
Committee Meeting

of

SENATE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE ASSEMBLY HIGHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE

"The Committees will hear testimony regarding the recommendations submitted to the Governor in the final report of the UMDNJ Advisory Committee"

LOCATION: Chamberlain Student Center
Rowan University
Glassboro, New Jersey

DATE: March 19, 2012
11:00 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES PRESENT:

Senator Sandra B. Cunningham, Chair
Senator Nellie Pou, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Celeste M. Riley, Chair
Assemblyman Thomas P. Giblin, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Craig J. Coughlin
Assemblywoman Connie Wagner
Assemblyman Christopher J. Brown
Assemblyman John DiMaio
Assemblywoman Dianne C. Gove



ALSO PRESENT:

Sarah B. Haimowitz
Jonathan Tang
Adrian Crook
*Office of Legislative Services
Committee Aides*

Tina LaCasse
Senate Majority
Keith White
*Assembly Majority
Committee Aides*

John Gorman
Senate Republican
Kevin Nedza
*Assembly Republican
Committee Aides*

***Meeting Recorded and Transcribed by
The Office of Legislative Services, Public Information Office,
Hearing Unit, State House Annex, PO 068, Trenton, New Jersey***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Senator Stephen M. Sweeney Senate President District 3	2
Leo J. McCabe, Ph.D. Mayor Borough of Glassboro	4
Ali A. Houshmand, Ph.D. Interim President Rowan University	7
John P. Sheridan Jr. President and Chief Executive Officer The Cooper Health System	16
James J. Gruccio Chairman Board of Trustees Rowan University	20
Wendell E. Pritchett, Ph.D. Chancellor Rutgers-Camden Campus Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	24
Peter J. McDonough Jr. Vice President for Public Affairs Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	36
Howard Gillette, Ph.D. Professor Emeritus Department of History Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	37
Margaret Marsh, Ph.D. Professor Department of History Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
John Wall, Ph.D. Professor and Chair Department of Philosophy and Religion Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	40
Vincent Manco Senior Class Senator Student Government Rowan University	42
Daniel T. Cook, Ph.D. Associate Professor Department of Childhood Studies Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	44
Katherine C. Epstein, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Department of History Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	47
M.A. Rafey Habib, Ph.D. Professor Department of English Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	49
Martin Rosenberg, Ph.D. Professor Art History Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Vibiana Bowman Cvetkovic Reference Librarian, and Head of Access and Technical Services Paul Robeson Library Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	53
Eric Milou, Ph.D. Professor Mathematics Department, and President University Senate Rowan University	55
Adam F. Scales, Esq. Professor Rutgers School of Law Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	57
Ed Rentzelas, Esq. Chancellor Alumni Board Rutgers School of Law Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	59
Dee Jonczak Secretary Department of English Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	63
Lara Saguisag Adjunct Lecturer Department of English Rowan University, and Lecturer Department of Childhood Studies Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	64

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Nicole Lister Private Citizen	66
Joe Perella Private Citizen	69
Liz Kilborn Private Citizen	74
Erin Kerr Private Citizen	76
J.W. Whitlow Jr. Professor Department of Psychology Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	78
Timothy Farrow, Esq. Treasurer Rutgers University Alumni Association	80
James J. Schwarzwald Private Citizen	89
Mark Showers Private Citizen	90
Lynne Vallone, Ph.D. Professor Department of Childhood Studies Rutgers-Camden Campus Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	92
Howard Marchitello, Ph.D. Associate Professor Department of English, and Associate Dean Faculty of Arts and Sciences Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	94

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
William D. Brown, Sr. Vice President Alumni Association Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	96
J.T. Barbarese, Ph.D. Associate Professor Department of English, and Editor <i>Story Quarterly</i> Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	98
William T. FitzGerald, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Department of English Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	100
Hyun Kyu Seo Creator R2RMERGE.com	102
Karen T. Sieftring President Local 2373 American Federation of Teachers	104
Phillip A. Lewis, Ph.D. Associate Professor and Chair Department of Marketing and Businesses Information Systems, and Representing Local 2373 American Federation of Teachers	106
Maurita Bivans Private Citizen	109

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Sean Duffy, Ph.D. Associate Professor Department of Psychology Rutgers-Camden Campus Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	111
Debra Kendall Private Citizen	113
Freddie Elmore Private Citizen	115
Alex Bernstein Executive Director American Association of University Professors University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey	117
Kathleen Hernandez Executive Vice President Local 1031 Communication Workers of America	120
Patrick Nowlan Executive Director American Association of University Professors- American Federation of Teachers Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	122
Adrien Dumoulin-Smith Representing Health Professionals and Allied Employees	125
Frank Fulbrook Private Citizen	127
APPENDIX	
Testimony submitted by Leo J. McCabe, Ph.D.	1x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Testimony, plus <i>“Rowan University in Support of Higher Education Reorganization for Southern New Jersey”</i> submitted by Ali A. Houshmand, Ph.D.	4x
Testimony submitted by John P. Sheridan Jr.	30x
Testimony submitted by James J. Gruccio	33x
Testimony, plus attachment submitted by Wendell E. Pritchett, Ph.D.	36x
Testimony, plus attachment submitted by Howard Gillette, Ph.D.	42x
Testimony, plus attachments submitted by Margaret Marsh, Ph.D.	44x
Testimony submitted by John Wall, Ph.D.	59x
Testimony submitted by Vincent Manco	62x
Testimony submitted by Daniel T. Cook, Ph.D.	64x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Testimony submitted by Katherine C. Epstein, Ph.D.	68x
<i>“An Assessment of the Report of the Barer Commission (sic)”</i> submitted by M. A. Rafey Habib, Ph.D.	69x
Testimony, plus attachment submitted by Martin Rosenberg, Ph.D.	77x
Testimony, plus attachment submitted by Vibiana Bowman Cvetkovic	83x
Testimony submitted by Eric Milou, Ph.D.	85x
Testimony submitted by Adam F. Scales, Esq.	86x
Testimony, plus attachment submitted by Ed Rentzelas, Esq.	88x
Testimony submitted by Dee Jonczak	91x
Testimony submitted by Lara Saguisag	92x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Testimony submitted by Nicole Lister	93x
Testimony submitted by Joe Perella	94x
Testimony submitted by Liz Kilborn	95x
Testimony submitted by Erin Kerr	96x
Testimony, plus attachments submitted by J.W. Whitlow Jr.	97x
Testimony submitted by James J. Schwarzwald	105x
Testimony submitted by Mark Showers	106x
Testimony submitted by Lynne Vallone, Ph.D.	107x
Testimony submitted by Howard Marchitello, Ph.D.	108x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued):

	<u>Page</u>
Testimony submitted by William D. Brown, Sr.	109x
Testimony submitted by William T. FitzGerald, Ph.D.	111x
Testimony submitted by Hyun Kyo Seo	112x
Testimony, plus attachments submitted by Karen T. Siefring	113x
Testimony submitted by Phillip A. Lewis, Ph.D.	119x
Testimony submitted by Maurita Bivans	121x
Testimony submitted by Sean Duffy, Ph.D.	125x
Letter addressed to submitted by Debra Kendall	126x
Testimony submitted by Freddie Elmore	127x
Testimony submitted by Alex Bernstein	128x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued):

	<u>Page</u>
Testimony submitted by Kathleen Hernandez	130x
Testimony submitted by Patrick Nowlan	134x
Letter addressed to Senator Sandra B. Cunningham Assemblywoman Celeste M. Riley from Nancy C. Walworth, Ph.D. Professor of Pharmacology President, and John A. Walker, M.D. Professor of Medicine Vice President, and Monica Roth, Ph.D. Professor of Biochemistry Secretary Faculty Council Robert Wood Johnson Medical School	136x
Testimony submitted by Tom Murphy Co-President Health Professionals and Allied Employees AFT, AFL-CIO	139x
Testimony submitted by James Rushing, Ph.D. Associate Professor of German Department of Foreign languages and Literature Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	143x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued):

	<u>Page</u>
Testimony submitted by Ira Roseman, Ph.D. Professor Department of Psychology Rutgers-Camden Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	145x
pnf: 1-65	
rs: 66-130	

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CELESTE M. RILEY (Co-Chair):

Good morning, everyone. Good morning.

Welcome to the Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education. I am Assemblywoman Celeste Riley; I am Chair of the Higher Education Committee. And my partner here, sitting next to me, is Senator Cunningham.

We'd like to get started. We don't have everyone here, but they're all on the way.

Since we are only here until 3:00 -- we only have the room until 3:00 -- we would like to be expeditious in starting.

That being said, go ahead.

SENATOR SANDRA B. CUNNINGHAM (Co-Chair):

Good morning, everyone; Senator Cunningham. I'm Chair of the Senate Higher Ed Committee.

Just a few housekeeping rules before we begin. We're going to ask you, first of all, other than a few people who will be testifying first, if you are called to speak please remember that there is a three-minute limitation. Because time is of the essence, we do want to stick with three minutes. And secondly -- and this is very important -- we're going to ask you to please respect the views of whoever is speaking and, if you can, try very hard to try not to boo, or clap, or cheer, or laugh at any of the speakers.

Thank you very much. Let's get started.

We're going to start with a person from Gloucester County -- our Senate President, Steve Sweeney.

SENATOR STEPHEN M. SWEENEY: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. We are thrilled to have you here, Senator, in southern New Jersey, in beautiful Gloucester County. And, obviously, the other Chairwoman is very familiar with it.

But you know we're here talking about an issue of great importance to this state. And I know there's a lot of emotion going on throughout. And there are some very critical issues to deal with, from the Newark campus -- although we're here in southern New Jersey -- that issue of Newark and northern New Jersey is not lost on me as the Senate President, and how important it is to get that component correct. In the central part of the state -- to get that portion correct; and then down here in the southern portion. And there is a lot of emotion here, and I understand it. But I'm focused on jobs and the economy of this region, and the fact that we have the least amount of higher ed degrees in this region than anywhere else in the state. We're not going to get pharmaceutical industries, we're not going to get high tech industries in this area unless we do something better.

This suggestion that the Governor has come up with will give us an opportunity to see what higher education could be like in southern New Jersey, and how we can strengthen the economy of this region; because at the end of the day it comes to jobs. You've heard that we have 30 percent of the population and 12 percent of the seats. We lose way too many young people in this state to other states. We're the number one exporter in the nation of children. So finding a way to improve higher education, to keep our talented young people here and growing our economy is, obviously, extremely important.

So what I'm hoping is the people of this region who are very passionate and caring -- on both sides -- find a way to work together to create -- whether it's a partnership or a new consortium, something -- to strengthen this region.

And I said this before, and I'm going to say again: The worst thing in the world we could possibly do is kill an idea that you don't know what it is yet. We do not have the details. We need to look to make it better. And as far as both campuses, again, there are a lot of very great people. The Governor put out a concept without a plan. There's a great opportunity for people to put details on paper and provide some guidance to us as the Legislature, also.

But we shouldn't kill this concept or this idea when we're looking at the economy of this region and this State. So for the people in the southern part of this state, there are some serious issues in the northern part. And this plan can't move forward with one section being saddled and the other not.

So again, we're going to be working very hard throughout this state to ensure that this is done properly, that it works, and we respect each other.

So thank you for being here. I know you have 50 people speaking; but again, I wanted to urge the people who are so emotional on both sides -- with good reason -- to put their emotions aside and sit down and start thinking about how we can improve the economy of this region. Because this region lacks a whole lot of opportunities for people that we would love to see them have here.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, President Sweeney.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: We would like to call up the Mayor of Glassboro, Leo McCabe.

MAYOR LEO J. McCABE, Ph.D. (off mike): First, I would like to welcome all of you to the Borough of Glassboro. We are pleased to have you to discuss this very important matter, one more time.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you so much for having us here, Mayor.

MAYOR McCABE: Thank you.

Senator Cunningham, Assemblywoman Riley, and members of the Committee, my name is Leo McCabe and I am the Mayor of the Borough of Glassboro.

It's my privilege to testify before you today on behalf of the residents, business owners, and students living in Glassboro and throughout the southern New Jersey region.

The State's higher education restructuring plan recognizes the absolute need for a research designation for Rowan University. The proposed merger of Rutgers-Camden and Rowan University is pivotal, and the result would mean greater equity in higher education funding and a more educated workforce. It would generate new avenues for public-private partnerships and create limitless economic development opportunity not just for Glassboro, but for New Jersey's eight southern counties.

In Glassboro, we rely on relationships with local businesses and private developers whose entrepreneurial spirit are creating jobs and ratables despite the down economy. And our ever-broadening relationship with

Rowan University will ensure academic, economic, and cultural prosperity region-wide for generations to come.

I became Mayor of Glassboro about 11 years ago at the beginning of a new partnership among the Borough, Rowan, and private developers for the revitalization of downtown Glassboro. I committed to the challenge of public service because I believe in the power of this relationship to create the quintessential college town. Rowan Boulevard is a \$300 million redevelopment project that physically links the campus with the downtown, bringing 60 new retail opportunities, multi-generational residential space, offices, and classrooms. The project is creating 750 temporary construction jobs and more than 1,000 permanent jobs, and is expected to generate \$2 million in annual ratables within the next five years. Rowan Boulevard is the largest municipal construction project in the state, and similar efforts in college towns across the country pale by comparison in size and scale.

The State of New Jersey has honored the participants in the Rowan Boulevard project with the Smart Growth Award and it has been recognized nationally for its economic impact.

Rowan's commitment to this project's potential is a primary reason for the success of the project. In addition to being at the table for all facets of development, the University has given a \$1 million grant to Glassboro over 10 years for pre-construction expenses. The University also supports tax incentives to their employees who purchase homes in Glassboro, and more than 100 faculty and staff have taken advantage of this option.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough that Rowan's commitment to Glassboro's revitalization is just one example of the vision this University brings to the entire region.

In New Jersey, far too many people will leave the state for higher education -- we hear this so many times -- and a good many of them never return. Rowan understands the ramifications of this out-migration, so they have leveraged Henry Rowan's \$100 million donation to develop an engineering school that is superb. In just 10 years the chemical engineering program is ranked third-best in the nation. Similarly, the new Cooper Medical School at Rowan University will train New Jersey native physicians committed to quality health care for New Jersey families. The medical schools' partnership with the Coriell Institute in Camden provides access to biomedical research. The merger would allow for the creation of a new College of Health Sciences, further capitalizing on expanding career opportunities in the sciences, technology, and medicine.

I am particularly encouraged and excited by Rowan's commitment to the high-growth medical and technical fields because of my background as an organic chemist. I earned a Ph.D. from The Ohio State University, and spent most of my career in research and management with Mobil Oil. There I managed environmental research focused on fuels and air quality. But the success of our research required fostering relationships with auto manufacturers worldwide, university researchers, and, of course, with governmental entities.

In Gloucester County we have two other projects: the LS Power natural-gas powered electric plant now under construction; as well as the Port of Paulsboro, which promises to create career opportunities similarly

tied to alternative energy. The success of these industrial investments will require relationships and innovation that offers the opportunity for research and access to a prepared workforce.

The effort will result in the local economy creating better jobs, opening doors to educational partnerships for students at every level, and providing a much better quality of life for all residents.

The southern New Jersey region is primed for the promise of world-class higher education opportunities and the economic access that accompanies it. Rowan has long been a leading partner in regional growth, but the challenge of today's economy and workforce demands require much more.

On behalf of the residents and businesses in Glassboro and in the region, I encourage the Legislature to take this proposal to the next step. Rowan has proven itself equal to the challenge, and the citizens of New Jersey deserve the advantages it will undoubtedly provide.

Thank you, Senator Cunningham, Assemblywoman Riley, for granting me the privilege of testifying today.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mayor.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Next, we'd like to hear from Ali Houshmand, Rowan University Interim President.

A L I A. H O U S H M A N D, Ph.D.: Senator Cunningham, Assemblywoman Riley, and members of the Committee. My name is Ali Houshmand. It is my pleasure to testify today as Interim President of Rowan University

In the weeks that have passed since Governor Christie's endorsement of the higher education reorganization, talk of change has

dominated discussions throughout the state. It has been lively discussion, to say the least, and it is familiar territory for Rowan to consider new challenges and opportunities, including another transformation of our institution.

In our 89-year history, we have purposefully evolved as a result of strategic planning, wise investment, public-private partnerships, and plain hard work. The Advisory Committee's proposal and the Governor's support of it present us the potential for another transformative moment.

This time, however, the potential for transformation of higher education in southern New Jersey will extend throughout this state and the nation. It is no secret that there is no model in higher education for merger such as the proposal presents. But the lack of a pattern to follow, and the magnitude of the challenge, should not deter any of us from doing our best to improve higher education in the great State of New Jersey.

Rowan University is a pro at responding to change, seeking it, and embracing it. Just three examples prove the point: our nationally ranked engineering school, the soon-to-open Cooper Medical School of Rowan University, and our exceptional record in fundraising to anticipate and replace the reduced State funding without compromising quality and service.

From our perspective in higher education, the merger will address well-documented and far-reaching concerns:

A stronger, single university will help remedy New Jersey's historic brain drain -- the nation's worst -- that sees more than 35,000 of our New Jersey best and brightest leave the state each year for education. They rarely return to become part of our economy and communities. A

powerhouse institution with the increased capacity for research will attract and keep bright minds and productive initiatives in the Garden State.

The merger will increase educational access, the percentage of residents with college degrees, and the stability and development of our economy and communities that comes with a better educated population. In the current structure, southern New Jersey is home to 30 percent of the state's residents, but can only serve 12.5 percent of its student population. With the exception of Burlington County, degree attainment in all of the eight southern New Jersey counties is lower than all but one of the 13 northern New Jersey counties. Only 24.19 percent of South Jersey adults have earned a bachelor's degree, while 37.14 percent of North Jersey adults have done so. The U.S. average is 27.5 percent.

One of the most important developments of a Rowan/Rutgers-Camden merger would be the creation of a College of Health Sciences. Our resources and the impressive track record of our affiliates -- that is, Cooper University Hospital doctors, Coriell Institute scientists, and Rutgers-Camden and Rowan faculty -- present unprecedented opportunities to cooperate and collaborate. This synergy would enable the new Rowan to become a major force in both health sciences research and education.

We have heard plenty of arguments for and against the reorganization in the past several weeks. Emotions have run high and likely will continue to punctuate conversations, both formal and informal, throughout the state and our academic communities. Even so, the question "How should we improve higher education in New Jersey?" begs an answer borne of rational consideration and free from rancor. We need to do what's best for higher education in New Jersey. We must respond thoughtfully

and decisively to the fact that higher education resources decrease each year while demand rises for what only we can provide.

Both Rutgers-Camden and Rowan have remarkable strengths that will build upon each other in a merger and increase benefits to the students and communities that we serve. The merger addresses this decisively.

Once accomplished, the merged institution will be one of less than 70 in the nation with both a law school and a medical school. And if you consider engineering, business, and education, it will be probably one of 40 in the nation. It's worth noting that this national distinction isn't just another higher education statistical trivia, but the practical result of strategic planning and investment. No matter the uniqueness of its history or structure, this merged institution will emphatically address issues of education, economy, society, health care, and much more in New Jersey and beyond.

We urge the Legislature to support the recommendations of the distinguished Advisory Committee.

Thank you again for allowing me to testify to the benefits of the reorganization.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much, Dr. Houshmand.

Does anyone on our Committee have questions for Dr. Houshmand?

Senator Pou.

SENATOR POU: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good morning, and thank you very much. Is it still morning? It certainly is. Good morning to you.

I just want to quickly ask you the same question that we had the opportunity -- that I had the opportunity of asking the -- I believe it was Dr. Rodgers, at our first hearing. And it's my understanding that there currently is a steering committee that, essentially, is pulling together information in terms of the issues like faculty transfer, student transfer, building assets, information technology issues -- just a wide range of issues. Have you been a part of those discussions?

DR. HOUSHMAND: Internally we have been meeting for the past several months.

SENATOR POU: Did you say internally?

DR. HOUSHMAND: Internally.

SENATOR POU: Okay.

