 graduate programs.
- **Rutgers Camden** has 13 graduate majors. Graduate and undergraduate admissions functions are combined into a single office. There is a separate structure with an acting Graduate Dean, two associate deans and an administrative assistant, all of which appears to take charge of policies, curricula and other traditional functions of a graduate school. Overall total college enrollment is 5900 with a small graduate population.
- **Montclair University** with 90 programs and 3500 graduate students, has recently added an office entitled Office of Graduate Admissions and Support Services (a new director and 11 staff members) which report temporarily to the Provost and which offers support services to both prospective and enrolled students. It also has interesting model for an elected Graduate Council with 14 voting faculty members (2 from each of 7 academic colleges), in addition to faculty, representatives from crucial offices on campus such as graduate admissions, registrar, financial aid attend meetings as non-voting members. Graduate enrollment is 3 times the size of Rowan.
- **Drexel University** has an Admissions Division which reports to the VP for Enrollment Management. The following offices report to this VP: Decision Modeling and Reporting, Freshman Admissions, Graduate Admissions, International Undergraduate Admissions, Transfer and Part-Time Admissions. For enrolled graduate students an office called Graduate Studies is headed by an Associate VP for Graduate Studies (reports to Provost) and includes 2 additional staff members. Graduate enrollments are 6 times those of Rowan.

Given that Rowan University's Graduate School appears to be in the mid-range of the neighboring institutions in terms of size and offerings as well as parallels many of the institutions listed in the US News benchmark list, the CGS model seems to be the most workable and viable model for handling graduate education at the University.

Even though the Graduate Executive Council recommends keeping the CGS model for structuring the Graduate School and its processes, the GEC recognizes there are critical challenges facing graduate education at Rowan. The next section outlines what challenges the GEC found.

## Challenges to Graduate Education at Rowan University

Multiple issues surrounding Rowan University's graduate programs reflect both a series of strengths and weaknesses that have affected trends in enrollment figures over the past five years. While the core strengths are important and necessary to the successes many graduate programs have had during this timeframe, they have not always been sufficient to counter other variables that affect graduate education.

Our analysis of the Graduate School strengths is as follows:

- Quality program offerings with many programs holding professional accreditation
- Expert faculty
- Small class sizes

- Central location to Philadelphia, DC, NYC for recruiting
- Central repository in the Graduate School to compile, certify, and perform preliminary review of application materials
- Central and visible location on campus for maintaining graduate student forms, records, and procedures
- Central and visible location for official communication with prospective and current students as well as faculty advisors

However, significant weaknesses have hampered the Graduate School's growth over the last five-year period. During this period, the Graduate Council argued regularly – albeit often unsuccessfully – for change in many of these areas.

Our analysis of the Graduate School weaknesses is as follows:

- No history of marketing, advertising, or promotion of new and existing graduate school programs
- A 20% rise in graduate tuition costs for most of the last five years that priced many Rowan graduate programs out of the market for local applicants
- A dramatic increase in online or on site degree offerings from profit-centered colleges and universities
- Limited enrollment management functions; some individual programs practice enrollment management, but there is no school-wide enrollment management program in place
- Very limited campus visibility, either internally or externally, for the Graduate School
- Limited availability of or flexibility in delivery of graduate courses
- Little customer relationship management outside of program coordinators
- Inadequate International Student Services to recruit international students
- Inadequate housing opportunities (availability and policies) to recruit students past a 50 mile radius
- Inadequate food service hours for international students or for students who attend evening classes after work hours
- Inadequate public transit for students who do not or who choose not to drive to campus

Along with these weaknesses, our study found several threats or risks to growing graduate school programs and offerings at Rowan. These threats or risks must be addressed quickly to avoid falling further behind in enrollment figures.

Our analysis of immediate threats or risks to grow the Graduate School is as follows:

- Online programs of varying quality and cost
- Competition in variable tuition and delivery from similar four-year programs
- Off-site satellite programs
- Non-credit options (i.e., professional licensure or certification instead of a degree)

Still, the Graduate School situation is not bleak. As the Graduate Executive Council studied Rowan's offerings in light of other benchmark institutions, we discovered multiple opportunities exist.