DR. HOUSHMAND: We meet with the Rowan administration, specifically my cabinet, a number of the deans, some of the managers, and many faculty members. We have been meeting regularly trying to respond to the challenges that were just mentioned. And this is, indeed, a (indiscernible) challenge. And we have done a great deal of work. I really think that this is the time for us to get together with our distinguished Rutgers-Camden colleagues and have a serious discussion with them. Because without that discourse, without the real close collaboration within our colleagues, this is going to be very difficult. And we urge our colleagues to please come in; we have the highest regard and respect for all of them. We have the highest regard and respect for Rutgers-Camden. We really like our colleagues and we would like an opportunity to sit down and

have a discussion with them so that we can respond to these issues. These are important, but it requires both sides. I mean, it takes more than one person to dance the tango here. (laughter)

SENATOR POU: I absolutely agree and certainly understand.

Doctor, so am I to assume that you are not a member of that steering committee, and you have, thus, not been asked to participate in that committee discussion?

DR. HOUSHMAND: That is correct, that is correct.

SENATOR POU: Is there any reason that you're aware of that you have not been asked to come to the table for that discussion?

DR. HOUSHMAND: I am not aware of the reason. If there is one, I'm not aware of it.

SENATOR POU: My understanding is that this steering committee was put together by the Governor's Office. Has that not been-- Have you not been invited to come to those discussions?

DR. HOUSHMAND: To those discussions, no. I had a wonderful meeting with the Governor's staff this past Friday. And in our meeting and discussion we urged the Governor's staff to create an opportunity so that there would be serious discussion between our colleagues at Rutgers-Camden and Rowan.

SENATOR POU: Given the degree and a lot of the information that we've heard, both from our Senate President-- The Mayor just mentioned some very impressive information, and a great deal of revenue and finances that are being put forth here in this great town. It would be vitally important that a plan such as this, that really makes such an incredible difference, and will have such a great impact -- that you and

members of your staff and your team should be part of those discussions in order to make a smooth transition -- if at all -- if that's to take place.

There was some discussion and comments made by the Senate President just earlier with regards to a plan; a plan, unfortunately, that we have yet to see ourselves in its entirety. It's important as we move forward, though, that that plan is made available to us or at least -- and certainly in light of some of these discussions, in these hearings that something to that effect would be made available to us. And we're learning the bits and pieces of that -- from these hearings, not necessarily from any other formal information that's come forward.

So I'm really concerned that Rowan University, given that this is a major part in all of this, is not part of those discussions. That should have happened; that should have happened from day one. And if it's not happening now, I'm questioning why that is not.

Thank you very much.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Madam Chairwoman.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: I apologize.

Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: That's quite all right.

May I ask a couple of questions?

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Doctor, how long have you been here with Rowan, and how long have you been in your position now -- as far as being a part of the Rowan community? And what is your educational background, and how

did you come about becoming the acting President? And what is your, basically, your résumé -- your rundown of your credentials.

DR. HOUSHMAND: I joined Rowan as the Provost in August 2006. Prior to that I was a Dean and then, subsequently, the interim Provost at Drexel University for six years. Prior to that I was a Professor and Program Director at the University of Cincinnati in Ohio for 10 years; prior to that I was a staff analyst and researcher at United Airlines. My background is I have a bachelor's degree and a master's degree in mathematics from the United Kingdom -- University of Essex. Subsequent to that I came to the University of Michigan and obtained another master's degree and a Ph.D. in industrial and operations research. So I am an engineer, a system engineer; I'm very much into data analysis and statistics. And I guess I answered all your questions you asked. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Clearly your background demonstrates you're well-rounded in the educational field.

DR. HOUSHMAND: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: I read over your testimony and one of the things that stuck out to me: You used words like *decisive*--

DR. HOUSHMAND: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: --*action now* -- a lot of action words. A lot of statistics on the drain of what's happening here in South Jersey; not just in South Jersey but in New Jersey across the board. Do you find this merger to be critical to saving higher education? Or not rather save, but to compete nationally with our neighbors as far as our bordering states, states across the board, and against other countries and other universities?

DR. HOUSHMAND: Absolutely, sir; absolutely.

Let me, again, throw some statistics at you: The southern New Jersey counties have 2.5 million population. If it was a state, it would be the 35th largest state in the union. If you look at the 15 states, currently, whose population is smaller than southern New Jersey, every single one of them has at least one, many of them more than three, major comprehensive research institutions. Furthermore, every one of those states, including places like Delaware -- with one-third of the population of the state of southern New Jersey -- have substantially many more seats available to the population (indiscernible) -- substantially many more -- that's number one. Number two: If you go back into history -- only four years back -- you will see that the countries like China and India, if they wanted to educate their workforce -- the best and brightest -- they will send them to the United States to get a Ph.D. Not only are they going to do that, but currently China also produces substantially many more engineers than the United States does. This is the number one economy in the world. This is the major country in the world. This is the country that everybody else has to follow in order to structure their economy and their workforce. We cannot possibly fall behind countries like China. It is a danger for this region and for this state to export this many of the young people, and not have the necessary and trained workforce in here to bring the kind of business that this region deserves.

This is really frightening for me to think that we are allowing this to happen and allowing our competitors to take over the world economy. So to me it is absolutely essential. This is-- Strategic collaboration in whatever form is absolutely essential for us to increase and

enhance the educational assets in this region, and beyond that, really, in the nation.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

Next we'll hear from John Sheridan, President and CEO of Cooper Health System.

J O H N P. S H E R I D A N Jr.: Madam Chairs and Committee members, good morning. My name is John Sheridan; I'm President and CEO of Cooper Health System and Cooper University Hospital. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this morning.

I wholeheartedly support the reorganization plan for higher education proposed by the Governor's Advisory Committee.

Today I will focus my remarks on the recommendations that impact South Jersey and Camden, in particular. This plan provides an opportunity to address significant issues in South Jersey related not only to higher education, but also to economic development. South Jersey is the fastest-growing area of the state and will continue to be so in the decades ahead. South Jersey has close to 30 percent of the population, but South Jersey has only 12.5 percent of the undergraduate seats in New Jersey. South Jersey receives only slightly more than 10 percent of the State appropriations for higher education. South Jersey does not have a research university; North Jersey has three: Rutgers, UMDNJ, and NJIT. South Jersey has only a handful of doctoral programs; North Jersey has numerous programs.

The budgets of the State's higher education institutions total more than \$5 billion; however, Stockton and Rowan's budgets combined total considerably less than 10 percent of that amount.

What are the effects of this public policy? One, there are inadequate opportunities for our students to attend college in South Jersey. Two, there are inadequate opportunities for our students to attend graduate school in South Jersey. Only 24 percent of South Jersey adults have a college degree; this is 13 percent lower than North Jersey and 3 percent lower than the U.S.

New Jersey leads the nation in exporting some of our brightest children and their parents' hard-earned dollars to pay tuition and fees to out-of-state colleges and universities.

These policies need to be revised. Creating a research university as envisioned by the Higher Education Committee is the quickest and most efficient way to do so. This plan combines two highly ranked regional universities to create a university that can achieve national stature in a relatively short time. There are 3,000 universities in this country; this university would be one of only 70 in the country that has a medical school and a law school. It would have close to 20,000 students and it would have a nationally ranked engineering program.

Research university status in New Jersey means more than creating a university that does research. A research university is the master of its own destiny. It can initiate and develop doctoral programs and other terminal degrees as it determines the need; State colleges cannot.

What are the benefits of this new research university in South Jersey? One, it will greatly increase educational opportunities for our high

school students today and for generations to come. Two, it will create a well-educated workforce for the jobs of the 21st century. Three, it will be a magnet that attracts dynamic, technologically advanced industries and businesses. Four, it will continue the exceptional expansion of Rowan's Glassboro campus into a major academic center. And five, it will spur the redevelopment of Camden by creating a long overdue residential campus; and expanding a health sciences campus anchored by the Cooper Medical School of Rowan University, emphasizing the biosciences, biomedical engineering, nursing, and allied health.

The question for South Jersey is: Do we reject this once-in-a-generation opportunity in favor of the status quo, or do we embrace the Committee's visionary plan and move forward to create a dynamic new research university that will benefit not only our children, but our children's children and theirs too?

I think the answer is clear and I urge you to support the Committee's plan for South Jersey.

Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you, Mr. Sheridan.

Does anyone on the Committee have questions?

Senator Pou.

SENATOR POU: Thank you, thank you very much.

Good morning. I wanted to ask you the same question that I asked previously. Could you tell me what your involvement, if any at all, any participation in terms of discussions with respect to this merger has there been? Cooper Hospital plays a very important role in what you've described, not only in your testimony, but also some of the speakers before

you spoke with regards to Rowan University and the involvement of that. Could you please share with us what information or plans or discussions have you had with anyone to this date?

MR. SHERIDAN: Yes, Senator. We had some discussions with the Chancellor and his staff back in the fall. We've had no formal process put in place to address the opportunity presented by this plan. That has not been a lack of willingness on our part to do so; it's been, I think, a lack of willingness on Rutgers' part to engage, at this point in time, without knowing for sure exactly what is going to happen.

SENATOR POU: So you believe that this is a responsibility of Rutgers and not--

MR. SHERIDAN: No, I think it's a -- I'm sorry -- I think it's a responsibility of all of ours; I'm just trying to explain to you why it hasn't happened. I know that Rowan took the opportunity to address the issue with the Governor's staff last week, and hopefully something will be forthcoming quickly out of that process.

But all is not lost because a lot of work has been done by Rowan in preparing for those meetings. And I'm sure Rutgers has done the same.

SENATOR POU: What kind of preparation or--

MR. SHERIDAN: There's an extensive report that has been done by Rowan University.

SENATOR POU: Is that report public?

MR. SHERIDAN: No. (laughter)

SENATOR POU: Who has participated in the creation of that report?

MR. SHERIDAN: As Dr. Houshmand testified, he said it was done internally.

SENATOR POU: When will that report be made available to the public?

MR. SHERIDAN: You're asking the wrong person; I don't know.

SENATOR POU: I'm sorry, I didn't know that--

MR. SHERIDAN: I'm sorry -- you're asking the wrong person.

SENATOR POU: No, I understand. I'm just sorry that I did not have that information ahead of time. I would absolutely-- Certainly, we don't-- For the sake of time, we're not going to ask the Doctor to come back and speak again. But I would certainly, through the Chair, ask that we find out what kind of plan and information and reports are available for this Committee to review so that, if plans are in fact being put together -- in order for us to make a very informed decision we're going to need to know what that information is and what those facts are.

Thank you very much.

MR. SHERIDAN: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

Next, we will be calling up James Gruccio, Rowan University Board Chair.

JAMES J. GRUCCIO: It's still morning, so good morning.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Good morning.

MR. GRUCCIO: Senator Cunningham, Assemblywoman Riley, and members of the Committee. Senator, I handed you the report that you've referenced -- or was referenced by my confrere who spoke now. I

happen to be sitting next to Ali, so that's the report. I'll make certain that everyone gets a copy of it.

I am Jim Gruccio, the Chairman of Rowan University. I represent the Board of Trustees today, and will speak to you very briefly -- because I have only 2 minutes and 40 seconds left (laughter) -- about the commitment of the Rowan Board of Trustees.

By the way, I'm sure you recognize a close resemblance between myself and Senator Sweeney. We are not related. (laughter)

Rest assured that our Board takes very seriously its commitment and the stewardship, with fiduciary responsibility, that we have. And we are, and have, an unwavering determination to serve not only Rowan, but indeed, the entire Garden State with regard to the development of Rowan University and the opportunity it's presented.

Importantly, we are cognizant of our duty not only to serve the economic -- those who are economically fortunate enough to attain an education at Rowan, but probably more importantly to serve those who face adversity and rely on education as their proverbial way out, so to speak.

Permit me a personal anecdote. It is personal, it is an anecdote, but it's on point. I am keenly aware, personally, of the tremendous impact that higher education has when coupled with a heavy dose of hard work which allows one to achieve a life of accomplishment. Please consider this: In 1902 my father was born in a converted potato shack on Wheat Road in the City of Vineland. In 1972, my older brother was sworn in as a Superior Court judge, and later as an Appellate Division Court judge. And, at that same time, I became the senior managing partner of the largest firm in the

county, and at that time the largest firm in three counties. My sisters are equally accomplished.

I say that not for personal aggrandizement, but to demonstrate clearly how in one generation -- from a potato shack on Wheat Road to the Appellate Court, to whatever success I have and now the ability to speak to you as Chairman of a great university. That's what this is really all about.

And what we are about, as a Board, is furthering the effort to create a vehicle with the concept that in unity there is strength. And South Jersey does not have that vehicle, not that unified effort that we need, at least in our perception, to struggle against the competition from across the river and, indeed, across the country. This merger will allow that vehicle the impetus that it needs.

Back to my script.

In our inexorable effort to improve higher education, the Board of Trustees establishes policies that are targeted not just toward the individual but also at improving society as a whole by providing a workforce, and energized economic development and stability in our community. When we implement these policies and fund educational incentives, we of course invest in infrastructure, public and private. However, in addition to that we focus and zero in on the academic side. It's important to keep in focus that we achieve today benefits that will benefit countless thousands from generation to generation.

The opportunity to help reorganize higher education in southern New Jersey, and specifically to merge Rowan and Rutgers-Camden, presents Rowan with yet another challenge. Although Rowan was not the architect or the original proponent of the merger recommendation,

we now embrace the opportunity it presents wholeheartedly and unequivocally, and we accept the challenge to do the right thing -- because it's the right thing for public higher education in the State of New Jersey.

Therefore, it's important that you are aware that Rowan is committed to supporting the progressive, thoughtful public policy for higher education planning, funding, and development that is needed. Rowan continues to demonstrate that our strategic and creative approach to public-private partnership actually works. Witness the high ranking of its engineering school and, indeed, its other schools, including the medical school which will open in August on time and, incredibly, under budget.

The institutional strengths of Rutgers-Camden and the public component of the joint collaboration with private enterprise serve to ensure that the combined institutions will only be stronger and make more attractive and compelling those investments in higher education that people choose to make.

Rowan's history is replete with unparalleled accolades and achievements. Our funding success and our endowment demonstrate the confidence that both individual and corporate donors have in our ability to accomplish any goal that we undertake. When opportunities arise, Rowan has a remarkable proven track record of turning opportunities into huge successes.

As conscientiously as we at Rowan take our mandate to provide excellent public higher education, we now must necessarily depend upon the unwavering commitment of our elected officials such as yourselves to support our efforts with both policy and funding.

On behalf of the University Board of Trustees, I encourage the Legislature to take any and all action necessary to move the merger proposal forward, thus taking advantage of this singular, historic moment in history for higher education in New Jersey.

Thank you, Senator Cunningham, Assemblywoman Celeste Riley -- who is a kissing cousin of mine because we're both from Cumberland County. Thank you for-- (laughter)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: That's right; we're all related down there, aren't we?

MR. GRUCCIO: Thank you for giving me the opportunity for a presentation, my thoughts; and again welcome to Glassboro and Rowan.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Any questions? (no response)
Thank you so much.

MR. GRUCCIO: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Next, could we hear from Wendell Pritchett, Chancellor of Rutgers-Camden.

W E N D E L L E . P R I T C H E T T , P h . D . : Good morning. Good morning, Madam Chairs, members of the Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today.

There has been a lot of discussion related to the proposal of the UMDNJ Committee. But let me state that there's far more upon which we all agree than we disagree. We all agree that southern New Jersey's fine colleges and universities need real investment in order to grow and thrive. We all agree that we can find new and better ways to collaborate. We agree that southern New Jersey should have more resources to expand the number

of higher education seats in the region. And we agree that the expansion of research capacity in southern New Jersey is crucial to the region's future.

We agree on 98 percent of everything. We disagree on the mechanism for achieving these goals.

I stated publicly, and will do so again here, that I'm opposed to the proposal to eliminate Rutgers-Camden. I'm opposed to the removal of the opportunity for South Jersey residents to earn a Rutgers degree here in southern New Jersey. Let me be clear: I am not here to denigrate our friends and colleagues at Rowan University. Rowan University is a fine institution, and I will argue with anyone who suggests otherwise. I have had many opportunities to collaborate and spend time down here in Glassboro; it is a wonderful institution.

Rutgers-Camden is also a fine institution. Both universities serve their students and their communities. New Jersey has every reason to be proud of Rutgers-Camden and to be proud of Rowan. While we are both strong universities, we are also different universities. I'm not saying that one is better than the other; we are simply different. And the differences in our institutional DNAs are profound.

The forced merger of two sharply different cultures poses extraordinary challenges. The cost implications for the proposal set forth by the UMDNJ Advisory Committee is tremendous. The loss of Rutgers research professors and the elimination of Rutgers-Camden will exacerbate, not improve, our current challenge with the departure of bright graduate and undergraduate students from our region. This flight will, in turn, deplete the availability of knowledge-driven workers to advance those South Jersey businesses and organizations.

Many of Rutgers-Camden's innovative and effective service programs are funded by Federal agencies and foundations that are willing to invest in the Rutgers' brand. That funding and those services for thousands of South Jersey citizens will disappear with the elimination of Rutgers-Camden.

And perhaps most worrisome is the cost to South Jersey's working families. Right now, South Jersey families have a choice: Some families will choose the Rowan experience and all that entails. Some families want the Rutgers' degree which offers a global reputation and the brand promise of learning from world-class research professors. Many of our families at Rutgers-Camden cannot afford to send their children to New Brunswick. Many of our students have personal and work obligations that keep them well-rooted here in South Jersey. These are students who made a deliberate choice when they enrolled at Rutgers-Camden. These are students who will be solicited aggressively by Philadelphia colleges and universities, and by the University of Delaware. They will not automatically accept the loss of options in favor of a Rowan degree. Many will find alternatives with many of those taking them out of New Jersey.

Competition is good; it's healthy. And so is collaboration. Rutgers-Camden and Rowan already collaborate in our host city of Camden, where Rutgers provides library services to Rowan's Camden students. And we both, along with Camden County College, share the University District Bookstore.

There is far more that we can do together. Rowan and Rutgers-Camden, partnering with Cooper Medical School and Coriell Institute, have the framework in place to develop an institute for genomic research that

would define our region as a global center for the biosciences. Working together, our institutions can compete for and achieve the Federal grant resources that will serve all institutions well. And we can do this at a fraction of the cost of forcing an inorganic merger between two very different institutions.

There are other opportunities. As partners, Rutgers and Rowan can, and should, enter into formal agreements to allow our students to cross-register. The Rowan student earning her master's in engineering could, at the same time, work to earn her Rutgers-Camden law degree -- graduating with two highly desirable degrees at the same time.

That's just one example. Working together collaboratively, we can develop so very many more, allowing both Rutgers-Camden and Rowan to retain their unique identities and missions while also offering new opportunities for the families of our region -- all without forcing an extraordinary price tag on citizens of this state.

As I said at the onset, we agree on 98 percent of the issues here. Maintaining the status quo is not an option. At the same time, removing opportunity and options from our region, and forcing the dissolution of Rutgers-Camden into Rowan will set these plans back by decades. The people of South Jersey don't deserve that. They demand choices, and they want progress now. Rutgers and Rowan, working as partners, can deliver that promise.

We at Rutgers-Camden stand ready to collaborate, and we look forward to working with all of you to advance this agenda.

Thank you for your time. (applause)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

Does anyone have any questions?

Assemblyman Brown.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Chancellor, I'll offer you the same question as Dr. Houshmand.

Can you give us your background, your résumé, how long you have been with Rutgers, your educational background, your relationship with South Jersey? Thank you.

DR. PRITCHETT: Thank you for the question.

I've spent all of my life in the region. I have a Ph.D. in history and a J.D. My last job before coming to Rutgers-Camden was -- I was a Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania across the river; I was there for 10 years. I've been at Rutgers-Camden for three years -- almost three years. And what drew me to the opportunity was the opportunity to work -- to lead a research institution which had a very, very strong urban mission. And I think that we have done-- We have made a lot of progress in the last decade in expanding our research capacity and also meeting our urban mission. And I'm very proud of both of those things.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: So is it your testimony that this particular merger in South Jersey will be dysfunctional to higher education and our opportunities to get additional grant funding in the future, if this merger were to take place?