Our analysis of potential opportunities to grow the Graduate School is as follows:

- Encourage programs to investigate grant funded initiatives, especially those that cross disciplinary boundaries, to foster growth
- Explore alternative course delivery methods (i.e., satellite sites, online, hybrids, low residency programs, weekend college, accelerated learning)
- Expand market reach beyond a 50 mile radius of the Glassboro campus
- Attract a growing regional population by offering unique programs
- Work more closely with professional licensing and accreditation programs to generate new ideas
- Build enrollments by advertising Rowan graduate programs as a way for people to pursue graduate degrees to hedge against the weak economy
- Explore ways to improve rankings in influential graduate school lists (i.e., Gorman Report)
- Increase recruitment through international student population
- Create partnerships with international colleges and universities
- Explore variable tuition rate models
- Provide incentives to departments and faculty to develop and support profitable graduate programs and certificates
- Create immersion experiences for international graduate students
- Explore corporate sponsorships for certain programs
- Explore corporate partnerships that design, develop, and deliver customized programs

In short, the challenge to Rowan University's Graduate School may be its greatest opportunity: Develop and sustain unique, highly flexible, rigorous programs that are cost efficient to run and can be delivered through multiple systems.

## Different Models for Graduate Education

At Rowan University, graduate enrollment varies widely from program to program. While certain programs that accommodate interest in currently popular fields of study can attract larger numbers of tuition paying students, there are important programs that cannot. The wax and wane of program enrollments in a particular field of study can be based on relatively diminished interest, economic downturns that affect some industries who send students for further education, established expectations individuals have about a program of study, or heavy competition from other universities. In some areas, such as Engineering, there is a well-established tradition of complete tuition-waivers for (teaching and) research assistants, which both domestic and international graduate students expect. The fact that Rowan does not currently have a strong graduate/research

assistantship program can affect the enrollment numbers of many campus programs, particularly those who depend upon offering assistantships to cover tuition. In engineering, for example, full tuition is paid by the grants supporting the student, which makes Rowan faculty's proposals disproportionately more expensive compared to those from other institutions.

A strong Graduate School recognizes the varied program models for reaching potential student populations. It is useful, then, to consider alternative models for Rowan University's graduate education. The Graduate Executive Committee can envision three models for programs that can draw greater numbers of students, whether their goal is professional development, research, or academic enrichment. Some graduate programs may generate hybrid offerings – a master's program that is academically enriching, supplemented with certificates of graduate study that are professionally oriented. Similarly, there may be professionally based programs that have strands in the research and academic domains.

Professional programs, many of which are housed in the Colleges of Business, Communication, and Education, attract those students who pursue graduate education for career advancement. Research programs, like those found in the College of Engineering, attract students whose goal is to partake in research activities. Academically enriching graduate programs, found in the Colleges of Communication, Fine and Performing Arts, and Liberal Arts and Sciences, may have students who attend for career advancement, but also many may select a program based on their ability to engage in scholarly or creative activities.

Based on the Rowan University mission, the three program models must be supported. However, from a financial perspective, tuition-supported professional programs are the easiest to support, as these offerings can generate enough tuition income to justify their cost. Tuition & grant-supported research programs are more difficult to support unless some of the cost is subsidized through non-tuition based revenue sources (i.e., grants, foundation money, corporate gifts, and corporate partnerships). Academic enrichment graduate programs are traditional in nature; their funding is directly tied to tuition dollars that enter into the general fund and are distributed through college and departmental budgeting.

The Graduate Executive Committee recommends the following funding mechanisms for the three types of graduate programs at Rowan University:

- Tuition-supported
- Tuition & grant-supported
- Traditional academic funded through the General Fund

While each model has advantages and disadvantages – purely from a financial perspective – the decision to use which model should be left to the individual program and its department.

## Tuition-supported Professional Graduate Programs

In general, this model is suitable for those programs that draw large numbers of tuition paying students. The primary financial goal in this model is revenue generation for the department and college as well as the University. Tuition-supported professional graduate programs have operating budgets directly tied to the tuition dollars generated by that program. A percentage of the tuition (e.g., 33% as in the CPCE model) produced is returned to the program to cover *instructor costs* (not *instructional costs*).

The instructor cost is simply the cost of the faculty salary to teach the course. In turn, the program decides whether each course is taught by its own full-time faculty as in-load or by adjunct faculty.

Typically, a professional graduate program would probably offer a portion of its graduate courses using its own faculty and a portion using adjunct faculty. If a program asks its faculty to teach graduate courses (or a graduate course), then *following this model* the program will be responsible in covering any undergraduate courses normally taught by that faculty member.

In the tuition-supported professional graduate program model, each program shall also be provided with an additional percentage of the generated tuition and/or fees to cover *instructional costs*, such as office supplies, technology needs, grading, and so forth. This percentage shall be 10% of graduate tuition, plus 33% of fees generated by the program's graduate courses.

Table 1 offers the Revenue Model for Tuition-supported Professional Graduate Programs:

Table 1. Revenue model for professional programs

Number of credits	3				
Tuition per credit	\$590				
Fees per credit	\$115				
Number of students		24	16	10	6
Tuition per course		\$1,770	\$1,770	\$1,770	\$1,770
Fees per course		\$345	\$345	\$345	\$345
Revenue generated		\$50,760	\$33,840	\$21,150	\$12,690
Revenue returned to program		\$20,999	\$13,999	\$8,750	\$5,250
Instructor cost / adjunct		\$3,500			
Instructor cost / full-time faculty		\$20,136			

Table 1 shows the approximate calculations associated with offering a single 3-credit graduate level course. Full-time faculty costs have been approximated based on an associate professor's salary at R29

\$12 (including some course release provided to the departments), whereas adjunct salary is based on \$1100 per credit (plus 7.65% fringe benefit costs).

It is clear a large number of students (> 24) would be necessary to make a course self-sufficient if full-time faculty at the associate or full professor level teach all courses in the tuition-supported professional graduate program model. However, this model can work if professional programs use a combination of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty. Assuming a roughly equal division of full-time and adjunct faculty in this model, about 12-15 students would be an adequate benchmark to make the course self-sufficient for the program and the department.

In the tuition-supported professional graduate program model, these programs will continue to receive the standard indirect cost return from any externally funded research projects faculty members hold.

To summarize, in this revenue model, tuition-supported professional graduate programs will be provided with the following:

- Standard operating costs for delivering undergraduate courses
- 33% of the tuition dollars generated by the program's graduate courses to cover instructor salaries
- 10% of tuition + 33% of the student fees generated by a program's graduate courses to cover instructional costs, including office supplies, student workers, office & staff, technology needs or upgrades, phone, photocopies, faculty travel (for delivering courses, not conducting research), advisor release time, program advertisement and promotion.

The remaining revenue is retained by the University to provide campus wide services, such as clerical support, graduate assistantships, office & staff upkeep, utilities, infrastructure costs to labs, smart classrooms, library holdings, building cleaning and maintenance, debt service, campus security, grounds keeping, and overall administrative overhead.

## Tuition and Grant-supported Graduate Programs

Tuition and grant-supported graduate programs are primarily research-driven programs that do not draw as many tuition-generating students as professional programs. Therefore, it is impossible for these programs to be self-sufficient solely based on tuition revenue. For programs like Engineering (and perhaps future programs in the sciences), very few tuition-paying students typically enroll. In Engineering, for example, graduate students expect not only to have *full tuition remission* but also to have *paid stipends*. In turn, these students work as research assistants in externally funded research projects or grants.

On rare occasion, students in these programs will take courses to make themselves more marketable. Generally, in those situations, tuition is covered through an employee benefit program or some other corporate funding situation.

Therefore, the Graduate Executive Council notes that additional revenue sources must be identified for such graduate programs. One approach is to make these graduate programs even more financially independent than professional programs by providing tuition and grant-supported graduate programs specific dollar allotments from the revenue they generate. Another way to consider sustaining these programs would be to have a renegotiated percentage of indirect costs generated by program research returned to the program.

Compared to tuition-supported professional graduate programs, a larger percentage of tuition dollars generated by these grant-supported graduate programs needs to be returned to the programs to achieve some sort of sufficiency. However, this solution is not adequate. Therefore, tuition and grant-supported graduate programs are expected to generate additional revenue from outside sources, such as research grants, endowments, and/or corporate partnerships.