DR. PRITCHETT: Yes. I think that there are opportunities within collaboration, existing structures for us to advance research education in South Jersey that are much more efficient and much less risky than the potential merger.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: So give me the educational structure of Rutgers-Camden Law School and its relationship with Rutgers University.

DR. PRITCHETT: Rutgers-Camden Law School has a long and prestigious history. It is a part of Rutgers-Camden. The Dean of the Law School reports to me, and I also happen to be a proud member of the faculty of the Law School. And, of course, Rutgers-Camden Law School is one of only three law schools in the state, supports graduates -- students all across the state. We recruit students from not only the rest of the State of New Jersey, but from all around the country.

But to answer your question: Rutgers-Camden Law School is part of Rutgers-Camden University, and a crucial part of it.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Am I to understand that Rutgers-Camden Law School is its own charter? That it's an operational institution unto itself, but with the assistance of Rutgers University for funding through the State of New Jersey.

DR. PRITCHETT: I don't think that's accurate, but we're certainly happy to get you more information on that.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Okay. So when it was created in 1926, it was once known as The South Jersey School of Law. And it merged with Rutgers nearly 25 years later -- with Rutgers -- to create, what? A better educational opportunity, okay? So where I'm going here -- that evolution of the law school created in an inorganic transformation -- or merger -- somewhat similar to what we're even discussing here today.

DR. PRITCHETT: A little bit more on the history: The South Jersey College of Law was created in 1926; in 1927, South Jersey College

was created as a partner with South Jersey College of Law. So Rutgers-Camden has offered undergraduate degrees since 1927. Both of those institutions -- South Jersey College of Law and South Jersey College -- expanded over several decades, and both of them became part of Rutgers University in the early 1950s. And so both of them have grown and, over time -- the last 60 years -- as part of Rutgers, they have continued to grow.

It is certainly true that Rutgers-Camden, South Jersey College of Law, have changed over time. So I understand your question to be that, and there have been changes in the past. And I think that there should be changes in the future. The question is, what are the right changes? And again, my view is that the proposal of the UMDNJ Committee is not the right approach to future education.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: So just going along with connecting and creating synergies between two educational institutions, given the cost of education -- which almost rivals health care, let's put it to you that way -- and with the next balloon being student loans -- being not being able to be paid, being deferred, interest rates on top of interest rates that are collecting because kids can't get jobs. Merger and consolidation -- and I'm a business guy, I run multiple companies -- seems the only logical but hard decision that sometimes has to be made to create greater synergies, to create more efficiencies, to match up with our competitors.

DR. PRITCHETT: Assemblyman, that's an excellent question, and I take it seriously.

I lose a lot of sleep about the cost that our students incur for their education and the debt that they have to go into. I agree with you -- it's a gigantic challenge. The answer -- my answer -- to your question,

however, is that this approach would not improve those opportunities for students. They would not deal with the cost to students for going to school, and it would weaken opportunities of choice for the students.

Now, your question is well taken. We need, as an institution -- all of our institutions of higher education, especially the public ones -- need to be very cost-effective; need to be much more efficient about how we operate, and need to think much more deeply about what we charge our students. There's no question about that. But this proposal of the UMDNJ Committee does not solve that problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Are you familiar with Toledo University and Toledo Medical School's merger in 2006?

DR. PRITCHETT: Somewhat. Not to a great deal, but I have investigated it -- yes. And I do think that is an interesting approach that they have taken.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: And the success that it brought to the city of Toledo -- it actually rejuvenated the city on an economic development path that's second to none. And the educational grants and research centers that it is creating have been amazing, from what I'm reading. Have you read anything different than what I'm speaking of?

DR. PRITCHETT: Well, I would say the story is a little bit more complicated than that. I think that actually that school has struggled financially. And Toledo, while it is a lovely place and I've been there, it certainly struggles still.

But you are right. That collaboration -- consortium, partnerships -- in promoting medical research is an important avenue for cities and regions to pursue. And we believe that we should pursue them.

The only question is what are the appropriate institutional mechanisms to pursue them.

I would say that Rutgers-Camden has and is building a very strong relationship already with the Cooper/Rowan Med School. Our faculty sits on searches for faculty at the Cooper/Rowan Med School; our faculty has staff on planning committees for the Cooper/Rowan Med School; our administration has talked and has worked to collaborate with the med school on administrative programs that we could use to save costs. So we're already doing that. In my mind the question isn't whether we should be doing those things; the question is what are the proper mechanisms by which to do them?

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: But these things occur because of our economic conditions. These conversations occur because of what we face as a society right now, whether it be to strive for higher educational efficiency or to make economic development -- or redevelopment, in this case -- a reality. And that only happens in hard times. And we are certainly facing some really serious hard times which creates us to have -- make these hard decisions -- to have to have them. But when I look at Toledo University -- and that wasn't a consortium; that was a merger. That was a merger between two educational institutions that had the same difficulties in creating that merger. But yet when you look five years later, what I'm reading and seeing statistically -- in the research and the funding that they're able to obtain because they have merged together to make them a much stronger and bigger institution -- it sounds like a success story that is relevant to what we're trying to do here in South Jersey -- or it's discussed what we're doing here in South Jersey.

DR. PRITCHETT: Assemblyman, I agree it's relevant. It's completely relevant and it is something that we will try to get you more information on.

I do disagree with you that it was a merger. I think it was more complicated than that and, in fact, it is a model that we are willing to discuss pursuing. But I will say again that I don't think that the UMDNJ Committee proposal, as proposed, will effectuate the kind of changes that you and I both seek to effectuate.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: I guess we beg to differ.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

Assemblyman Giblin, did you have a question?

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Chancellor, I try to look at things kind of practical. We all know that Rowan University has certainly evolved into one of our State's better institutions as far as higher education is concerned; and, of course, Rutgers-Camden has a long legacy. Have you been able to sit down with your colleagues here at Rowan and Rutgers-Camden to see if there is any way of really developing some type of consensus as far as delivery of higher education in this region of the state? Is there any talking going on at all, or are you just waiting for direction from the Administration?

DR. PRITCHETT: The answer to your question, Assemblyman, is actually both: yes and yes. We have had conversations; again, I've been at Rowan University many times over my three years at Rutgers-Camden. We've had several conversations; I've already mentioned some of the partnerships that we have ongoing at Camden with the Cooper/

Rowan Med School. But the answer to a question that Senator Pou had asked earlier: It is my understanding that after the first UMDNJ Committee report in September, the Governor's Office directed that there be a committee created to focus on issues of merger between Rutgers-New Brunswick and Robert Wood Johnson Medical School. And that is the committee that has been meeting. We have not participated in those discussions because the direction of the Governor's Office was that that committee was to focus on those issues.

There has not been a committee created by the Governor's Office of similar structure regarding the recommendations of the committee in December, and, therefore, we have not participated in that.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: So going forth, what's your timetable, from your end, and the costs involved with this? I mean, it just seems that we're trying to reinvent the wheel here when we could put people together and have a consortium and make all of our lives a lot easier. And I know it was alluded to about the economics, but all of the reports that I've seen, this is going to break the bank with this whole merger, up and down the state. And I'm just trying to figure out where the money is coming from.

DR. PRITCHETT: So we at Rutgers stand ready to engage in those discussions. I do think that there are many potential collaborations/partnerships that we could engage in that would be cost-effective, that we could advance quickly and it would be beneficial for the region.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Well, if you were going to estimate: Everybody looks at polls these days. What's the percentage of people at Rutgers-Camden who want this merger?

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBERS OF AUDIENCE: Zero.

DR. PRITCHETT: I ask my colleagues to respect the Chairs' wishes that nobody from the audience interject their opinion.

I would answer your question by saying this, Assemblyman: I've been affiliated with universities for almost all my adult life -- way over 20 years. It is extremely rare within academia that people agree about something. (laughter) We usually disagree violently; that is what we do. Every single person that I have interacted with -- faculty, staff, students, alums -- connected to Rutgers-Camden is opposed to this merger -- every single person that I have interacted with. I have never, ever seen, in my 20 years connected to a university, unanimity of position on something. But there is in this case.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Thank you.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Good morning, Dr. Pritchett.

DR. PRITCHETT: Good morning.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: You know, you said a few things that were interesting. One of them I thought was interesting was the cultural difference between Rowan and Rutgers. And I also know that many of the students I've spoken to are not for this merger.

But what I also find interesting is that you have not had an opportunity to sit down and talk with anyone on the Governor's Committee about what your feelings are or your colleagues' feelings are, or even to make suggestions. Especially considering the fact that I think the Governor's plan for this is to make it happen by July 1, 2012. Have you been told that?

DR. PRITCHETT: I'm going to actually invite my colleague, Pete McDonough, up to answer that. Pete, do you want to come up and answer the last question, please?

I'm going to have Pete introduce himself.

It's about the timeline, Pete.

P E T E R J. M c D O N O U G H Jr.: Good morning, everyone. It's nice to see you again.

The timeline for the first steering committee was to come up -- which was the UMDNJ parts in New Brunswick and Piscataway, and their merger into Rutgers-New Brunswick. We've been working towards -- and I sit on that steering committee -- a July 1 date for having some clarity toward some action. Probably, I think what we see now is legislation coming through your Committees, as opposed to an executive reorg, which was the topic *du jour* a month ago. That's that timeline. We don't have any timeline for a Camden-Rowan merger because we really haven't seen a specific plan yet. And there are lots of issues: there are issues about bonding, there are issues about-- There are practical issues, there are financial issues, and we really haven't even begun to look at those.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

DR. PRITCHETT: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: As we move forward, we will now be adhering to our time limits. We thank you very much, the testimony from the previous speakers.

So we're going to call people up in sets of four. And if you're on opposing teams, that's okay. Please be respectful of each other.

Howard Gillette, Professor at Rutgers; Margaret Marsh; Vincent Manco; and John Wall.

I also want to remind you to turn your cell phone off when you come up to testify; it does interfere with the microphone.

You all can decide which one of you wants to go first.

H O W A R D G I L L E T T E, Ph.D.: I think we'll go in the order you called our names.

I thank you, Madam Chair, for the prelude that we might be on opposing sides. My wife is to my left, and I'll try not to say anything she won't approve of. (laughter)

Thank you for the opportunity to address your Committee. I'm Howard Gillette; I spent the last 12 years of my career at Rutgers-Camden as Professor of History before retiring in July 2011.

I'm speaking today to the effect of the proposed merger on the City of Camden, a subject that is informed by my 2005 prize-winning book, *Camden After the Fall*. Your Committee has already heard from Mayor Cory Booker about the adverse effects the Barer proposal, if implemented, would have on Newark. The proposal would be no less harmful to Camden, all claims of proponents to the contrary.

Ten years ago the State stepped in to Camden with similar claims that it could reverse Camden's decline. No doubt the millions invested under the municipal recovery legislation in the city's edes and medes had positive results. Plans to revitalize city neighborhoods failed, however, largely because they advanced over the intense opposition of Camden residents whose primary needs were not addressed.

Dissent and litigation followed. As a result, no one can claim the city is safer or more prosperous today because of the State's intervention.

If the Barer proposal for a merger is approved we will head in the same direction. We've had dissent; soon we'll have litigation. Even the most touted results of the proposal cannot be achieved for decades.

Make no mistake, this proposal severely damages Rutgers-Camden, one of the major success stories in the City of Camden. It would deprive the campus not just of its name, but of the resources that make it possible to recruit and maintain top research and faculty and students from around the country and the world. Undercutting Rutgers-Camden in such a way will weaken the city as well by reversing campus growth and the consequent boost to the city institutions that comes with it.

A logical extension of the municipal recovery effort is to boost both Rutgers-Camden and Cooper Hospital. But appropriating the intellectual and monetary resources from Rutgers-Camden in aid of the new Rowan diminishes Rutgers without assuring the desired end of nationally recognized research status for Rowan. To work, any partnership should be mutually arrived at thorough assessment and consideration of costs and consequences, none of which has been provided through the Barer report. No such precedent of taking resources from a public university and giving it another university has ever happened in the history of higher education. Your Committee should demand research and a thorough assessment before making any decisions which have long-term consequences for higher education, the region, and the City of Camden.

And I did attach my own comments, along with George Norcross', from the *Inquirer* from February 5.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

MARGARET MARSH, Ph.D.: Good morning, everybody. My name is Margaret Marsh and I'm a Professor of History at Rutgers. I'm a historian, that's why you have so many references attached to my three-minute testimony.

I also served for two years as Interim Chancellor of Rutgers-Camden, just preceding Wendell Pritchett, and as Dean and Executive Dean for more than a decade. I'm also a life-long South Jerseyan, and I grew up just down the road in Vineland.

So I'm just one of more than 44,000 alums, hundreds of faculty members, thousands of existing students who oppose the elimination of Rutgers-Camden. And I want to remind you that the people of New Jersey agree with us. Across the state, only 22 percent support the idea of the takeover of Rutgers-Camden; and in southern New Jersey, only 19 percent are in favor of it.

So why is this such a bad idea? First, it would remove from the region the one university whose name is recognized around the world. Second, it would make it harder for adult learners, including veterans who are very important to our campus, to attend Rutgers. Almost 30 percent of our students are older than 25 years old, and hardly any of them would be able to travel to New Brunswick or to Newark for a Rutgers' education. Third, removing Rutgers-Camden from the Rutgers system would cause an exodus of its world-class faculty. After all, they are faculty members at a university ranked among the top 60 in the world. Fourth, it will be

incredibly costly. The Barer Committee chose not to consider costs, but they will be enormous and they will go on for decades. How can the Legislature enact into law a proposal that has no plan and no idea of cost?

There is a better way to make higher education great in South Jersey, my home. Follow the lead of other states that have created successful, formal alliances between universities. That way, each one retains its individual identity and its strengths while they leverage the resources of both to create new opportunities for students and faculty. Let's look to the future, not the past.

Shame on us, shame on all of us if we allow this elimination of Rutgers-Camden to happen, weakening what strengths are already in place in the region and leaving to speculation what might happen to make up for those losses many years down the road.

Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you.

J O H N W A L L, Ph.D.: It's my pleasure to say good afternoon, Madam Chairs, and members of the Joint Committee.

I'm John Wall; I'm Professor and Chair of the Department of Philosophy and Religion at Rutgers-Camden. I'd like to thank you for holding these very important discussions, and I'd like to thank Rowan for generously hosting them.

I want to talk here about some of the facts of the situation in the Barer proposal. The two main reasons put forth for the takeover are: first, to retain more college students in South Jersey; and second, to create another major research university in the area. And together, thirdly, these should boost the economy.

Do these reasons, in fact, stand up? A 2009 Seton Hall study found that the vast majority of students leave New Jersey to attend private universities, not public ones, and that they don't leave for lack of seats, they leave for lack of choices. Eliminating Rutgers in South Jersey will obviously make these choices even fewer, not only now but also for our children and grandchildren.

Up until seven years ago, Rutgers-Camden had only about 4,000 students and survived on financial support from the larger Rutgers system. Great efforts grew this enrollment to a level of financial self-sustenance and we actually -- until a point where, today, we actually send about \$50 million up north.

But I ask you to imagine what the situation will be like four years from now as the last Rutgers' student graduates from our region. Will Rowan students flock to Rowan-Camden in sufficient numbers to maintain this growth? Or will they, instead, attend the main campus, the larger campus and the safer -- and frankly more beautiful -- campus in Glassboro? I've seen no study on this, but I doubt it. Rather, it is more likely that enrollments will go down at Rowan-Camden, as we're already seeing for next year. The gains will be lost and in four more years enrollment could very well be so low that the campus can't even go on. And so, of course, that will lose more students.

As for research, let me to briefly offer my own story as a typical one. I came here 12 years ago fresh out of grad school. I have since then published five books in top presses like Oxford University, 50 articles, and I give keynote addresses around the world several times a year. This level of research is possible because I work at a major research university with an

international reputation which has invested large sums for many decades in research infrastructure synergies across its three campuses, research-level teaching loads and sabbaticals, the best library in the state, and in these and many other ways its own long-standing global reputation.

Rutgers-Camden is on its way towards becoming a Carnegie doctoral institution in the next few years with its graduate programs. It could cost billions to create another such major research university in the south, and these would mostly be duplicate costs to taxpayers -- and it would assume that the merger succeeds, which may not happen.

South Jersey could have its cake and eat it too with partnership and consortium models in which both institutions can grow their distinct identities from the bottom up instead of from the top down.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you.

V I N C E N T M A N C O: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

My name is Vincent Manco; I'm from Jackson Township. I'm a senior economics major here at Rowan University. I'm also an elected Senior Class Senator in student government.

I'm here today because I'm in favor of the proposed merger -- the proposed realignment, more specifically, between Rowan University and Rutgers-Camden. Rowan's been a steadily growing institution over the past few decades. I'm excited to see Rowan University grow right in front of my eyes. With the addition of Rowan's new medical school and the Rutgers-Camden business and law schools, I see a great future ahead for our University.

The merger would benefit both campuses. Becoming a major research university would only help both campuses and improve the value of both our degrees. Our university could become more notable and enhance our image through our own merits. We would also receive more Federal funding. I understand that there's a little disparity between universities in the north and south in terms of funding.

I believe that it is important that New Jersey has another major research institution in the state; more specifically, that it be in the southern portion of the state. Since I started attending Rowan University (indiscernible) while I'm living in South Jersey, I've seen more of, like, an identity to this portion of the state, and I think it would be definitely beneficial that there be another major research institution.

We also need to give more incentive for New Jersey students to go to college in-state. I know plenty of my friends who go to West Virginia, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania to college, and I'm sure that they would be more willing to stay in-state if there were more notable and large research institutions.

One of the concerns I keep hearing from students is that class size may increase. I will have to disagree. Just about every classroom on this campus has a maximum capacity of 25 or 35 people. I don't think class size will be an issue. There are very few lecture halls that could seat hundreds of students.

I do not believe that the proposed school realignment is a partisan issue. Governor Christie, a Republican, supports this plan; Senator Sweeney -- Senate President Sweeney -- a Democrat who represents Glassboro here, seems to have support for this also. I am President of the

College Republicans on this campus and I am in favor of this merger; and the President of Democratic Club is also.

I hope that you will come together and support the school realignment with Rowan University and Rutgers-Camden.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much for your testimony.

Does anyone from the panel have questions?

SENATOR POU: Just a quick one.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Senator Pou.

SENATOR POU: To the young man who just spoke: What year are you in?

MR. MANCO: I'm a senior.

SENATOR POU: And prior to being accepted at Rowan University, how many colleges or universities did you apply for? Was this your first choice?

MR. MANCO: I originally went to Ocean County College and got an associate's degree there and transferred here. I applied to three colleges: TCNJ, Rowan University, and Arcadia in Pennsylvania.

SENATOR POU: Okay, thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

MS. MARSH: Thank you all.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Next, we'd like to hear from Rafey Habib, Kate Epstein, Daniel Cook, and Dr. Martin Rosenberg.

Is class starting? I see a mass exodus. (laughter)

DANIEL T. COOK, Ph.D.: I guess I'll start.

I'm Dan Cook. I'm an Associate Professor in the Department of Childhood Studies at Rutgers-Camden. And I want to thank you for having these hearings and paying attention to this matter in such a serious way.

I came to New Jersey in 2007 to help build a new, innovative program in Childhood Studies, which remains the first and only doctoral-granting degree program of its kind in North America. I left a comfortable, tenured position at the University of Illinois in Champaign Urbana, a campus with considerable resources and a fine academic reputation, to invest my knowledge, skills, energy, and enthusiasm into the Childhood Studies program, into Rutgers-Camden, and into South Jersey.

Had I seen an advertisement for a similar start-up program being launched at Rowan University, I would not have given it a second thought and would have remained in Illinois. I say this not because of any negative associations with respect to Rowan; I had none. I had no knowledge of Rowan. But simply because I would not have embarked on such a risky venture at a small and unknown place to me, anyway at that time.

I'm not alone, of course. Since we began, we have attracted outstanding faculty and graduate students to our program from all over the region, the country, and the world. Every one of us came to Childhood Studies, and to Camden, because the program was backed with the name, good faith, and resources of Rutgers University.