It is important to note that the primary goal in this model is to provide a sustainable, self-sufficient, quality research based program, NOT to provide a profitable revenue stream for the department, the college, or the University. Therefore, the underlying understanding is that the University will provide minimal resources for these graduate programs, but at the same time will not expect a return of revenue from these programs. The program’s return to the University will be in the form of improved reputation, greater visibility to campus, a higher caliber of students and faculty in specific departments or programs directly involved, and improved infrastructure from which to conduct research.

Table 2 outlines the *tuition structure* for tuition and grant-supported graduate Programs, , where 50% of the tuition and fees generated are returned back to the program:

Table 2. Tuition based revenue income for research programs

Number of students	10	8	6	4	3	2
Tuition per course	\$1,770	\$1,770	\$1,770	\$1,770	\$1,770	\$1,770
Fees per course	\$345	\$345	\$345	\$345	\$345	\$345
Revenue generated	\$21,150	\$16,920	\$12,690	\$8,460	\$6,345	\$4,230
Revenue returned to program	\$10,575	\$8,460	\$6,345	\$4,230	\$3,173	\$2,115
Instructor cost / adjunct	\$3,500					
Instructor cost / faculty	\$20,136					

Note that with only a few tuition paying students, typically 1-2 in engineering, the cost of even an adjunct faculty instructor cannot be covered with 50% tuition /fees returned to the program. Given that graduate level courses in research intensive areas would typically have to be taught by full-time faculty, it is clear a tuition based model by itself falls far short of the costs. Therefore, the programs offering

research based graduate education need to generate income from research grants. Indirect costs recovered from these grants can then be used to help cover the cost of instruction. For these programs, a different indirect-cost model needs to be developed, however, since the existing model does not provide adequate income to cover graduate program related costs. For example, currently 55% of indirect costs are retained by the university, and 45% returned to the college. Of the 45%, usually a smaller percentage is returned to the department to cover various costs. In engineering, for example, this is typically half of the college share, about 20% of the total indirect. We recommend that this amount be increased to 45%.

Table 3, Indirect Costs Generated for Various Numbers of Students and Faculty for Salary Months, shows the total revenue generated for several scenarios of graduate student stipends and faculty summer salaries. The Graduate Executive Council structured this along several assumptions outlined below:

- Annual graduate student stipends of \$12,000 and summer faculty salaries of \$10,000/month
- Fully burdened grants at an indirect cost recovery rate of 70.2%

Table 3. Indirect costs generated for various number of students / faculty salary months

Indirect generated							
Graduate student annual stipend-->	2	4	5	6	8		
Faculty salary (1 month)							
2		\$30,888	\$47,736	\$56,160	N/A	N/A	
4		\$44,928	\$61,776	\$70,200	\$78,624	\$95,472	
6		\$58,968	\$75,816	\$84,240	\$92,664	\$109,512	
8		\$73,008	\$89,856	\$98,280	\$106,704	\$123,552	

For example, if a program has enough grant activity to fully cover 5 graduate students (stipend + tuition + indirect) and 4 months of faculty salary, the total indirect cost generated is \$70,200. (Note: N/A areas indicate that it is unlikely that with only 2 months of faculty salary support could a total grant activity support more than 5 students).

The revenue returned to the program, based on 45% cost recovery, is outlined in Table 4:

Table 4. Indirect returned to the program based on 45% cost recovery

Indirect returned to program (45%)							
Graduate student annual stp-->	2	4	5	6	8		
Number of Faculty salary (1 month)							
2		\$13,900	\$21,481	\$25,272	N/A	N/A	
4		\$20,218	\$27,799	\$31,590	\$35,381	\$42,962	
6		\$26,536	\$34,117	\$37,908	\$41,699	\$49,280	
8		\$32,854	\$40,435	\$44,226	\$48,017	\$55,598	

Returning to the same example of 5 grant-funded graduate student assistants and 4 summer months of faculty salary, the program will garner \$31, 590. However, now the program must offer enough courses for these students.