I tell this story not simply to ring the bell of my program, but to illustrate the drawing power of the Rutgers name, and what one program

has been able to do with it. We are quite successful and we are already known internationally.

The problem with the Barer report and with the general rhetoric surrounding the Rowan issue and its aftermath is the shortsightedness and wrong-headedness in its approach to bringing money and resources to South Jersey. The recommendations in the report are, as we know, unsubstantiated. There is no plan, no budget, no timetable, no research whatsoever to back it up.

One striking aspect of the Barer Report and discussion is that the Rutgers-Rowan issue is framed from a position of weakness -- based on fear of losing students, offering pie-in-the-sky remedies for arresting this loss. It is not based on building something that will attract people -- like myself, my colleagues, and graduate students -- to New Jersey, to South Jersey.

The thinking is short-sighted, in part because to cut the Camden campus from Rutgers and to enfold it into Rowan will decimate a significant equity of scholarship and human capital already accumulated and invested that is right now drawing faculty and students to the state. If this happens, anyone who can leave will leave Rutgers-Camden, including graduate students, professional students, undergraduate students, and faculty. Those who leave will do so because they have the most value to offer other places.

It is faculty, their quality of teaching and research, which make a great higher educational institution. It is the quality of programs, the reputation, that draws students to a university. The higher-quality faculty, the higher-quality students who then, in turn, draw better faculty and better

students. Smart money is investment that builds on itself. In higher education nothing builds on itself like human capital -- particularly the faculty and the students. Dumb money is a one-off infusion of funds with no plan, no timetable, and no thought put into it.

Is that my time?

There is a great deal of talk about seats, but there is very little talk about the brains that are attached to the heads that are attached to the bodies in those seats.

So what I want to say is to think about the kinds of loss in human capital and reputation that will be gone if Rutgers is gone, and what that does to attract people like myself and, I think, many people here.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you.

KATHERINE C. EPSTEIN, Ph.D.: Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here today.

My name is Kate Epstein; I'm a tenure-track Assistant Professor of History at Rutgers-Camden.

I strongly oppose the proposed hostile takeover of Rutgers-Camden by Rowan, which will set back higher education in the region for decades to come.

First, if the merger goes through there will be an exodus of research faculty. I took the job at Rutgers-Camden, turning down two other offers -- one of which would have paid me almost twice -- more than twice as much money -- not just because of the prestige of the Rutgers' name, but because it gave me the opportunity to research as well as teach. At Rutgers-Camden I teach two courses a semester, which leaves me time to do research; tenure and promotion standards value research along with

teaching; and I have seamless access to an excellent library system which contains 3.5 million volumes. By way of comparison, the teaching load at Rowan in the Humanities is four courses per semester, leaving faculty far less time to pursue research; tenure and promotion standards do not emphasize research; and the library contains only 420,000 volumes as opposed to 3.5 million. You cannot have a research university without research faculty.

Second, proponents of the merger have yet to explain how the merged university would acquire the resources that Rowan lacks, but that Rutgers-Camden enjoys through its participation in the Rutgers' system. Where will the money come from -- tuition hikes? How long will it take the law school to reacquire accreditation from the American Bar Association, without which its graduates cannot practice law? When will the merged university join the elite American Association of Universities, to which Rutgers belongs but Rowan does not? A proposal that did not offer answers to such basic questions as these would be laughed out of corporate board rooms; it astonishes me that it is being taken seriously in public debate.

Third, the merger proposal is already hurting Rutgers-Camden, and it will continue to hurt us until it is killed. Faculty and students are naturally wary of joining an institution that may no longer exist. I've seen that wariness up close since I recently served on a search committee to hire a new junior faculty member in the History Department. There is a real urgency to kill the merger proposal before it does any more damage than it has already done.

Contrary to what proponents of the merger would have you believe, South Jersey already has a research university, and it is Rutgers-

Camden. It is outrageous that my colleagues and students are having to waste time fighting a proposal whose proponents have not performed even minimal due diligence and are transparently motivated by political and financial interests. I'm sick and tired of hearing our opposition characterized as being purely self-interested, emotional -- when we are the only side that has offered evidence and facts -- or "just about a name." It's about much more than that; it's about values at the heart of higher education. The Higher Education Committee should immediately condemn the merger proposal for the travesty it is.

Thank you, and I look forward to your next meeting in Camden. (applause)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: We've asked you not to show any form of public outbreak.

M. A. R A F E Y H A B I B, Ph.D.: Assemblywoman Riley, members of the Higher Education Committees, and respected colleagues of Rowan University, I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to speak.

And I apologize for my funny accent, but I spent a long time in Camden. (laughter)

My name is Rafey Habib. I'm a Professor of English at Rutgers University, Camden, and the author of seven books. Please understand that my comments are directed not at my Rowan colleagues; I know a lot of them are equally concerned as to what this proposal will bring. I have written a detailed critique of the Barer Commission (*sic*) report and have provided you with copies of this. Here, I just want to offer a summary of my critique and my concerns.

As I have tried to show in detail, the Barer Commission report contains no actual analysis of higher education in South Jersey. It offers no arguments or evidence to support its proposals, and contains no indication as to the implications of its recommendations in fiscal or educational terms. And the Committee clearly failed to consult with numerous groups of stakeholders.

This is a proposal that has the potential to affect the future of the entire State of New Jersey and the lives of millions of its residents. We are agreed -- politicians, educators at Rutgers, educators at Rowan, and the people of South Jersey -- we are all agreed on one thing: We need to improve the education and economy of our region. But let us not short-change ourselves by adhering to a hastily conceived plan. Let us take the time to address these issues properly with consultation from the appropriate experts in finance and education. Because the consequences will affect not just us, but our children. New Jersey deserves better.

Thank you.

MARTIN ROSENBERG, Ph.D.: Thank you, Assemblywoman Riley and Senator Cunningham, for having us; and the other Committee members. I'm Dr. Martin Rosenberg, Professor of Art History at Rutgers; and I chaired the Department of Fine Arts on the Camden campus from 2002 to 2011.

Like my colleagues, I came to Rutgers, in my case, already as a tenured full professor at another public university in another state; and, again, I came because it was Rutgers. I really didn't even hardly know Rowan existed. That's nothing against Rowan; it's simply a mark of the reputation that Rutgers has.

As a senior faculty member of Rutgers-Camden, I wish to express our unanimous opposition of the proposed takeover of our Rutgers-Camden by Rowan University -- an act being misrepresented as a merger. Why is the proposal for Rutgers-New Brunswick to incorporate some units of UMDNJ been tied to giving Rutgers-Camden to Rowan? Why the linkage? There is no logical reason. We believe that such a takeover would be devastating to our students, faculty, the City of Camden, and to Rutgers University as a whole.

In addition, it will be of indeterminate but extremely high cost, likely involve litigation, and have a whole range of unintended negative consequences. The entire range of Rutgers-Camden stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, and many of our 45,000 alumni, as well as many others throughout our state, have already expressed overwhelming opposition to this so-called merger because they believe, with good reason, that it is unjustifiable, has had no due diligence or true cost-benefit analysis, and will be extremely costly.

They also feel that everyone associated with Rutgers-Camden will be disenfranchised and materially damaged by this plan, and that the residents of South Jersey will have diminished educational choice and will go elsewhere in ever-greater numbers should it come to pass.

Every faculty member on our campus, including the nine world-class faculty hired in our Department while I was Chair, came in large part to join the faculty of Rutgers, a research university with all the necessary aspects of support, culture, and resources to allow them to be highly productive scholars and teachers. These include an international reputation as a top AAU research university, an unparalleled research library, rich

collaborations across Rutgers campuses; and a culture that focuses on, supports, and rewards achievements in research. As faculty members at Rutgers we have all these necessary conditions and support; at Rowan we would have none of them -- none of them -- because Rowan is a totally different type of institution than Rutgers, focusing on teaching as the top priority rather than research. That's not a difference in quality; it's just a difference in culture, and it's profound.

Our tenured faculty -- tenured according to the same standards as all faculty at Rutgers -- have passed one of the most rigorous reviews of scholarship of any public university in the country. Why would we simply allow ourselves to be traded to Rowan? Our students have made it clear that they are in Camden to go to Rutgers and to study with its world-class faculty. Why would they attend a branch campus of Rowan in Camden? If someone can give me an answer to that, I'd love to hear it.

I just want to end by saying we urge you to scrutinize every aspect of this extraordinarily complex non-proposal, at this point. And to quote your own Vice Chair of Higher Education: It's time to put the brakes on this merger proposal, talk to all the stakeholders, and evaluate not only the dollar costs, but also the human costs of implementing it. And fully consider not only the intended, but the likely unintended consequences.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

Any questions from the panel? (no response)

Thank you very much.

Next, Vibiana Cvetkovic, Eric Milou, Adam Scales, and Ed Rentezelas. I apologize if I mispronounced someone's name.

I'll remind you about your cell phones when you're testifying.

Would you like to go in the order that I called you?

All right, thank you.

VIBIANA BOWMAN CVETKOVIC: Okay, now I'm on?

Okay, thank you.

Madam Chair, and distinguished members of this Committee, should this proposed merger go through it would be devastating to the citizens of New Jersey.

I forgot to introduce myself. I'm Vibiana Cvetkovic; I'm the head of Access Services for the Paul Robeson Library, which is part of the Rutgers University Library System.

So it would be devastating, not only to the citizens of New Jersey but, in particular, to the citizens of South Jersey.

In addition to being a librarian, I am also a proud, all but dissertation student in the Childhood Studies program. So borrowing from a Grimm fairy tale, should this proposed merger go through it will be killing the goose that lays the golden egg -- educationally and economically for the people of New Jersey, but particularly South Jersey.

In my brief remarks today I'd like to give the Committee some information that is absent from the Barer report, information about an entity vital to any research institution -- the library. And I would like to examine some popular misconceptions about what a research library is and what it does.

First, what is a research library? Again, to borrow from children's literature -- this time Tolkein's *Lord of the Rings* -- one does not simply call oneself a research library. In other words, it's not a designation

that one can make for oneself; it is a designation that comes through the Academy. The bodies that determines whether an institution is a research library are the Association of Research Libraries and the Center for Research Libraries. Neither Rowan nor the Paul Robeson Library at Rutgers-Camden, as a stand-alone, is eligible for membership. But the Rutgers' library system is.

This designation is not an empty honorific. Once an institution receives this designation it is eligible for participation in national consortium for collection development, archiving materials, and borrowing agreements.

Second, what does a research library provide? Contrary to popular belief, the information resources faculty and students in the humanities and sciences need are not freely available on the web. The databases, data sets, and current scholarly articles that are vital to their research are only available through subscription. And these are typically purchased through the library -- and they are very expensive.

According to statistics self-reported to the National Center for Education statistics, Rutgers University Library spends \$6.2 million annually on its database. By comparison, Rowan spends one-tenth that amount -- \$650,000. The Robeson Library, where I am a faculty member, spends nothing; that is because we have no electronic subscriptions. All of our subscriptions come through the Rutgers Library Services.

Finally, what does a research library do? The Paul Robeson Library serves not only the Camden campus of students and faculty, but also the Camden community. It serves the citizens of Camden, the local, State, and regional officials. It also serves scholars and extension services

throughout South Jersey, the Rutgers marine field stations, the Rutgers Business College in Atlantic Cape County, the Rutgers program at the Fort Dix-McGuire Joint Base. We also provide access to scholarly materials to independent and unaffiliated scholars throughout the region. And there is a very hefty dollar amount attached to all these services.

Thank you for kind attention, and please keep Rutgers united.

E R I C M I L O U, Ph.D.: Senator Cunningham, Assemblywoman Riley, members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to address you today.

My name is Eric Milou. I address you as the Rowan University Senate President, serving my fifth term as Senate President, and a mathematics professor, serving 15 years of service at Rowan.

First, let me extend a welcome to the scores of distinguished faculty and staff from Rutgers-Camden.

All of us in this room are well aware we await a final decision from the Governor and politicians. Unlike many reports, Rowan faculty and staff are not pushing for this merger to happen. But together with our Administration, in the spirit of shared governments, we have merely taken the position that if comes, we want to be ready, and therefore have alerted our campus and set up planning teams to do some preliminary work, just in case.

Change is reality at Rowan, and we have little choice but to embrace it. If the merger does become a reality, the first and foremost difficult challenge will be how to repair relations between Rutgers-Camden and Rowan. Whether intentional or not, much of what has been said by the Rutgers-Camden Administration, faculty, staff, and students has been

perceived by the Rowan community as derogatory, even demeaning. My hope, and that of my colleagues, is that the conversation can become professional and civil.

Rowan has a proud history of civil conversation. Many of you may recall that just across the street from this very building, in 1967, Soviet Premier Alexis Kosygin and President Lyndon Johnson spent more than three days in discourse that led to a greater understanding between the two countries.

In the 45 years since, Rowan has grown from a state normal school to a multi-accredited regional institution.

It's important to note, however, that the upfront cost commitments necessary for just the initial integration of administration systems could well be projected into the millions. Moreover, Rowan will have to absorb the financial burden of maintaining components such as major upgrade in our library holdings, IT support, and a host of other things that are covered centrally by Rutgers University.

None of this is noted in the Barer report, and it is naïve to believe that there are not significant costs associated with this merger.

Let's be clear: A merger is not something that can happen by fiat or order. It is going to take interaction, faculty-to-faculty, student-to-student, staff member-to-staff member, administrator-to-administrator. Across all these groups the Rowan community is ready and willing to undertake this work, as hard and as time-consuming as it promises to be, for the sake of the larger good that could come from joining our two excellent institutions.

Politicians, colleagues, students -- please remember that universities are not businesses and that the heart of a university is its students, and the soul of a university is its faculty. Please, as you continue to debate the pros and cons of this merger, don't forget to consult with, engage, and listen to the heart and soul of our universities.

Thank you for your time.

A D A M F. S C A L E S, ESQ.: Good afternoon. I'm Adam Scales, Professor at the Law School at Rutgers-Camden.

I'd like to express my appreciation to many of the comments just put forward by my colleague -- I can call him, for the purposes of today's meeting -- to my right. I think a lot of this comes across as quite thoughtful.

I have a number of concerns with the process that has brought us to this point. And the first (indiscernible) involved process. Because the Barer Committee did not -- has not disclosed any supporting documents or records, we are really left only with the report itself. The Committee appears to have rather selectively consulted with interested parties to reach the conclusion that Camden should be separate from Rutgers. Now, given the strong recommendation of President McCormick against that, it's interesting that the Committee did not actually consider that recommendation in the context of the report. In fact, from reading the report one would not be aware of any opposing views whatsoever.

That's a very strange way to evaluate a problem -- pick the arguments that you like and ignore the rest. But it does seem to be how the Committee proceeded in this case.

Of course, I could be wrong about that; just as it's clear that the Committee consulted with people or sources not mentioned in this report, perhaps the Committee really did consider opposing views. But we can't know that without a full disclosure of the Committee's consultations, records, and sources of information. I hope that this body will exercise its power to demand a fuller accounting of the Committee's thought process.

Sunshine is always an excellent policy. I was gratified to hear the Chair of Rowan's Board a few moments ago offer to this Committee, and anyone on this Committee, a copy of Rowan's internal report. On behalf of Rutgers, I would love to have a copy of that report. And since I'm here at Rowan, perhaps I can take a copy back with me to Rutgers later today.

Sunshine is particularly called for when the reasoning process appears to be opaque. The Committee has documented a number of problems with higher education in New Jersey, but its conclusion that dismembering Rutgers is the best way to solve them does not follow. If one is concerned with the number of seats in South Jersey -- and my colleague John Wall did address that a few moments ago -- you should note that this proposal won't do anything to do that. That's a consistent theme with the portion of the Barer Committee that deals with Rutgers-Camden. There appears to be the solution -- merge Rutgers-Camden to Rowan -- without a clear tie-in to the actual problem in which it is in aid of solving.

Ask yourselves: Suppose the Commission had, instead, concluded the key to fixing higher education in New Jersey was to double spending and open more Rutgers campuses? That might be a great idea. But from my conversations with a number of your colleagues in Trenton

last week, I suspect that a number of you might think it's a terrible idea, because Rutgers-New Brunswick would simply gobble up all these new resources.

Whether or not that's true should turn on evidence, and the report points to none.

Thank you.

E D R E N T E Z E L A S, ESQ.: Good afternoon, Senator Cunningham, Assemblywoman Riley, and Committee members. My name is Ed Rentezalas and I am the current Chancellor of the Rutgers School of Law-Camden Alumni Association, an organization which represents over 9,000 alumni.

After Governor Christie announced his support of the UMDNJ Advisory Committee report in late January, the Alumni Association received countless communications from alumni which, almost unanimously, came out against the Committee's conclusions regarding the Rutgers-Camden campus. In response, we drafted and distributed a statement which I have provided to you.

A portion of the statement states, "The Rutgers School of Law-Camden Alumni Association has received e-mails, social network postings, and calls from alumni expressing significant concern regarding the merger proposal. We share those concerns and strongly oppose any merger of the Law School into Rowan University that will result in the loss of our Rutgers' affiliation and identity. We appreciate the thoughtful debate that is occurring across the state on how best to restructure health sciences education. We were surprised, however, to learn of the recommendation that the Law School merge into Rowan University. That recommendation

was made without consulting the affected stakeholders, including our Law School Dean, Chris (*sic*) Solomon, student leaders, and representatives of our alumni constituency. The report fails to consider the adverse impact a merger of the law school into Rowan would have on student admissions, faculty retention, and the philanthropic efforts of law school alumni to support scholarships, public interest advocacy, and legal education programs. The report also does not consider ongoing efforts by the law school to collaborate and pool resources with the Rutgers School of Law at Newark.”

Our statement called upon all alumni to contact the Rutgers Board of Trustees, the Rutgers Board of Governors, President McCormick’s office, Governor Christie’s office, and their local elected officials to express their views regarding the proposed merger.

Since that time, I have attended two alumni gatherings and the opposition to the merger has not changed since late January.

The Law School Alumni Association has given back to the Camden community by organizing events with local school children, by working with Habitat for Humanity, and, most recently, offering free general legal guidance at a local farmer’s market. It is our hope that we can continue to give back to the Camden community under the Rutgers’ banner for years to come.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

Any questions?

Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Chancellor, can you give me the operational structure of the Law School and its relationship to the University? I asked Chancellor--

MR. RENTEZELAS: Pritchett.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Pritchett, thank you -- that question prior to you. He had referred it back to you. How do you operate in terms of-- When tuition comes in for the Law School, do you handle -- like it's its own business unit that then sends funding to the University to pay for your operational costs, you know, like physical plant, things of that nature, payroll, what have you?

MR. RENTEZELAS: Assemblyman, I'm not an administrator at the Law School. I can answer some other questions that you pose about the Law School, but not that particular one.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: I guess where I'm going is, I'm just trying to determine: Is Rutgers Law School separate and apart in some way in its charter than the University? And what is the financial relationship between the two? That's all I'm looking for.

MR. RENTEZELAS: Well, I can partly address this. I mean, certainly, operationally the Law School, while enjoying a degree of autonomy that is common to law schools, does not operate, I think, quite as separately as your question suggests; although I believe Chancellor Pritchett agreed to look into that and get you more information about it.

You are correct, also, about the events in the 1950s that led to the joining of what was then the South Jersey College of Law and Rutgers. But it was a very different situation. Enrollment at the law school in 1950 was 100; and because of its financial problems, that had declined, actually,

to about 40 within a couple of years -- within a meeting or two of actually being shut down. That's a very different situation from the thriving law school of 800 students that we have today.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: No, I don't disagree with that. I'm just looking at, from the standpoint -- from the business acumen of the Law School, is the Law School the attractor of the Rutgers college, or is the college the attractor for the Law School? And are they separated by charter in their operation, in terms of maintaining separate books or what have you? Not to make it remedial, but that's what I'm looking to know. I guess I'll wait for Chancellor Pritchett to bring that back, but I'm very curious about that. And there's a reason for everything.

MR. RENTEZELAS: Sure. I'll leave to the Chancellor your second question in terms of which is the dominant attractor of students and faculty. There's no question that it's the association with Rutgers University and the imprimatur of that that makes the Law School as good as it is, and as attractive as it is. I just joined Rutgers this year after 14 years at a private law school in Virginia. An absolute key component of my decision to pack everything up and move here was the assurance as to be part of advancing legal education across Rutgers University. It was very important to me.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: I don't disagree with you. I think the Rutgers Law School is phenomenal. It's almost like a relationship of the Wharton Business School at the University of Penn. I see something of that being of a question -- whether it is the Rutgers Law School at the University of Rutgers, or could there be a Rutgers Law School at the University of Rowan? Something along that mentality. I don't know if it's

been explored; I'm just curious to see as this Committee moves forward -- to see if that is a possibility for discussion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Is that all we have?

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: That's it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

I do want to commend this audience. You are wonderful and very well behaved, even though -- I've only had to speak to you once or twice (laughter). I am very proud of you.

Next, I will be calling up Dee Jonczak, Lara Saguisag, Nicole Lister, and Joe Perella.

You can go in the order I called you.

D E E J O N C Z A K: Hi, my name is Dee Jonczak, and I'm a staff member at Rutgers-Camden.

I've been employed at Rutgers for the past 17 years. I'm a secretary for the Department of English. My husband is also a staff member at Camden. He's been there for 36 years.

We both planned on staying at Rutgers until we retired. And now with all the talk of the Rutgers-Rowan merger, we are both very worried about what our future holds.

And I've read every article pertaining to the merger and, to date, no one has given a fact-based, in-depth analysis as to how this Rutgers to Rowan change will be implemented.

And yet Governor Christie keeps saying, "This will happen." My major concern is: What is the impact on the employees at Rutgers-Camden? What happens to our jobs and our futures? And as a taxpayer in South Jersey I would like to see more, not less, educational choices. I would

like to see my grandchildren have the choice of where they go to college in South Jersey.

I thank you for your time.

L A R A S A G U I S A G: My name is -- is this on? (referring to PA microphone). Good afternoon. My name is Lara Saguisag and I'm a member of both the Rowan and Rutgers-Camden communities.

I teach as an adjunct lecturer at the Rowan English Department, and I'm also a part-time lecturer and a Ph.D. candidate in Childhood Studies at Rutgers-Camden.

I wish to thank the Higher Education Committees of the Senate and Assembly for giving us this venue to exercise our right to free speech.

I'm here to voice my opposition to the proposed merger of Rowan and Rutgers-Camden. Opposing the merger -- I want to be clear about this -- is not equivalent to opposing the development of higher education in South Jersey. What I am opposed to is the lack of any comprehensive cost-benefit analysis that should accompany a project of this magnitude. The Barer report claims that a merger will improve the state of higher education in the region, yet this 57-page document gives both Rowan and Rutgers-Camden extremely short shrift -- discussing the merger in all of two-and-a-half pages.

Proponents of the merger insist that the merger will be good for future generations of South Jersey. But the future starts here, in the present. We can only secure the future if today's questions are answered fully and honestly. Questions such as: How will the merger be funded? What impact will it have on tuition rates? What happens to the adjunct

faculty members who teach classes at both Rowan University and Rutgers-Camden? Part-time lecturers have become an important component of the university system, but we are often underpaid and have limited to no benefits. Because we cannot be given full-time status in one university, we often resort to teaching one to two classes in multiple universities. Merging Rowan and Rutgers-Camden will most likely take away teaching opportunities for many of us who have already a limited income and live on semester-to-semester contracts.

How will the merger affect the three doctoral programs and the master's in fine arts program that are currently thriving at Rutgers-Camden? Each year the Childhood Studies program, for example, accepts four students, all of whom are fully funded with four-year assistantships. Rutgers-Camden graduate students also have access to resources based in New Brunswick and Newark. We constantly utilize our comprehensive library system, cross-register for classes, and work with research centers based on other Rutgers campuses, and take advantage of a New-Brunswick fellowship writing program specifically designed for graduate students. And it was through this program that I recently secured a competitive one-year fellowship from the Library of Congress.

I would like to know what happens to our graduate students -- who actively publish, present at organized conferences, engage in community service, and consistently win national awards -- if we no longer have access to the financial and academic resources provided to us by the Rutgers University system.

The decision about the merger should be made after, not before, accurate facts and figures, and a complete study of financial and

human costs are laid out on the table for all stakeholders to see and scrutinize. I implore the Committees to reject the merger because of its lack of data and detail. I ask the Committees to assist us in creating a democratic and careful discussion about how we can ensure a better state of higher education in South Jersey. A merger that is fast-tracked and understudied is not the answer.

NICOLE LISTER: Good afternoon, legislators.

My name is Nicole Lister, and I am a proud member of the Rutgers community, especially that of Rutgers-Camden. I am a 2010 graduate of Rutgers University-Camden College of Arts and Sciences. I am also a second-year law student at Rutgers University School of Law-Camden.

Allow me to preface my testimony by saying that there are many wonderful things about Rowan University, just as there are many wonderful things about Rutgers-Camden. And I am certain that both schools wish to maintain their own separate and very strong identities. Today I am here to speak about the very strong identity of Rutgers-Camden.

We, the students, like thousands before us, chose Rutgers-Camden for its unique attributes: a world-renowned Rutgers education in an intimate classroom setting; nationally, even globally, recognized faculty -- faculty who have garnered Fulbright Scholarships, MacArthur Fellowships, and faculty whose works have even been cited by the United States Supreme Court. Our prestigious Law School is nationally ranked, and we launched the first childhood studies Ph.D. program in the nation.

To obliterate one-third of the Rutgers legacy would deprive South Jersey students of this wonderful gift. If Rowan takes over Rutgers, what will happen to those students from South Jersey who can't afford to commute to or live on campus in Newark and New Brunswick? What happens to their dream of earning a Rutgers degree? Many of those students, our best and our brightest, will escape to other competing universities in the area, especially for law school -- namely Temple, Drexel, and Penn, all who, like Rutgers, have a brand name and reputation that is marketable worldwide.

Rutgers has revived Camden City. Rutgers students live in the city; shop at the city's businesses; and many, including myself, work at firms in the city. Rutgers students give back to the city. We provide free legal assistance to Camden residents through various clinical programs, we register voters through our Voters Rights Project, we tutor and teach Camden City school children in Camden's high schools and at our very own charter school, LEAP Academy. The list of what we students and our university do for Camden City is inexhaustible. "Jersey Roots, Global Reach" -- the Rutgers slogan -- Rutgers's goal, must remain accessible to all students in New Jersey. And without Rutgers-Camden, this is impossible.

For those of us who already have a Rutgers-Camden degree, we worry that the value of our degree will dwindle with time. Unlike our Rutgers-New Brunswick and Rutgers-Newark brethren, there will be no growing alumni base for us that we can continue to tap into, no faculty for us to reference, no school for us to go back to. Rutgers University would be gone for us.

To be clear, we students support more higher educational opportunities in South Jersey. (fire alarm sounds)

May I briefly conclude? (laughter)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Yes.

MS. LISTER: To be clear, we students support more higher educational opportunities in South Jersey. Whether South Jersey students aspire to obtain a Rutgers degree or choose to pursue a Rowan degree, they should be given the opportunity that they already have -- the option to attend Rowan University or Rutgers University -- and that option should not be taken away.

Thank you. (applause)

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: This is a fire alarm, so we're going to ask everyone to leave the room.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: It's a fire alarm. We should leave the room.

It's a malfunction. It is not a fire alarm, it is a malfunction. You may return to your seats.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: This is a malfunction. Everything is taken care of. Please come back in the room.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Nicole, are you comfortable with finishing?

MS. LISTER: Sure.

Thank you, Assemblywoman Riley. I appreciate it.

To be clear, we students support more higher educational opportunities in South Jersey. Whether South Jersey students aspire to obtain a Rutgers degree or choose to pursue a Rowan degree, they should be

given an opportunity that they already have -- the option to attend Rowan University or Rutgers University, and that option should not be taken away.

Thank you.

J O E P E R E L L A: Thank you.

I would like to begin today by thanking both the Chairs and the committees of the Senate and Assembly for affording me the opportunity to speak today.

My name is Joe Perella. I am a senior here at Rowan University studying biological sciences. I am also a member of the Rowan Student Government Association's Executive Board, and a resident of southern New Jersey.

When I was preparing--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Joe, can I interrupt you?

MR. PERELLA: Sure.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: And a proud student of my CCD class.

MR. PERELLA: Yes, I am; yes. (laughter) Class of 2004.

When I was preparing to speak here today, I began by reading many news articles and the UMDNJ Advisory Committee report. And what I was able to learn about this merger is there are many unknowns. The Committee report only made a recommendation and did not provide a blueprint on how to make the merger happen. We do not yet know what these schools could look like, how much this could cost, or how long a merger could take, and, most importantly, if it will even happen. And so

I'm not going to talk about what I and many others don't know, but what I do.

I do know Rowan University. As a student here, I have learned over the last seven semesters that Rowan has a very long, illustrious history, one that has included some very large changes and accomplishments. This school simply started as a normal school to train teachers here in southern New Jersey. Over time it has expanded to include a diverse and strong undergraduate and graduate program. Even within the last few years, Rowan has continued to grow and change by adding the new medical school and continuing the work on the Rowan Boulevard project. Also in my time here at Rowan, I have met many great people, from students to administrators, faculty, and staff. And I am confident that whatever faces Rowan in the future, we will take it in stride.

I also know South Jersey. I have been a resident of Cumberland County my whole life, and my family has called the county home for more than 100 years. I know that the county and region has not been as strong in the past 20 years as it was in the decades prior. I can say that the region needs a boost, both academically and economically. When I see numbers that show Cumberland County as one of the poorest and least educated counties in the state, I want to see something done to correct this. If, to correct these numbers, changes must be made to Rowan, I can support it as long as the education of current and future students is not compromised. I understand that changes will need to occur for the school to grow, as it has in the past, and that I shouldn't let my love of Rowan as it is stop me from accepting what future greatness it could achieve.

I would now like to comment about the recent conversations regarding the names of each institution involved with the merger. We all obviously feel very strongly about the name of the university that we attend or work. But I caution that we shouldn't overvalue a name. A name is just a reflection of the great work of students past and present, and the commitment of a university's faculty and administration. In essence, we define the name, the name does not define us. If it is determined that a merger should go through that would benefit both South Jersey and college students at both schools, the potential loss of a name as a result of the merger will not change anything about the people here and their accomplishments. Whatever new institution is created, it would bring with it the success of both previous institutions and the potential for a strong future.

Finally, my comments here today may have sounded like I am in favor of a merger, but I would like to make it clear that I am, right now, only open to a merger or other possible solutions, and I urge that others also take this approach. I would only be in support of a merger if I feel that all groups -- staff, faculty, administration, and students -- from both universities were properly sought out and included in this process. I above all else hope that, whatever comes out of this discussion we are having, a strong -- excuse me, will end up with a stronger South Jersey, both economically and academically.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you.

Any questions?

Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This is actually for Lara. Since you have a working relationship with both institutions, as an employee at both-- And in just general terms of your experience -- the pay scales. How do they compare one to the other? Is one higher than the other? Are they similar?

MS. SAGUISAG: I would say-- I'm actually pretty-- I feel privileged to be working for both universities. And I did not-- I just want to be clear that when -- in stating, like, these numbers I'm not denigrating one university over the other.

But I teach three credits here at Rowan University and make \$3,600. At Rutgers University, I teach three credits and I earn \$4,500.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: I'm pleased that you would actually answer me that quite frankly, because I think that's something that we as a Committee need to know as this progresses, if it progresses.

I want to make it clear that I believe the reasons for these hearings is for all of us to gain information as to the impacts before we make any decisions. I don't think there is any preconceived notion on any of our parts. But we do need to know that information, going forward, as to what the costs will be or how it will work if it is integrated. So I thank you for answering me.

MS. SAGUISAG: Thank you for asking that question.

MS. LISTER: I know that there has been a question about the Law School, and it was Assemblyman Brown who asked. While I don't presume to be an administrator -- I am not -- I will tell you that as a student, the Rutgers University School of Law-Camden is an integral part of Rutgers University-Camden. And, in fact, our financial aid, our grades are

linked to New Brunswick. So I cannot get my own financial aid from Rutgers School of Law-Camden. So, if anything, money is very much tied to the greater university. It's not autonomous in that way.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Assemblyman Giblin.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Ms. Lister, do you understand what would happen, hypothetically, if the Rutgers-Camden Law School name was disbanded? What are the implications as far as accreditation or standing among other law schools in the country?

MS. LISTER: There are great, and tremendous, earth-shattering implications. (laughter) In fact, some of my fellow students who are just coming up at Rutgers University School of Law-Camden may not even be able to sit for the Bar if the school loses its accreditation. And accreditation is granted by the American Bar Association. It is nontransferable to other schools. So if Rutgers University School of Law-Camden became Rowan University School of Law-Camden, the accreditation is not transferrable and can take up to five years if it is lost. So, in fact, those students would not be able to sit for the Bar.

For me, myself, personally -- my degree would not be worth as -- it would not be as comparable to Rutgers University School of Law-Newark because my school would no longer exist; the alumni base is not there, the faculty will not be there.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: After law school-- I mean, I can tell by your -- you're very bullish on Camden. Do you intend to practice in the City of Camden after graduation?

MS. LISTER: I currently work at a law firm in the City of Camden. Yes, around the area.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: If you had not gone to Rutgers-Camden Law School, where would you have gone -- out of state?

MS. LISTER: Yes, I would have gone to-- I applied to Temple, Drexel, and Rutgers University. If I had not heard back from Rutgers University or, God forbid, they didn't accept me, I would have gone to Temple.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: It would have been our loss.

MS. LISTER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Okay, we're now going to call Elizabeth Kilborn, Erin Kerr, Bill Whitlow, and Timothy Farrow.

(recorder malfunction)

E L I Z A B E T H K I L B O R N: Hello, everyone.

My name is Liz Kilborn, and I am one of the students of the College of Arts and Sciences at Rutgers University-Camden. All my peers who are here are doing an excellent job defending the reasons against the merger. However, I am going to take this opportunity to talk to any Rowan students, faculty, and staff who are present.

To all the Rowans students, faculty, and staff, I want to apologize to you on behalf of the Rutgers University student body for the negative dialogue which accompanied the very first reactions to the merger proposal issued by Governor Christie.

The threat of having your identity, existence, and everything you've worked toward getting dissolved would ignite extreme passion and outrage with anybody. After the dust settled and the blood pressures dropped from the initial reaction of the proposed merger, many of us

realized we did not fully understand the facts, or lack of facts, establishing this proposal. Again, we could not reiterate enough, we apologize for the negative comments reflecting your school, and we hope to move forward toward a more positive and productive dialogue between both student bodies.

Rowan University is an amazing university. Your engineering and teaching programs, not to mention your athletic programs, are highly esteemed, prestigious, and known nationwide.

On paper, this proposal looks amazing for you. Rowan would stand to gain a law school, a business school, and a brand new, \$55 million graduate housing building. However, just like anything else in life, we need to look at the fine print of any deal because nothing is ever as good as it seems. The fine print doesn't tell you that this proposal may have huge monetary detriments to Rowan students. Do you understand that this merger will potentially cost millions of dollars? The Governor has been refusing to increase taxes, so who do you think is going to pay for this merger? You will pay for it through your tuition. The conservative estimates, that I've received through our faculty who have done numerous research on this, is estimating your tuition may -- like I say, may, go up \$5,000 to \$8,000.

In high school we all had the choice of where we wanted to go to college. We may have applied to one or numerous schools. The point is, we had options. Our younger brothers, sisters, neighbors, future students we don't even know will be stripped of their right to choose between multiple competitive college universities in South Jersey. Supporting the

merger means you support fewer higher educational options for the future students of South Jersey.

There is a way for both Rowan and Rutgers to not only exist, but for both universities to expand and complement each other through a consortium model where we would share resources. Not only will this leave both identities and institutions in South Jersey, it is simply more monetarily feasible.

Please, Rowan students, faculty, and staff, and legislators -- please read and understand the lack of information proposed in this merger and the threat this poses not only to South Jersey, but to the entire State of New Jersey's higher educational system. Please do not take this merger at face value, and take the opportunity to educate yourself on the fine print and how this will affect you.

Thank you.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

ERIN KERR: Good afternoon.

My name is Erin Kerr, and I'm here today first as a voting citizen in New Jersey; and second as a member of the Arts and Sciences School at Rutgers-Camden, and a member of the University Senate at Rutgers, at large.

It is true. We have higher education problems in South Jersey. You've heard about those today. I'm not going to go through them again. They're in my paper.

Everyone can agree on the fact that we need help in South Jersey for higher education. But the proposal to merge Rutgers-Camden with Rowan University will not provide that help. South Jersey is supposed

to get a university, with this proposal, that might have a world-renowned research staff, a medical school, a business school, an engineering school, a law school, and a ground-breaking Ph.D. program in childhood studies. We've heard about all of that earlier. This new school might double the size of collegiate seats in South Jersey, it might attract out-of-state students, and it might compete with Rutgers-New Brunswick for research grants. It just might keep students from going over the bridge for an education -- and then never returning. It might.

All of these possibilities are positive, however they are just that: possibilities. Nothing guarantees that merging these two institutions, which have different student demographics, academic goals, histories, would make a functioning, competitive school. This new school would have to compete with Rutgers-New Brunswick, an established research university with a medical school, large endowment, and over a million alumni worldwide. It would have to compete with Temple, Penn State, University of Delaware, and all the other out-of-state schools that the already established programs are already competing with. Cooper Medical School is a brand new medical school, and attracting students will be difficult, at least for the near future. Integrating the Law School into Rowan University would cause it to lose its accreditation, and regaining it could take years. The loss of a law school with a top 100 national ranking alone should discourage this proposal.

Some things are guaranteed by this proposal though. New Jersey taxpayers, like myself and I assume many of you, will have to pay for it. A change this astronomical does not happen without a cost. And if it does not come out of our pockets, I would like to know where it will come from. Also, students in South Jersey, particularly those who are considered

nontraditional, will not only lose the ability to obtain a degree from their state university, but they will lose the ability to choose the kind of higher education they receive. This merger would rob students in South Jersey of the choice, without a doubt. Another guarantee is that this merger cannot be successful overnight. Professors do not come with this merger, students do not come with this merger, research grants do not come with this merger. A research university must gain its respect, and this new school will not have that kind of accreditation. A university cannot be made great simply because an elected official says it is.

The message of the Advisory Committee's report is clear: create better opportunities for students in South Jersey. The way suggested will almost certainly not create those opportunities. If this merger happens, South Jersey will lose a research university -- we are a research university -- and access to its multimillion dollar library system. Students in South Jersey will lose their choice. That is South Jersey losing opportunities. As a lifetime resident of South Jersey, I am here to tell you that we cannot afford to lose all of that because of some possibilities. We need a consortium.

Thank you.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

J. W. WHITLOW JR.: Good afternoon, Senator Cunningham, Assemblywoman Riley, members of the Higher Education committees of the Senate and the Assembly, distinguished faculty, guests, and students.

My name is Bill Whitlow. I'm a professor of Psychology at Rutgers University in Camden. I have received over \$2 million in funding from the National Institute of Health and the National Science Foundation during the time I've been at Rutgers in Camden. And I would like to speak

to you today about my knowledge of the realities of research funding in medical and higher education in New Jersey. As a resident of South Jersey, I'm also very concerned about opportunities for education and for research.

Much of the discussion of the past two months -- at least that I've heard -- has involved sound bytes and speculation. And there are claims, for example, that reorganizing higher education, medical education will lead to significant increases in Federal funding. What I would like to do is present some facts and context regarding Federal funding for research and medical education, based on data from 2011 from the National Institute of Health and the National Science Foundation, the nation's principal sources of research funding for science and medicine. The packet I have provided you with provides details about the facts I am going to review.