Assuming 1 tuition-paying student and 5 grant-supported students, a program following this model would have to offer classes for 6 graduate students. Some of the courses may be jointly offered with undergraduate courses; however, a successful research based graduate program would have offer “graduate only” courses as well.

In preparing this fiscal model, the Graduate Executive Committee also assumed that the department has to teach 2 such courses per semester (or 4 “graduate only” courses per year). The further assumption made was that graduate students will also take one course per semester that is jointly offered to undergraduates through cross-listed courses. Such a scenario suggests the revenue returned to the program from tuition will be \$6345, using the formula (3 courses X 2 semesters = \$38, 070), for a total revenue of \$38,070 + \$31, 590 = \$69,660.

*Instructor* cost for 4 “graduate only” courses in this model would be (4 courses X \$20, 186 = \$80,744). If one of these courses can be taught by an adjunct faculty member or could have an adjunct replace a full-time faculty member who would otherwise teach an undergrad course, then the total *instructor* cost would be \$64,058. Considering that these students also take 6 ~9 credits of research credits (for which advisors / instructors should get 1 credit course release), such a scenario makes this a financially possible proposition for these programs.

However, there is one additional issue to consider. In the aforementioned example, there is only 1 tuition paying student. The tuition for the other 5 students comes from grants. In fact, a majority of the income for the tuition and grants-supported graduate programs comes from grant activities. For the example given earlier, \$31,725 comes from grant-paid tuition and \$31,590 comes from grant-paid indirect costs; that is, \$63,315 (of the total \$69,660) are generated by grants. *Therefore, to have a sustainable graduate program in this model, it is imperative to have sufficient research funding.*

The example given above, supporting 5 graduate students and 4 months of faculty summer salary barely covers *instructor* cost. These calculations do not include instruction-related costs, such as office supplies, grading assistants or other student workers, technology needs, phone, photocopying, faculty travel to deliver courses, any promotion or advertisement of the program, advisor release time, or other incidentals.

For those departments or programs considering a tuition and grants-supported graduate program fiscal model, the Graduate Executive Council believes it is in the department's best interests to fund as many graduate students as possible through as many external grant opportunities as possible, so that all instructional costs can also be covered. Under this model, such costs are also placed under the department's responsibilities. The underlying mechanism in this model is "self-sufficiency," and these programs are not meant to generate income for the University. Consequently, neither Rowan University nor programs that pursue this model expect much from each other. However, some level of interdependence is unavoidable.

The University still needs to pay for campus wide services, such as office space, utilities, clerical support, graduate assistants not funded under grant support, infrastructure (labs, library support, smart classrooms) and maintenance, building cleaning and maintenance, debt service, campus security, administrative overhead, and so on. This is why, in this model, a considerable portion of indirect costs (in this instance, 55%) and a portion of the tuition and fees collected (50%) are retained by the University to cover these expenses. Using the above example of 1 tuition-paying student and 5 grant-supported graduate students along with 4 summer month faculty salaries, the return to the University would be \$76,670. Or \$38,070 (50% tuition rate) + \$38,610 (55% indirect costs returned).

To summarize the Tuition and Grant-supported Graduate Program fiscal model, any department or program offering this option will have the following revenue streams:

- Standard operating costs from the University for delivering undergraduate courses
- 50% of tuition & fees generated by graduate courses in those programs to partially cover instructor salaries
- 45% of the indirect costs generated by externally funded grant or research projects to cover instructor and instructional costs, including office supplies, grading assistants or student workers, technology needs, phone, photocopying, faculty travel to deliver courses, promotion and advertisement of the program, advisor release time and other incidentals

The remaining revenue is retained by Rowan University to provide campus wide services, such as clerical support, non-grant funded graduate assistantships, building cleaning and maintenance, grounds keeping, campus security, and so forth.