What national data show are that more funding goes to states with more people. That makes a certain amount of sense. In the case of NSF, the data show that New Jersey is average in funding, adjusted for the size of the population. What we need to know is who gets these grants in New Jersey, and so we need to look at the NSF data for institutions. And when we do that, it turns out that the funding for institutions depends upon the number of full-time faculty. That also makes sense. So we need to make adjustments in assessing research capabilities of our institutions in terms of faculty size.

When we make those adjustments and look at the amount of research funding of the two institutions in New Jersey adjusted for faculty size, what we find is that Rutgers, Princeton, NJIT, Stevens, and Rider do better than average for their size. Rowan, on the other hand, does less well

than any school except UMDNJ. What Rowan does well is funding for science education. They are well above average in the funding they get from the National Science Foundation for science education. In other words, Rutgers-Camden is a good research university and Rowan is a good teaching university. Whatever steps are taken regarding higher education, we should make sure the separate strengths of these institutions are reinforced and not weakened.

The second point I wanted to make is about medical research funding. There has been a lot of discussion about the reorganization proposed by the Barer Committee leading to an infusion of Federal funding for medical research. With respect to the takeover of Rutgers-Camden by Rowan, for example, claims have been made about creating a world-class university in South Jersey. Those claims are not supported by facts.

Since my time is up, I will thank you for your (indiscernible).

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

TIMOTHY FARROW, ESQ.: Good afternoon, Madam Chairs, distinguished members of the Committee.

My name is Tim Farrow. I'm a 1999 graduate of the Law School in Camden, and I currently serve as the Treasurer of the Rutgers University Alumni Association, which is the university-wide alumni association. Formerly I was the Chancellor of the Law School Alumni Association, completing my term in 2008.

And what I'd like to start in my discussion with is what was referenced. And, Madam Chair, it was in the press -- in the paper. So if it's not accurate, I would certainly like you to correct me or elaborate any further. But there was a reference to the Governor's ability to sign the

executive order for reorganization and the fact that he has the legal authority to do it. So in your role as the Committee -- is to take in this information and then further advise.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: I am -- I go back and forth on this one, so I don't actually have any -- actually clear -- what -- direction on what's going to happen. I was -- have been told that -- initially that this could be a reorganization by the Governor. I then get information that possibly, "No, it's going to have to come through the Legislature." But I still don't have one firm, "This is what is going to happen, and this is what we're doing." So that's why we're doing these hearings. One, if it is a reorg by the Governor, we would like to be able to present the information that we gain from the hearings to the Governor so that if something does happen through his Office that it is in a positive moment -- movement, without us always fighting on this issue. If it comes through the Legislature, then we can work on it, can't we? But right now that's where we are headed.

MR. FARROW: And that's exactly what I wanted to only briefly address; because you're, of course, not in the position, as the court, to ultimately rule on this issue. But I think it would be helpful to briefly provide what I feel is the research behind this issue as to which direction this must go legally. And that is for it to come through the Legislature. And that's based upon what I'm sure most of you, in your position as legislators, are familiar with -- the 1994 Act on the restructuring of higher education in the State of New Jersey.

And in that Act -- which the findings are very clear when that act was voted upon and finalized by the Legislature -- was that it was with a goal to restructure higher education and provide the independence that is

necessary for the universities within -- especially in this case, Rutgers University -- to have, to effectively govern. And when it restructured higher education throughout the state in dismantling the Department of Education (*sic*) on the State level, and formulating the council that would then replace it, it brought the universities specifically within the control of what happens with higher education in this state. And most importantly, in that act itself, of course, is the subsection that says that any entity which has been restructured through this Act is not subject to the executive order for reorganization. It's specifically laid out in the statute. And since then, of course, we've had the COAH decision that recently came down. And in my view, and the view of many other colleagues at the Law School -- the faculty, of course -- that decision is right on point. (timer sounds)

If I could just finish, because that question kind of--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Go, please.

MR. FARROW: --is right on point, in that what they found in that decision -- the Appellate Division -- is that COAH was formed by legislation which, again, specifically gave the Council on Affordable Housing their own discretion, and therefore did not allow for the Governor, through executive order, to reorganize or, in this case, abolish COAH. That is right in line with what we're talking about here. So that's why we're saying the power is in the hands of the Legislature, and we ask that you, of course, utilize that.

If I could make just a couple other brief remarks because of the break within the testimony.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Go ahead.

MR. FARROW: As I said, I'm a 1999 graduate of the Law School in Camden. And there has been a lot already laid out in terms of what this would do specifically to the Law School, in addition to Rutgers-Camden as a whole. And that is, of course, that it's been a top-tier law school for all its years now, basically, in formation. And this would strip it, of course, of that and allow -- force it to go through reaccreditation and all of those things. But it's not -- as the question was posed by Assemblyman Brown earlier -- its own individual school that could just be taken out. It cannot be. Legally, within the school there is no board of trustees, there's no board of governors that exists independently within the Law School. There are only those two boards that exist at Rutgers University level. So the Law School does not have the authority to separate itself and take the Rutgers name with it. And without that name-- And, again, it's been spoken about on several occasions today. It's not simply the name, it's what has been built over the years in terms of that name. And that's the same thing for the Law School, in terms of it being that research university and that quality that it's brought to the Law School over these years.

And in addition to that, as a member of the university-wide Alumni Association -- which has only existed now for four years -- all the Law School alumni are now members of that university-wide Alumni Association. So there have been incredible efforts at the university level to make sure that they're brought in -- the alumni of the Law School, Rutgers-Camden -- all within a unified body. They have marketed that, and they've stressed it immensely over the last four years through that Alumni Association being formed and other aspects of the university. So they've not only had that reputation as the Rutgers brand since the inception of the

Law School, but it's been something that has been greatly enhanced by really bringing it within a united university.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you.

Any questions?

Assemblyman Brown.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Tim and I know each other very well. He is my lawyer. (laughter)

MR. FARROW: No comment.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: No comment.

Just one question for you: When you graduated from the Law School, what was the yearly tuition, and what is it today?

MR. FARROW: I think I know where you're going with this, and I agree with you 100 percent -- in guessing where you're going with this. It was only in the eights when I went. But I can give you a very concrete example. My wife graduated five years later from the Law School. And when I first got her student loan payments, I literally turned to her and said, "What did you spend all this money on when you went to law school? How can you have over double the amount of loans I had just five years earlier?" So I understand the tuition has skyrocketed, it's continued to. And I understand the basic concept behind this whole proposal that we need to do something to trim the operational costs of these universities in this state. I absolutely agree with you 100 percent.

But what I'm asking this Committee to do is consider not throwing it all away in terms of the investment in these two universities by gambling on this proposal, when very -- *easily* is not the appropriate word --

but in a much safer fashion, transition through some kind of relationship, whether it's just the consortium or it's something expanded beyond that. But there is an opportunity here to take advantage of where we are at with this very engaged discussion and do something. But the something I'm asking is not the extreme gamble. The something is in the middle. And if that does not work, we transition to the next step. But that's what makes sense here. It's common sense, but it's financial sense also for this state.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: And I agree with you wholeheartedly. And I think we're all here to figure out what is the most efficient way of delivering education.

You said your wife graduated five years after you, and that's 2005?

MR. FARROW: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: So what is it today compared to when you graduated? It's double?

MR. FARROW: It's at least double, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: At least double.

MR. FARROW: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: So when we take into consideration efficiency within higher education, we have to take into consideration, to your point, the cost that we -- if we don't capture this-- The State will not have a choice but to continue to underfund higher education unless something is done. And as we vet this process through, I hope to God in my lifetime, for my kids who are 10 years old, that we have this in a situation where I can afford for them to go to school. Because the

disparity between those who are getting higher education and those who are not continues to grow in leaps and bounds.

I was a Freeholder in Burlington County. I was the liaison to Burlington County College for three years. And I can tell you right now, the economic prosperity that education brings is second to none. That's why I'm so passionate to figure out the way it should be delivered for our children's children. Because the way it's going now, the funding capacity that's available to the State -- and to what is going on in education -- will continue to dwindle, and the cost will continue to go up. And if we don't harness this and provide better opportunity, less kids will get the opportunity that you have, and that you have, and that you have, or even I did. And I went to The College of New Jersey. The year I was graduating they changed it to The College of New Jersey. I understood. But if I look back now and see those changes that occurred, the College is second -- is one of the top schools in the country for best buys.

So this is a great day. I think that you have handled this unbelievably well, and I think the audience has done great in delivering so much information. And we will continue, as a Committee -- or joint committee -- to work together to deliver a report to the Governor to where we think our educational opportunities should go toward.

So thank you very much.

MR. FARROW: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: You're going to become one of my favorite Assemblymen. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN BROWN: Look to your left.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Assemblywoman Wagner.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WAGNER: Thank you very much, Chairwoman.

I apologize for being late, but I was at an event in North Jersey before I made my way here. And I sat in on the first hearing. I have read everything that has come my way, including all of the e-mails. And at first I wondered why we were doing this. If it's to strengthen the opportunities for our students, that all sounds great for me. If it's to cut down on administrative costs, I can somewhat understand that. But I feel that, as a member of this Committee, I would like to know all the facts first and then decide on a plan. And I feel the plan came before the facts, and that's what I am struggling with.

Now, if I have any decision-making -- which I don't think -- I'm not so sure I do -- executive order versus the legislative branch. And I would hope that if anything comes out of these hearings it is that somebody is reading all of this stuff other than us, including the Governor's Office. Hopefully he is seeing that this is not such an easy plan to implement.

I also am a graduate of The College of New Jersey, and I was there when it was Trenton State. But to me, that I see differently because that was one institution. This I see as two separate institutions and almost as a land grab. So I do have my reservations. But I want to make sure that college education is affordable. So my way of thinking is going shared services, consortium. Can we do a better job with that? Because I know Rowan people love Rowan, Rutgers people love Rutgers, and I get that. But if we can share services and do that without destroying the name and what each school stands for, and certainly the accreditation, that will be what I am for.

So, listen, the lawyers who are out there -- I guess it will be your decision as to what's legal and what's not legal. I am not a lawyer. But I do appreciate hearing everything that everybody has had to say.

Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Assemblyman Coughlin.

ASSEMBLYMAN COUGHLIN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just quickly: I don't pretend to know how Rutgers is structured corporately. You indicated that Rutgers-Camden is not separate and apart. It is not a separate corporate entity from the rest of the university. Does the Legislature have the authority to require Rutgers to do something with their assets, or are they a separate corporate entity with their own rights?

MR. FARROW: Right. Well, that dates back to the 1956 Act, which gives the Board of Trustees and the Board of Governors of Rutgers University the voting power in terms of releasing any financial assets. So the answer to that question would--

ASSEMBLYMAN COUGHLIN: They obtained that power from the Legislature.

MR. FARROW: Correct. So, I mean, the other answer -- could you--

ASSEMBLYMAN COUGHLIN: And we can take it away?
(laughter)

MR. FARROW: That, I believe, would be within power, as exercised in the 1994 Act, in terms of restructuring in terms of the Legislature's power. There's potentially power to influence. But as of now, until that law changes--

ASSEMBLYMAN COUGHLIN: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

Next we'll hear from Daniel Hart, Mark Showers, Naomi Nelson, and James Schwarzwald.

I guess the others left.

State your name.

J A M E S J. S C H W A R Z W A L D E R: My name is James Schwarzwald. I'm from Lindenwold, New Jersey. I'm retired. I spent 40 years in the field of public transportation.

I'm grateful to the Committee, to State legislators, governors, and Rutgers boards for establishing and funding Rutgers-Camden.

I received my B.A. degree in 1969 from Rutgers-Camden. Small then, today Rutgers-Camden enrolls about 6,000 students.

My wife graduated with a B.A. degree from Rutgers-Camden in 1970. Soon thereafter she traveled to Newark and passed all parts of the Certified Public Accounting exam. There were not many women CPAs in 1970. Our Rutgers-Camden degrees gave us equality with other Rutgers graduates. Getting a meaningful job or an advanced degree often hinges on the college that confers your undergraduate degree.

Following my service in the U.S. Army, my wife and I enrolled in Texas A&M University and received master's degrees in 1973. My mother, now deceased, received her B.A. degree from Rutgers-Camden in 1986 at the age of 72. Rutgers-Camden serves many nontraditional students.

The famous U.S. Supreme Court *Brown v. The Board of Education* decision ruled that separate but equal public education violated the Constitution. The proposed merger or *shotgun* marriage of Rowan

University and Rutgers-Camden would create a discriminatory, separate but unequal, condition. Future Camden graduates would not be Rutgers graduates, thereby lacking equality with New Brunswick and Newark graduates.

Most students at Rutgers-Camden are commuters. Many full-time students hold part-time jobs, and many having full-time jobs are part-time students. The High Speed Line, River Line, and New Jersey TRANSIT buses serve those who cannot afford to live in dormitories, eat meals away from home, or own cars.

I was proud that the Rutgers boards did not acquiesce to former Governor McGreevy's merger proposals. Today you will hear many good ideas to expand and improve research and higher education. These ideas will support the new Cooper/Rowan Medical School. Rutgers-Camden has been underfunded, but an undernourished patient needs nutrition, not amputation.

The Osteopathic Medical School in Stratford, with 520 students, will remain part of a realigned and renamed New Jersey Health Sciences University. Protect our State university, save Rutgers-Camden.

Thank you.

MARK SHOWERS: Good afternoon.

Thank you for coming to Rowan to listen to our concerns about higher education in South Jersey.

I'm Mark Showers, and I've lived in South Jersey since 1968. I started with Glassboro State College in 1980 and have witnessed the changes as we grew to become Rowan University.

In 1992, Mr. Henry Rowan recognized the need for increased access to engineering education in South Jersey and created serious change with his gift of \$100 million to start an engineering college. Some of you may remember the concerns that were raised by Glassboro State College graduates as their history and traditions were challenged by the name change to Rowan College. Fortunately, the swift completion of Rowan Hall and the admission of the first of over 1,000 engineering graduates quickly proved that history and tradition are only enhanced by the growth of what was soon to become a university.

We are now faced by an even greater need for increased access to higher education in South Jersey. Every year, tens of thousands of New Jersey high school graduates have to leave the state in order to obtain a college education. Every year I receive calls from relatives, friends, and anyone else who learns that I work at Rowan, asking if there is anything I can do to help their students gain admission to Rowan. They know instinctively that if their child leaves the state, they too often do not return to New Jersey after graduation. Friends who work at Rutgers-Camden and Stockton tell me that they also receive these calls. It would not be helpful to advise the callers to contact their legislators and ask for their help in expanding the number of seats available in South Jersey for their qualified applying students. The State has not been able to afford to fund increased access to higher education for the past several years.

Rutgers-Camden has done great work in helping to revitalize Camden. Rowan University has also done great work in helping to revitalize Camden and Glassboro. The incremental changes that we both have been able to effect are not nearly enough. The need is for sweeping

change that will affect the entire region of South Jersey. The need for revitalization is equally great in our shore communities, in Bridgeton, Millville, Salem, Vineland, Hammonton, Greenwich, and all of the many small towns in South Jersey.

We need to clearly define our mission of increasing access to higher education for our children, and creating an economic engine for the South Jersey region so that jobs will be available for them upon graduation.

We need to build upon our history and traditions by joining together to create a research university in South Jersey that will answer these needs. The addition of our resources will create something much greater than what we can accomplish individually. Please help us grow to meet the needs of all of South Jersey by moving to create a new combined university that will truly meet the needs of the entire region.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Do we have any questions? (no response)

Thank you very much.

Next, Lynne Vallone, Howard Marchitello, William D. Brown, and J.T. Barbarese.

I am so bad today. (referring to pronunciation) I apologize.

L Y N N E V A L L O N E, Ph.D.: Shall I start?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Absolutely.

DR. VALLONE: Okay. Good afternoon. Thanks to all of you for hosting this event.

My name is Lynne Vallone. I'm a professor in the Childhood Studies Department at Rutgers-Camden. I have a brief statement and a short question.

I stand with the faculty, administrators, students, staff, and alumni of Rutgers-Camden in strong opposition to the takeover of our campus by Rowan University. I believe that the severing of Rutgers-Camden from Rutgers University will result in grave losses in choice and opportunity for both graduate and undergraduate students of South Jersey.

In particular, I would like to speak to a significant loss that will affect the best and brightest of our undergraduate students, a loss of opportunity that has not been widely spoken about in the context of this ill-advised takeover plan: eligibility for election to Phi Beta Kappa, the oldest and most distinguished academic honor society for undergraduate students of the liberal arts and sciences.

Students at Rutgers-Camden are eligible for consideration for Phi Beta Kappa through the Alpha chapter at Rutgers-New Brunswick. Rowan University does not have a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. New chapters, granted to the full-time faculty of an institution -- not the institution itself -- are difficult to obtain. At least 10 percent of the full-time arts and sciences faculty must be Phi Beta Kappa members in order to apply for a charter. This application process is lengthy, stringent, and expensive, occurring on an triennial basis.

As a proud member of Phi Beta Kappa, I am loathe to anticipate a future in which the students of South Jersey will no longer have access to this emblem of strong achievement and strong potential. Only approximately 10 percent of American colleges and universities have

membership in Phi Beta Kappa. Rutgers University is one of them, Rowan University is not.

Please keep Rutgers University in South Jersey for the good of all of our students, including the most academically gifted among them. That's my statement.

Now I have a short question: When I left a major research university in Texas -- shout out to the Aggies -- to come to Rutgers-Camden five years ago to help establish the nation's first Ph.D. program in Childhood Studies, my tenure and rank as full professor did not transfer with me. I earned tenure and my rank at Rutgers University. My question is this: If the takeover occurs, as the Governor insists that it will, and Rutgers-Camden ceases to exist, who is going to fire me from Rutgers University, and on what grounds?

Thank you.

HOWARD MARCHITELLO, Ph.D.: Good afternoon.

My name is Howard Marchitello, and I'm a member of the Rutgers-Camden English Department and currently the Associate Dean of the Graduate School.

Before joining the Rutgers faculty in 2007, I was on the faculty of Texas A&M University for 17 years, where I served as the Associate Graduate Director and then Graduate Director of one of the nation's largest M.A.- and Ph.D.-granting English departments. I was also a member of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's multi-year Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate.

I have two brief points today.

First, my years of experience in graduate education have taught me a number of crucial lessons. Most importantly, I know -- and higher education professionals know -- that a university's status as a research institution is directly linked to its track record in graduate training. This is explicitly the case when earning AAU membership. And graduate student enrollment, especially at the doctoral level, is largely a function of a university's reputational standing among its national and international peers. There is no gubernatorial or legislative act that can confer reputational standing in higher education. Such reputations are the result of decades or, indeed, centuries of success in advanced graduate training, and many decades of state support and investment, and cannot be manufactured.

The suggestion that the loss of Rutgers-Camden to Rowan will produce a new research university in South Jersey is deeply flawed. There are no short cuts, nor has there been, as other people have said today, a single instance in the history of American higher education in which a state has allowed the dismantling of its flagship state university.

My second point: There have been statements by some supporters of the takeover to suggest that Rutgers-Camden faculty who are opposed to the Rowan takeover are afraid of change, and we've heard patronizing condescension offered in the guise of advice. Change, we are told, is hard and can be upsetting, or we're sometimes told we're being emotional. We reject this out of hand. As teachers and researchers we are, in fact, dedicated to change, for what is education and what is research except the intellectual pursuit of change: the generation and spread of new knowledge. This proudly is our business, but only when what we are

pursuing is positive change. What we are opposed to is change for change's sake, or the embracing of negative change. While it is true that South Jersey needs a greater share of the State's higher education dollars, I cannot accept that the proposed fix to the situation, which would dismantle the region's already successful research institution, represents positive change.

I would urge members of the Legislature to set aside this politically motivated recommendation of the Barer report and embrace instead the ready and easy way to improve higher education in South Jersey: grow and develop both Rutgers-Camden and Rowan University, encourage meaningful collaboration, and support the missions of these two independent institutions.

Thanks very much.

WILLIAM D. BROWN, SR.: Good afternoon to the members of the Senate Higher Education Committee and the Assembly Higher Education Committee.

My name is William D. Brown. I am the Vice President of Rutgers University-Camden Alumni Association -- we represent 45,000 alum -- Secretary Treasurer of the Rutgers University Veterans Association, and past president of Rutgers-Camden Alumni Crew. And on behalf of those organizations I welcome you to South Jersey -- and the opportunity to share our grave concerns concerning the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey Advisory Committee's final report.

My preference would have been to invite you to Rutgers-Camden and perhaps to the boathouse -- awesome. Unfortunately, that's not the case.

On a personal note, I served in the U.S. Air Force. I graduated from Rutgers-Camden with a degree in accounting, and I have an MBA at Monmouth University; and have spent the last 25 years serving New Jersey government as a Fiscal Resource Manager and Supervising Administrative Analyst for New Jersey, committed -- a lifetime commitment to improving our government. I have managed your cash resources and drafted your State plan amendments for Food Stamps, Welfare, Energy Assistance, hospital reimbursement, Mental Health, RTC and DDD facility rate reimbursements.

I have read and re-read the final report, and I am unable to understand why anyone, including our Governor, has stated that this is the document that he's basing his decision on to terminate our beloved Rutgers-Camden. This document contains no substance, lacks independence, is misleading, and its all-or-none conclusion serves no meaningful purpose that I can decipher. The only facts given in the entire report were the respective numbers of the students and the employees of the respective universities.

On a personal note, as a veteran, with the loss of Rutgers-Camden, I have concerns for those veterans who will follow me who wish to attend Rutgers. Rutgers-Camden is currently the only Rutgers campus participating in the service members' Opportunity College Consortium. This is a vital program that significantly aids in the reintegration and transition process for our returning veterans. If you're not aware of this, what this means is, credits that you earned while serving your country -- some of these credits, after you take a test, will be transferrable.

The report supports the education vision of New Jersey's two most powerful politicians. I know at Rutgers-Camden we're dealing with a stacked deck. I can't tell you how many people have approached me on a personal and professional level and said, "Bill, why are you fighting this?" I'm fighting this as my son fought it. We fight for what we believe is the right thing.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: You're going to have to begin to wrap up, sir.

MR. BROWN: I'm sorry.

Well, I will wrap up with this: Assemblyman Brown pointed out his concerns with efficiency in government, and particularly with our universities. I agree. I have dedicated my life to implementing proficiencies in change in our government. But this proposal, as presented, will do nothing but increase additional cost.

The last two governors, Governors Corzine and Christie, have both drastically reduced our higher education funds, and now we're going to-- The proposal is to increase that funding but without a plan, without impact statements.

Thank you.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

J. T. BARBARESE, Ph.D.: I want to thank the members of the Committee.

My name is J.T. Barbarese, and I'm an associate professor of English at Rutgers-Camden.

My colleagues already detailed some of the incongruities and the complexities of the proposed takeover. So I wanted to mention a tiny implication of this event that has not happened yet.

I am the Editor of one of two literary magazines published by Rutgers University, the magazine *Story Quarterly*, whose headquarters is at Rutgers-Camden, and two copies of which I have circulated with the Committee in lieu of the 15 copies of what I'm about to say to you.

I want to tell you briefly a story. *Story Quarterly* was acquired by my university in 2007. It has been editorially overseen by me and an editorial board that includes writers of national reputation, including Jayne Anne Phillips, our colleague at Newark; and Lauren Grodstein, our colleague at Rutgers-Camden.

More pointedly, it is financially administered and managed by Rutgers-Camden. *Story Quarterly* has been in continuous existence for four years. When it became the property of Rutgers-Camden five years ago, it was understood to be under the stewardship of Rutgers-Camden and no other institution. There was, at the time, no hint that it might become the property of another institution. And our guarantee that it would remain part of Rutgers-Camden was emphatically part of the acquisition agreement.

Immediately after we acquired *Story Quarterly*, we received a financial gift from Mr. Rich Aregood, a Pulitzer Prize winning journalist and a Rutgers-Camden alumnus. The donation of \$50,000 was to underwrite publication over five years of the magazine, which would be matched, dollar for dollar, by contributions from my department chair and from my dean.

For an institutionally affiliated journal, this is a windfall. Last month, following the Board of Governors meeting on my campus, I spoke

with our donor by phone about his gift. He said, and I paraphrase, he would not write a check until he knew whether to write it to his alma mater, Rutgers-Camden, or to Rowan. And when I pressed him about this, it was clear that he felt no obligation to continue with his commitment to a journal no longer overseen by his beneficiary, his alma mater, but by another institution.

I hope you see the problem. *Story Quarterly* is an acorn on the forest floor in all of this. But sometimes it's necessary to see the oak in the acorn. The implications of this process, and how the process thus far has caused confusion at every level -- the result of what Senate President Sweeney a little while ago called a concept without a plan.

Thank you.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Are there any questions by the Committee? (no response)

Thank you.

We'll now have William T. FitzGerald, Hyun Seo -- and I hope I pronounced that right -- Karen Siefring, and Phillip Lewis.

Please begin, Mr. FitzGerald.

WILLIAM T. FITZGERALD, Ph.D.: Thank you, Madam Chairs and Committee members. Thank you for holding these meetings.

There's a saying, "It is easy to praise Athens among the Athenians." I take this easy road to praise Rowan and to state that it is time for Rowan to be a major university in the region, with research-based teaching at the heart of its mission. South Jersey needs more seats in institutions of higher learning; more research dollars; more innovative programs in science and technology; more high-quality, hands-on education

designed to meet the demands of a 21st century workforce. I say this as a professor of English with many colleagues here today at Rutgers-Camden.

We can demand no less at this time. The current system of State colleges and universities in New Jersey is outdated by decades and in need of major redefinition. Rowan University is a test-case for what investment in public higher education can and must accomplish.

To be clear, Rowan needs to grow -- to double in size by 2025 or 2030. That growth must be in the direction of a new model for New Jersey of a comprehensive research university. Think East Carolina, in North Carolina; George Mason, in Virginia; Western Michigan, in, well, Michigan; and so on. My point is that New Jersey needs additional public universities with bona fide research status. By virtue of its history and its location, Rowan is poised to make that transition and deserves the resources to do so -- new lines for research faculty, with appropriate teaching loads and benchmarks for tenure and promotion; and new masters and doctoral programs that reflect an evolving mission. We lose too many students to neighboring states, as others have said.

But let me also be clear: Rowan does not need to absorb a regional campus of Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey to become a major research university in its own right. The implication that to achieve its destiny Rowan must be given Rutgers-Camden is condescending. In truth, South Jersey and New Jersey need both Rutgers, with its statewide mission and national profile as an AAU university across three campuses; and Rowan, with a vital role in the region, to develop into an economic and educational powerhouse. If anything, the Governor's merger proposal is a failure of imagination to think big, an act of redistribution rather than

reinvestment. Across the river, Philadelphia and its suburbs have dozens of colleges and universities. South Jersey needs, at a minimum, two strong, distinct universities to maximize choice, promote healthy competition, and foster productive synergies. (timer sounds)

One last sentence: Let Rowan be Rowan. Allow it to achieve, in its own right and its own way, greatness. And let Rutgers be Rutgers, with a storied past and a bold future on the banks of the Raritan and on the Delaware. (applause)

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

No clapping, please.

Next.

HYUN KYU SEO: Good afternoon.

My name is Hyun Kyu Seo, and I'm an undergraduate studying graphic design at Rutgers-Camden. I'm also the creator of a website, r2rmerge.com, and it's a petition with over 11,700 signatures from people who believe that Rutgers-Camden should remain in South Jersey.

A little personal story is that the credentials I've gathered from Rutgers-Camden have allowed me to successfully be accepted into some of the best design schools in the world, all out of state. I've sacrificed all acceptance letters and decided to continue my education at Rutgers-Camden, a flourishing research institution that has made profoundly influential strides of research respected by institutions such as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and UPenn. Rutgers hosts doctors and professors who have graduated from such prestigious institutions to lecture and perform research at Rutgers-Camden. It would be incredibly irresponsible if our legislators were to vote for this merger to happen. Rutgers-Camden, with all of its

incredible attributes, will cease to exist in South Jersey and take choices away from our South Jersey citizens, who are the constituency that the legislators have the responsibility to represent in this important decision. It is the responsibility of our legislators to acknowledge the concerns of the citizens in order to make a decision that will be mindful of all of the different issues that should not move forward. So much is at stake if Rutgers-Camden does not remain in South Jersey.

If a newly created institution is made, it will suffer the loss of databases, including electronic journals, archives, books, and access to all of the Rutgers libraries we currently have access to, to perform research. These databases and research materials take a substantial amount of funding to maintain subscriptions. I and many others acknowledge that this attempt of a merger is financial, and considering the necessities to operate as a research institution, this newly created institution will need to apply for all of these existing subscriptions to even be eligible to apply for research institution accreditation.

Our law students will be incapable of practicing law if they graduate from a non-accredited law school. Our South Jersey students who had hopes of attending Rutgers-Camden will be disheartened and potentially cross the Bridge to Drexel, UPenn, Temple, and others to conduct-- This will drive our talented students out of South Jersey even further.

If any decision is made today, the decision should be made to keep the Rutgers-Camden element out of the decision between merging UMDNJ with Rutgers. Because if Rutgers-Camden ceases to exist, students like myself, who are motivated and have great potential that may be held

back by family or economic responsibilities, will lose the choice of an accessible, established, and renowned research institution.

Thank you.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

KAREN T. SIEFRING: Madam Chairwomen, members of the Higher Education committees, and guests, thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

I am Karen Siefring, and I speak on behalf of the American Federation of Teachers, AFT Local 2373, at Rowan University.

Our position on this matter is to encourage you to either accept the UMDNJ Advisory Committee report as written or reject it. Our Communication Workers of America branch president, our International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers chapter president, and I stand ready to continue to move our university forward regardless of the outcome -- as per our recent letter to you, a copy of which I have supplied again today.

We take pride in our institution and would like to share with you the reasons for this pride. There are two constants that have helped define Rowan University throughout our history. These are our demonstrated ability to manage change and our desire to continuously excel, as what defines excellence is striving for continuous improvement.

Let us briefly review our history of change. Rowan began in the fall of 1923 as Glassboro Normal School, a two-year teachers' training school with 236 students. The citizens of this region needed educational opportunities in the area of teacher training. In the 1920s, there were two other colleges started in southern New Jersey, the Law School of South

Jersey and the College of South Jersey, both located in Camden, New Jersey. These institutions were merged with Rutgers University in 1949 and 1950, respectively.

With an expanding curriculum necessary for teacher training causing the creation of 4-year programs, we became the New Jersey Teachers College at Glassboro in 1937. In 1949, graduate courses began to be offered in education. Still changing with expanding curriculum and enrollment, we became Glassboro State College in 1958.

Becoming a comprehensive liberal arts institution in 1966, we introduced our Liberal Arts programs. The Hollybush Summit put us on the international map in 1967. Our Camden Urban Center, now our Camden Campus, opened in 1969, as there were still unmet educational needs in Camden. Our athletics program won its first of many national championships in 1978.

As a result of the 1992 transformational \$100 million dollar gift from Henry Rowan, our name was changed again to Rowan College of New Jersey, and so with it began our Rowan College of Engineering, now with a nationally ranked chemical engineering program. We were then approved to offer our doctorate degree in education in 1997. And our institution achieved university status on March 21, 1997, becoming Rowan University.

In 2009, an executive reorganization order called for Rowan University and The Cooper Health System to partner and create a four-year allopathic medical school in Camden. Our first class will enter this fall.

Thus, in our 88-year history, we can point to a minimum of 12 major changes in names and/or mission. Statistically, we've handled a

major structural improvement or change roughly once every seven years. Our status quo is change.

As for pride in our desire for excellence, we do not rest on internal measures, but look to external experts to verify and document our achievements. We hold nine national and international accreditations, plus the preaccreditation for our medical school. And we continue working on more. Our Rohrer College of Business, for example, will host their specialized accounting accreditation visit this fall. With it, we may become one of only a handful of business schools in the nation to hold three major international accreditations.

Whatever the final outcomes of the UMDNJ Advisory Committee's report is, we will continue to successfully manage change -- just as we have always done while achieving continuous improvement.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today and for your service to our fine State of New Jersey.

P H I L L I P A. L E W I S, Ph.D.: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today.

I am Dr. Phillip A. Lewis. I am an associate professor and Chair of the Department of Marketing and Business Information Systems here at Rowan University. And I'm speaking here today as the negotiator for Local AFT 2373.

Much of what has been said and written has cast Rowan University, and those of us who work and learn here, in the roles of villains, even though we had neither representation on the UMDNJ Advisory Committee, nor any meaningful involvement with UMDNJ, which created the -- resulted in the creation of the Advisory Committee.

A number of individuals, groups, and union locals have simply wished to oppose the reorganization of UMDNJ in order to maintain the status quo. That, from our AFT 2373 perspective, was playing into a narrative that suggests that State employee unions are preventing progress in New Jersey.

Rowan AFT 2373 has taken a neutral stance on the recommendations, recognizing that it is a decision outside of our hands and one that is not the result of our own work. However, today, as the negotiator of AFT 2373, I would like to encourage you to consider only two alternatives as you review the recommendations of the Governor's UMDNJ Advisory Committee: either adopt the recommendations, as outlined in the Committee's report regarding the merger, or ignore them entirely.

If you and the Governor choose to ignore the recommendations as they apply to southern New Jersey, Rutgers-Camden and Rowan will continue to coexist as they have for over 60 years. For its future, Rowan has a strategic plan that includes the expansion and growth of educational opportunities for all New Jersey residents, both in Camden and Gloucester counties. Those plans can continue without modification or State involvement. Rowan will continue to expand its footprint in Camden with the opening of the newly remodeled First Camden National Bank and Trust Building, and the completion of Cooper University Medical School at Rowan in the City of Camden.

If, on the other hand, you choose to adopt the recommendations, our two institutions will have to strategically redesign, merge, or differentiate colleges, departments, and programs at all of our locations. What we will need to be successful in this merger of the

universities, cultures, and labor groups is time and flexibility. Time will be needed to graduate students in the process; to tenure probationary faculty who are in the process; to honor existing contracts until they are at their expiration dates; and flexibility will be needed to consolidate the various separate agreements into a single agreement that reflects the both -- the best of all previous collectively bargained agreements.

While I would encourage you to watch us achieve these goals, I would discourage you from trying to micromanage those from Trenton. I want to discourage the Governor and the Legislature from doing something more than doing nothing, but not quite a merger. Over the past weeks I have heard a variety of merger alternatives presented that suggested mandated collaboration between faculty groups, mandated partnered advisory oversight of the medical school, and various partnerships mandated from Trenton that would result in doubling the number of bargaining agents, administrative levels, and the like.

As a result, we encourage you only to consider the two options and, as Senator Sweeney suggested, develop a plan.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: All right. On our list next would be Maurita Bivans, Sean Duffy, Joe Almedia, and Debra Kendall.

I'm sorry, again, if I have mispronounced someone's name.

If you were like any of my classroom students -- they would constantly correct me, so you correct me.

I was wondering if a Virginia Doolittle was here? (no response)
She is on the list.

Thank you.

How about a Dr. Elmore?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM AUDIENCE: Do you mean Dr. Freddie Elmore?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Elmore, I apologize.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM AUDIENCE: It's Minister Dr. Freddie Elmore.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: I can't read my own handwriting. Forgive me.

You're going to have to work out what order you'd like to go in.

MAURITA BIVANS: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you.

This coming fall semester will mark significant history for me regarding Rutgers-Camden. Fifty years ago I was a freshman at Rutgers-Camden. My career history also includes my recent tenure as a full-time assistant professor here at Rowan. I'm here to make two comments regarding the proposal and the merger of Rowan and Rutgers. This proposal will, of course, erase all the story-filled history, the legacy that has been built over time as far as the research status at Rutgers-Camden that would also be impacted.

My first concern is the cost. And as a resident and taxpayer of New Jersey, I listened to the Barer report on February 6 in Trenton and was surprisingly disappointed that when asked for the cost and planning for implementing the proposal, Dr. Barer responded that the Committee was

not charged to explore planning or budget issues. I'm very much concerned that the cost concern that was mentioned by the Rutgers President, Dr. McCormick, when he gave his information -- because he was given the task to begin planning and transitioning, regarding the meds. His projected cost for just the meds transformation was \$40 million.

During the discussion process, the Barer committee was asked to expand their task, and that's when they included the eradication of the Rutgers-Camden campus. My question to you is: What is the cost and the funding source for the medical and academic schools in this proposal?

I've given two letters to you. They're written by New Jersey Senator Rice, which was distributed on February 6; and a list of questions from U.S. Senator Frank Lautenberg. His correspondence is dated February 22. I'm hoping that you will respond to their questions and give more information to the public.

My second concern regards the thought that a comprehensive research university would be formed by this merger. I'd like to read the first -- in part -- the first mission statement sentence for Rutgers University. It reads, "As the sole comprehensive public research university in the State's system of higher education, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, has a threefold mission." It goes on to say that the mission is to provide instructional needs, conduct cutting-edge research, and to perform public service.

As a part of the faculty here at Rowan, I have firsthand knowledge of the outstanding faculty members, the dedication to work and research that is undertaken. The many occasions when faculty published, presented papers to national audiences and authored books is well

documented. I'm also aware that about four years ago there was a formal initiative to expand and increase research efforts to move Rowan to be a research university.

Fine programs exist at Rowan just as they exist at Rutgers. If there must be a change, I favor a consortium model with each university maintaining its own autonomy, and that would be cost-effective.

I also want to alert you that membership in AAU is by invitation only. Rutgers is a comprehensive research institution, and it took 89 years to gain that AAU status. There are many fine schools that are research -- well-rounded research universities. And the difference is, the prestige of AAU actually attracts outstanding faculty and students, and also provides a huge economic impact.

Thank you.

S E A N D U F F Y, Ph.D.: Thanks for hearing me today.

My name is Sean Duffy. I'm an associate professor of Psychology at Rutgers-Camden and Director of the Psychology undergraduate program.

I know my time is brief so I will focus on a simple message: If you want to create a great research university, you must first conduct the research. You must ask pointed questions and find data that provides probing, thorough answers, since the stakes at hand are so large. We're not talking about changing the name of a bank; we're talking about eliminating a university. We must not simply accept at face value the recommendations of the Barer report.

And in reading that report, what shocks me the most is the lack of serious data supporting the hostile takeover of Rutgers-Camden. For all

the grandiose promises of what this takeover will bring to the region, what is completely missing is actual data addressing some of the following questions. Members of both Rutgers-Camden and Rowan communities deserve answers to these questions.

First: What data suggests that students in New Jersey will actually attend this untried and untested mega-university? Or will they look north toward the new Rutgers, The State University of North Jersey for their education, or toward institutions across the Delaware?

Second: Is there data suggesting that students will attend the Camden campus, or will it quickly become an abandoned shell of its former self?

Third: What evidence exists that top-tier research faculty will flock to the new Rowan, or rather leave in droves for more established universities with better research facilities?

Fourth: What budgetary analyses exist demonstrating that funding to hire top-notch research faculty will flow into the new Rowan, and from what sources?

Fifth: What evidence supports the argument that this new institution will attract top students and faculty in a market that's already saturated with universities in Philadelphia?

Sixth: Where has the data been generated about the economic costs of this merger? I see a 517 million pound gorilla in this room. (laughter) Rowan already has over a half-billion dollars of debt, and Cooper Hospital's bonds trade almost at junk status. Is the purpose of this merger truly educational or simply financial -- a way to shore up Rowan-Cooper's bond ratings?

Eighth (*sic*): What studies suggest that eliminating an institution like Rutgers-Camden is the only way to financially support a medical school?

Ninth: Will disenfranchised former Rutgers-Camden students continue to donate money to higher education in New Jersey?

And tenth: What studies have been done on how the mechanics of this will work out? How will tenure be evaluated? What are the new teaching loads, class sizes, which curricula will be followed?