## Academic Enrichment Graduate Programs

The third model of graduate education offered at Rowan University falls under the category of “academic enrichment” funded through traditional University General Funds. These programs are necessary because either they provide students with an academically enriching experience for local or regional citizens or because these graduate programs offer a unique creative or scholarly experience not necessarily replicated elsewhere. Many graduate programs in this model are in the College of Communication, the College of Fine and Performing Arts, or the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Academic enrichment graduate programs are high-quality degree offerings that have little to no University overhead beyond instructor costs, as departmental budgets cover costs of mailing, phone, photocopying, and program promotion. Generally, these programs and their departments rely upon the formula presented in Table 5 to accommodate full-time faculty who teach in these graduate programs:

Table 5, Instructor Costs for Academic Enrichment Graduate Programs

Assumptions: Spring 2008, Associate Professor Salary (R29 S 12)

Spring 2008	Full Time Instructor Salary	Adjunct Asst Prof Salary
Average Instructor Salary	\$101,008	\$3,330
Fringe Benefits (37.5% FTF, 7.65% PTF)	\$37,878	\$ 252.45
Compensation/ Instructor	\$138,886	\$3552.45
Total College Cost (example drawn from College of Business)	\$38,888,080.	
College Faculty cost/course	\$20,575	\$3552.45
Gross Revenue/Course to Cover Instruction Cost	\$67,899.82	\$10,765.00
Graduate Tuition	\$2,115.00	\$2,115.00
Enrollment	32	5

In this scenario, adjunct faculty are hired to teach lower-division courses to allow full time instructors at the Associate Professor salary R 29 Step 12 level to teach graduate courses. Or, if there were qualified

adjunct assistant professors who could teach in a graduate program (this is possible for some graduate programs at the University), the cost of hiring an adjunct faculty member to teach in a graduate course.

In this model, for most academic enrichment graduate programs the traditionally used “break even” points for graduate education – 8 students – will adequately cover instructor costs and provide some profit to the University. It is the Graduate Executive Council’s recommendation that academic enrichment graduate programs use the 8 student “break even” points as a target for enrollment. While there may be some courses where 5 or 6 students might enroll because of scheduling issues or need for graduation, overall these programs must average 8 or more students in a majority of the courses offered to be considered viable. Clearly, the more students an academic enrichment graduate program can enroll *while still maintaining a high quality degree of study*, the more profit the department, the college, and the University can generate.

The Graduate Executive Council believes in the importance of Rowan having academic enrichment graduate programs of study on its campus. Academic enrichment graduate programs fulfill the “good neighbor” aspect of Rowan University’s presence in southern New Jersey. Because of the relatively low cost to establish and maintain these graduate programs, they are beneficial for attracting local students. In those instances where some of the graduate programs, such as Writing and Music, have national and international students, these degree programs act as magnets to attract wider student populations and add to Rowan’s diversity. *The overall strength and quality of these graduate programs attract not only top students from our region and from other parts of the US or the world, these degree offerings are ways to recruit and retain top faculty.* If Rowan wishes to remain competitive for drawing high quality faculty for its colleges, it must invest in the academic enrichment graduate programs.

The question becomes, will any of these models work to improve the financial structure of Rowan’s Graduate School? The Graduate Executive Council argues that the specific numbers in the above presented models are simply “best guess” estimates. Certainly, the Graduate Executive Council cannot know the exact amount of research revenue generated by any given program, nor the numbers of tuition-paying students in a professional program, nor the numbers of non-matriculated students in academic enrichment graduate programs.

However, the Graduate Executive Council can state that if a tuition-supported professional program wants to be self-sufficient, then there has to be a significant number of students interested in an area. Likewise, if a tuition and grants-supported program wants to sustain itself, it is clear that this program would have to be actively pursuing external research funding. Similarly, an academic enrichment graduate program has to provide a unique offering that attracts local, regional, national, or international interest and student enrollment.

## Additional Recommendations for Graduate Education at Rowan

Fiscal models alone will not improve graduate education at Rowan University. Therefore, the Graduate Executive Council makes the following recommendations regarding the Graduate School and its governance:

- Restructuring the Graduate School's responsibilities by dispersing some duties across campus offices
- Hire a Dean of Graduate Studies who can establish and maintain a strong vision of graduate studies for internal and external constituents
- Restructure the Graduate Executive Council to be more representative
- Develop a Graduate School wide enrollment management plan

Currently as it is configured, the Graduate School staff is reduplicating other campus offices' responsibilities. There are several areas where other campus offices can deliver the services rendered in a more efficient manner.

For instance, certain Graduate School activities can be shifted to the Registrar's Office, such as:

- Streamline graduate applications and maintain the online application process
- Assist all new students who need help accessing the Banner registration system (i.e., providing PIN numbers, tutorials, answering student records questions)
- Assist all new advisors with Banner orientation system
- Oversee graduate credit transfers and program transfer processes
- Enter all application data, status changes, completion of degree information, and so forth into Banner
- Oversee Post Bac admissions processes
- Create necessary information for online applications
- Manage all processes connected with online graduate applications
- Generate electronic admissions reports or other student records data for advisors and administration

The CAP Center should be utilized to handle the following Graduate School activities:

- Pre-application counseling for prospective students interested in pursuing graduate study
- Career testing to help students discover whether graduate school is right for them and which graduate program will help prospective students reach their goals
- Advising prospective students on financing graduate education

The Office of International Students should be utilized to handle the following Graduate School activities:

- Provide regular updates to program coordinators on international student issues that affect graduate enrollment
- Keep the Graduate School apprised of changes in international student recruiting/retention efforts

These changes will permit the Graduate School to spend more time on the following critical efforts:

- Recruiting students
- Overseeing all general promotional materials and advertising for programs
- Overseeing GRE/GMAT workshops on campus
- Conducting first reviews of graduate applications to ensure completeness and applicants' suitability for program
- Keeping abreast of legal processes and court cases related to graduate education to advise program coordinators
- Overseeing scholarship and non-grant funded assistantships
- Monitoring and updating Graduate School web site information
- Acting as liaison between students, prospective applicants, and coordinators when needed
- Managing the graduate assistantship program
- Overseeing the Graduate Resource room
- Acting as intake for graduate applications and thesis
- Preparing and forwarding all official correspondence regarding admissions, appeals, grievances, or other requests for information or student records

Restructuring the Graduate School offices requires the hiring of a Dean of Graduate Studies. This individual would have a strong vision for contemporary graduate education, understand how to deliver high quality programs using various fiscal and academic models, act as a liaison to CPCE when hybrid programs or certificates develop, and function as the campus voice for graduate education at Rowan University.

Specifically, the Dean of the Graduate School would maintain the following responsibilities:

- Conduct regular program review of graduate programs to ensure quality delivery as well as economic viability
- Devise and maintain an enrollment management program for the Graduate School
- Act as a gatekeeper for proposed curriculum
- Head the Graduate Executive Council and sit on Dean's Council as the voice of graduate education

- Handle student grievances and advisors' questions regarding programmatic concerns

Lastly, the current configuration of the Graduate Executive Council is ineffective for handling the diversity of certain colleges and their graduate programs. A revised Graduate Executive Council is proposed.

Specifically, the new Graduate Executive Council would be comprised of the following:

- 1 Graduate Executive Council representative per College for 100-1000 graduate student credit hours (e.g., the College of Education would have 3 representatives because they generate 3000+ student credit hours in their respective graduate programs)
- Graduate Executive Council representatives are elected from current program coordinators, as long as each College has 1 representative
- Colleges have the option to create internal Graduate Councils and nominate/vote for their Graduate Executive Council representatives from the internal council
- Have 1 representative added from CPCE, the Registrar's Office, the Library, Faculty Senate, and the Provost's Office
- The GEC would be considered the decision making body in terms of developing policies and procedures to recommend to the Provost. To assure coordination and communication with the University Senate, a member of the GEC would serve on each of the following committees of the Senate: 1) Academic Policy and Procedures (AP&P) and 2) Curriculum in order to coordinate key issues that apply to the Graduate School.
- Graduate Executive Council chaired by the new Dean of the Graduate School

Respectfully submitted February 2008

Graduate Executive Committee

Bryan Appleby-Wineberg, Music (FPA)  
 Barbara Bole Williams, School Psychology (EDU)  
 Wanda Foglia, Law & Justice (LAS)  
 Dorie Gilchrist, Director of Graduate Admissions (GS)  
 Daniel McFarland, MBA (BUS)  
 Diane Penrod, Writing (COM)  
 Robi Polikar, Engineering (ENG)