So these are just 10 questions, and I have about a 100 more. These are important questions that can be answered with research, but have not. I have seen no analyses, no studies, no data. I've only heard empty promises from individuals with no experience in academia. Where are the voices and input of those on the front lines of higher education who understand the challenges and difficulties involved in running a research university? Our Rutgers voices have been silenced because we were never invited to the discussion table in the first place. This is no way to start a research university, but it is a great way to destroy the one research university that already exists in South Jersey: Rutgers-Camden.

Thank you for your time.

DEBRA KENDALL: Hi. My name is Debra Kendall, and I come before you today as a resident of New Jersey.

I have children who have attended both Rutgers University in Camden and Rowan University. And I believe both institutions are excellent in their own right.

But I am here today on behalf of my entire family and many citizens of New Jersey. And I thank you for the opportunity to express our universal opposition to a complete merger of Rutgers-Camden into Rowan.

As everyone knows, Rutgers University has been an invaluable resource for higher education in South Jersey, as well as an incomparable resource for the improvement of the City of Camden educationally and economically for over 62 years. Generations of scholars have benefitted from the prestigious, world-renown name and resources of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, resulting in class after class of graduates thriving in our nation's workforce.

My husband, who has served for 20 years as a member of the Haddon Township Board of Education, and as -- now serving his sixth year as President of the Camden County School Boards Association. He and I have both helped to guide many students to Rutgers-Camden. We have personally seen the uncompromised success that the excellent staff of Rutgers-Camden has provided to southern New Jersey students who decide to stay near home or who prefer to attend a smaller, more intimate campus to pursue their higher education aspirations.

While we absolutely respect Rowan, we believe that Rutgers, with its 200-year history of awards, honors, and certifications is far too precious of a resource to be removed as an opportunity for the future students of South Jersey.

Rutgers' accomplishments as a premiere research university cannot be ignored. This designation is not easily achieved. We ask that the Committee, instead of removing Rutgers' name and presence from South Jersey, form a consortium between Rutgers-Camden and Rowan so that

both universities can thrive while working together and, in so doing, provide greater opportunity through educational choice.

Thank you very much.

FREDDIE ELMORE: First, giving honor to God, to this august Committee, to alumni of Rutgers, to students at Rutgers, and to the Glassboro family.

I'm Minister Dr. Freddie Elmore, Rutgers-Camden class of '73 undergrad.

I have a -- an honorary doctorate of divinity from Calvary Grace Church School in Pennsylvania. My youngest daughter had an opportunity to go to the University of Pennsylvania, but on my suggestion she chose to go to Rutgers-Camden and was in the Class of 2006.

I digress a little here: How have I got to Rutgers-Camden? My dad was in the military, and when he was sent to Vietnam, he bought a house in Cherry Hill, New Jersey. I was going to college in central Missouri. On that campus I was the human relations committee chairman.

I left that school in my senior year. I went to Camden, and I saw Rutgers University. I fell in love. I was a great football player. I had an opportunity, probably, to play football in New Brunswick. But I chose the Camden campus. I worked at U.S. Steel at the time. And Rutgers was very appealing to me, so I went to Rutgers-Camden.

I heard somebody say-- Churchill said there is nothing wrong with change if it is in the right direction. This proposal to change Rutgers-Camden to Rowan University is in the wrong direction. Changing Rowan to Rutgers would be in the right direction.

I hope that every time Governor Christie goes to work, a contingency of Rutgers sympathizers would be protesting and marching around Governor Christie's workplace, full of protesting clergy, alumni in New Jersey and U.S. citizens.

Jonathan Edwards, of 1703 to 1758, an American theologian and revivalist, wrote the sermon that is "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," about what happens to sinners. This proposal to change Rutgers to Rowan is putting Christie and company in the hands of an angry God. I am here to tell Governor Christie not to permit this sin.

Christie, what makes you think that Rowan is more prestigious than Rutgers? It seems that step by step you intend to turn all of Rutgers into Rowan. Rowan paid to change Glassboro into Rowan -- that's Mr. Rowan paid to change Glassboro into Rowan. How much is Rowan paying to change Rutgers into Rowan?

My wife Juliet told me to tell you Rutgers is greater than Rowan.

And I will say this -- like Patrick Henry said in his words -- give Rutgers liberty or give death to this proposal to change Rutgers into Rowan.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Do we have any questions from the panel? (no response)

Thank you very much for your testimony.

All right, Alex Bernstein, Patrick Nowlan, Kathy Hernandez, Jean Pierce.

And I have-- Can you fit five up there, because I have one more? (affirmative response)

Frank Fulbrook.

ALEX BERNSTEIN: Good afternoon.

My name is Alex Bernstein. I'm the Executive Director of AAUP at UMDNJ.

Thanks for giving us the opportunity to address the Committee.

We represent over 1,500 faculty at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, spanning the whole state.

And my objective here today is to raise your awareness about the potential impact the Advisory Committee's recommendations will have on faculty terms and conditions of employment, as well as their collective bargaining rights.

I want to start by telling you -- so that you don't think I'm coming from a one-sided perspective -- that the faculty at Robert Wood Johnson desire to have this merger go through with Rutgers. However, they do not want to do so at any cost.

The incorporation of Robert Wood Johnson School of Public Health and CINJ -- the Cancer Institute of New Jersey -- into Rutgers presents a human resources-labor relations challenge beyond one's imagination. I'm telling you this from the perspective of a director of labor and employee relations -- director -- at St. Vincent's Catholic Medical Center, who was involved in the merger of three huge healthcare systems into one and oversaw its collapse over the next six years. So I'm telling you from-- I'm trying to speak to you from a certain perspective, although I started my employment shortly after the merger.

I will tell you this: that much of the collapse that happened after the merger is attributed to not giving sufficient thought and

consideration, and a lack of understanding of the HR and labor relations issues that arose after the merger. So I want to highlight a few in the form of what I believe are unanswered questions. And I think you've heard a number of these acorns -- using the quote from a previous speaker. And so I will list them to you -- unanswered questions.

Number one: How will the State ensure that the individuals most affected by the proposed restructuring -- the residents of Newark, New Brunswick, Piscataway, South Jersey, and the employees of UMDNJ, Rutgers, and Rowan -- have a seat at the table to determine their future and the future of their institutions? We should all ask ourselves: Why has UMDNJ and Rutgers not included faculty and staff on these various integration teams? This is a pretty significant issue, and I think the fact that they're not included-- You've heard all the concerns that are raised here. You can only imagine the type of issues that would be raised if there was involvement.

Number two: Will Rutgers recognize the existing UMDNJ bargaining representatives? Will Rutgers honor the various collective bargaining agreements between UMDNJ and its faculty and staff, agreements that impact upon salaries, benefits, seniority, and so forth?

Will current faculty titles and academic rank, their academic track, promotion guidelines and procedures, and school bylaws -- which are -- incorporate critical shared governance principles -- be retained? These are critical to faculty.

Will Rutgers honor the commitments made to Robert Wood Johnson School of Public Health and Cancer Institute of New Jersey faculty in their term contracts -- their individual contracts that faculty hold, or

individual agreements that were reached between chairs and the faculty, or their deans and the faculty, and so forth?

Will the restructuring affect faculty tenure?

We are concerned about all of these things, as are the faculty at these institutions that want this merger to go through.

All these questions and issues that I've just raised equally apply to the Rutgers-Camden/Rowan merger as well. As well, there are criticisms that you've heard about the Rowan-Camden -- apply equally at UMDNJ and Rutgers. And I think that we need to all recognize that.

However, to their credit, the Advisory Committee did recognize the importance of these questions. In fact, they mention them on pages 6 and 7 of their interim report. But it's interesting that in their final report they did not address them at all. And I think you've heard comments to that affect here today as well.

Today these questions remain unanswered, and we are calling upon each of you to work with all of us in the coalition and to shape the answers to these questions so we can achieve the objectives of the Advisory Committee recommendations. It's to make each of the institutions stronger. However, this objective can't be achieved without -- with a mandate from the Governor, or a deadline, or at the expense of one individual institution. I think we all recognize that. I think we have to work hard and demand answers to these difficult questions. And I think the only way of doing that is by working together to figure out the details. And it's more than just details, these are substantive questions.

What is the HR-labor relations roadmap? What is the financial roadmap? This is all connected. Ultimately -- as you heard Dr. Rodgers

Speak to you -- this will require time and money. There is too much at stake here -- and I think we all recognize that -- to move forward without a plan that answers these questions. And I propose the only realistic way to do that is to do so legislatively. And we hope that these hearings are the process for that.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

KATHLEEN HERNANDEZ: Good afternoon.

My name is Kathleen Hernandez, and I'm the Executive Vice President of CWA Local 1031. Local 1031 represents workers of the nine State colleges, which are Ramapo, William Paterson, Montclair, Kean, The College of New Jersey, Thomas Edison, Rowan, and Stockton. Additionally, we represent approximately 600 supervisors at UMDNJ, 23 municipal libraries, and several municipal groups.

CWA Local 1031 represents four bargaining units at the State colleges. They are administrative/clerical, professional, supervisory, and higher-level supervisory. These workers are State workers, and they collectively bargain with the State of New Jersey, not with Rowan University or any other university. They share the same contracts as the Department of Transportation workers, DYFS workers, and the Motor Vehicle Commission workers. Our workers at Rowan University are covered by civil service protections. The titles, hours of work, job descriptions, and pay scales are different than workers at Rutgers and UMDNJ. Civil service provides guidelines for hiring and promoting, as well as offering protections and opportunities for veterans and all workers.

Rutgers and UMDNJ are public institutions, not State institutions. They are not covered by civil service guidelines or protections. They have different job titles, job descriptions, pay scales, bargaining units, and unions. Contracts at these universities are bargained with and held with each university. All of the universities share the same pension and health benefits. These are the only benefits that are identical between Rowan, Rutgers, and UMDNJ.

The merging of a State university with a public university is complex. Aside from the duplication of programs and services, it will be difficult to align job duties, pay scales, and hours of work. There may be differences in sick and vacation time accrual. As mentioned in my previous testimony, there will be difficulties in merging policies and information.

Removal from civil service protections was not mentioned in the UMDNJ higher education committee's recommendation and is not what the Rowan University employees want. Merging a public institution with a State institution should -- would mean significant changes in the terms and conditions of employment, not to mention a lot of time and money to sort through these changes.

Working collaboratively between the universities is a viable solution and is supported by the employees and unions. This would save the State of New Jersey, which has not offered to supply the necessary moneys needed to accomplish the merger, a lot of money.

The purpose of the UMDNJ higher education committee's recommendation is to make New Jersey and its universities stronger and more competitive. If the recommendations result in higher tuition or millions of dollars to the taxpayers, is it worth it?

The Higher Education committees of the Senate and Assembly -- you -- are considering these recommendations and the impacts. You have the power to implement changes to the New Jersey higher education system that will make Rowan, Rutgers, and UMDNJ all stronger. You have the power to implement any changes in a manner that protects the current workforce and working conditions, and maintains the current union contracts and representation. That power is through legislation, not executive order.

Thank you.

PATRICK NOWLAN: Good afternoon, distinguished Chairs and members of the committees.

My name is Patrick Nowlan. I'm the Executive Director of the Rutgers AAUP-AFT. We represent over 6,000 employees on all three of Rutgers' campuses. We represent all the faculty, the librarians, the non-tenure track researchers and instructors, the part-time lecturers, the teaching and graduate assistants, the post docs, and the Educational Opportunity Fund counselors.

And that Educational Opportunity Fund came up in the news recently with relation to SAT scores. Let me just say that that is probably one of the best programs the State of New Jersey developed, and they need to fund it. If every student in New Jersey -- every potential student in New Jersey colleges and universities had the same academic support as our EOF counselors, students wouldn't go outside of New Jersey for their higher education. They would know that they had outstanding support -- staff support, faculty support right here in New Jersey. So that's a program that should flourish. We should use it as a model at all of our institutions for

academic counseling and support -- not just on academic issues, but also on student-life issues. And that's what makes this such a valuable program. Students come in the summer before they enroll, and they take courses and they get acclimated to college education here in New Jersey. And I'm sure you've heard in all of your districts about the difficulty of students coming in and transitioning and being retained after their first year in college. So that's the model for what we want to do going forward, regardless of where we end up on this particular question.

And Senator Pou and Assemblyman Coughlin have probably heard me testify before the Higher Education committees in the past about research funding. It's important to fund our universities. And also about process-- I'm wearing a wristband that says "Rutgers One" -- it says "Students, Faculty, Staff, and Alumni." And we've testified to this. When you have a policy debate in a small box, you lose great value. So when you talk to President McCormick, or President Houshmand, or any of the college presidents alone to seek their advice and to understand the institutional support for policy decision or a funding decision, you lose so much value. And I think you've heard that today.

If these public hearings were held prior to the issuing of the Barer committee report, I think the recommendations would be very different. I'd like to applaud our members at Rutgers-Camden -- the faculty, the staff, our student and alumni allies -- for basically doing the research the Barer committee should have done prior to issuing their final recommendations. I think that our proposal as a union for a consortium was never responded to. In fact, I guess they sort of borrowed that from

North Jersey. They said they should partner in North Jersey, they should create closer linkages between the universities.

I thank you for holding this hearing today. I think Senator Sweeney started us off on the right note talking about jobs, about resources for South Jersey. And I'm a son of South Jersey. I grew up in Burlington County, a small town called Riverside. I graduated from Rutgers. My younger sister graduated from Rowan. And they're just choices that we made individually based on our personalities, based on our goals. And we can't limit choice in South Jersey; we should grow choice. We should grow and let Rowan flourish; we should let Rutgers-Camden flourish.

As a union, I can guarantee to you that under our contracts, Rutgers-Camden faculty are treated no differently than any other faculty at Rutgers. And the growth in our faculty -- and it has been growing -- is largest at Rutgers-Camden. So resources are coming. We welcome a debate that talks about where internal university resources go. Should more dollars stay in Camden or float to Camden? We encourage that debate. We want to look at the facts. But as you've seen today -- you've probably received more information today in this single hearing, these past three or four hours, than anything in the Barer committee report. And when Dr. Barer was questioned at the Board of Trustees meeting, he said they didn't have any documents to share. There was no supporting evidence for this.

And just to take it back a step further, the Barer committee report came out of an executive order -- the Barer committee was set up by an executive order by the Governor last year. That flowed out of a previous report -- the Kean commission -- Task Force. So to go over a year, possibly two years in researching and investigating this question, to have really no

evidence to support it, it becomes an hypothesis -- and our members will appreciate this. If you say you take Rowan and Rutgers-Camden and put them together and get something greater than the sum of the parts, you then have to test that. You have to do the research and see if that actually proves true. And I think you've heard today lots of evidence to say that possibly the reverse would happen. And Dr. Barer would even admit -- and he stated this publicly a few times -- that it would be decades and hundreds of millions of dollars for it -- to see any fruition to a comprehensive research university in South Jersey.

Thank you.

ADRIEN DUMOULIN - SMITH: Thank you, Chairpersons Cunningham and Riley.

My name is Adrien Dumoulin-Smith. I'm speaking instead of Jean Pierce on behalf of the Health Professionals and Allied Employees AFT, AFL-CIO, who represent 12,000 nurses, and healthcare workers, and researchers, and professionals throughout New Jersey, of which 4,000 work at UMDNJ.

The testimony I've provided to you today was delivered to the Senate and Assembly Budget Committees last week and today in Newark. So I will spare you the repetition for those of you who were there.

But I do want to touch on some of the financial issues that are being raised in all of these discussions. I want to touch especially on some of the bond issues that are going to -- we are going to have to face if we are going to pursue reorganization.

Moody's, which is an organization that not only has a perspective as a bond rating -- a credit rating agency, but also power over

the cost of the issuance of bonds themselves, has said that this reorganization will weaken UMDNJ. And we believe that reorganization should strengthen every institution involved.

Moody's has said that Rutgers, The State University and Rowan University would each be strengthened. Newark-based University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey would be pared down. The plan, as expected, leaves many details yet to be worked out that could affect credit ratings of the affected organizations.

As it stands now, UMDNJ pays well over \$45 million a year to its debt servicing. There is no plan to divide up this debt or to pay it down. Although, as Moody's also points out, that would be necessary to move forward to avoid conflicts with the bond covenant that UMDNJ is party to.

What the Governor does not mention in his plan to reorganize higher education-- In his 2013 budget summary, he has repeated the claim that changes will be budget neutral, yet there is no analysis how much reorganization would cost or, without State support, how the already strapped budget will handle the additional burden.

Previous cost estimates from the Vagelos report reached as high as \$1.3 billion. While cost estimates are missing from the report, Rutgers and UMDNJ have produced initial estimates. In addition to any costs that I'm discussing in terms of the bonds, UMDNJ estimated it would cost -- it would take a minimum investment of \$150 million over the next five years to pursue the financial success of NJHSU, the proposed renamed institution in Newark and beyond; and \$25 million every year to protect University Hospital.

In New Brunswick, Rutgers has estimated a one-time cost of \$40 million, and is still determining what long-term costs there might be in addition, related to things like those bonds that I mentioned, and to things we've heard about earlier today like library services, IT services -- all of these things that are currently set up in different institutions centrally.

I'd just like to finish by saying that we ask the Legislature to undertake an independent analysis of the total cost of reorganization, bond debt, and potential impacts on jobs and the State's economy. And if a reorganization moves forward, the Legislature must ensure that the actions taken will support each of these institutions so that each can thrive. The Legislature must consider pledging support for each university through any reorganization to mitigate harmful impacts on the economy, on education, on patient care, community care, and on the economic and long-term healthcare benefits of medical research.

Thank you.

F R A N K F U L B R O O K: I'm last. I'm highly honored to be before you.

Madam Chairs and members of the Committee who hung in there, I respect that you've hung in there for this.

My name is Frank Fulbrook. I grew up in Camden and only applied to one college: Rutgers-Camden, 1967. I knew that's where I would go, so I didn't need to apply anywhere else.

So off and on it took me 35 years to get a bachelor's degree. I then went on to -- encouraged by my mentor, Professor Van Til, got a master's degree. I worked as his teaching assistant. So now I work part-time as a teaching assistant in the summer session at Rutgers-Camden with

retired Professor Jon Van Til, whose published about seven or eight books. That's what you get with a research university full professor. You get that kind of extensive research in the field -- urban studies, nonprofits. He's a nationally recognized expert. That's what you get with a research university professor on the highest level of his field. So I'm honored to help Professor Van Til teach his courses any time he asks me to.

Now, not only did I enroll at Rutgers in '67, but I moved in to the neighborhood. I moved from East Camden -- moved to the neighborhood right next to Rutgers-Camden, which is called Cooper Grant. So I've been living there since 1968. I was 19 years old. Now I am 63, and I'm still there -- 44 years. I love it. It's my little urban paradise. I love living there. It's the Mill Hill of Camden. So if you know Trenton -- they have Mill Hill. In Camden we have Cooper Grant. It's the Mill Hill of Camden.

First of all, words matter. This is not a merger. The supporters keep calling it a merger. This is a hostile takeover that is being proposed. It's a highly predatory act originating with the Board Chairman of Cooper Hospital. But I will leave George out of this. It would be wrong for me to mention George in a hearing of this type. (laughter) But that's the elephant in the room. But I will move on.

You've got two great schools here. Rutgers-Camden ain't broke; Rowan University, based mainly in Glassboro -- the Camden campus in '69 -- also, it ain't broke. They're two great institutions. I'd like to see -- let Rutgers-Camden be Rutgers-Camden, let Rowan be Rowan. Work out collaborative arrangements where they're mutually beneficial, such as what was mentioned -- the library. There used to be a Camden County College

building at Broadway and Cooper. There used to be a library up on the sixth floor. They did away with that library and joined up and used the Rutgers library. There's a perfect example. The University District Book Store is Camden County College, Rowan, and Rutgers. And they have the color-coded aisles: the red aisles, the brown and gold, and Camden County College color is blue. It's great. There is a cooperative relationship that is working very well. It's a win, win, win situation the way it's being done. This is going to destroy all that -- this takeover proposal.

Now, one of my teachers was retired Professor Howard Gillette -- in urban studies -- history professor. My degree was in Urban Studies and Political Science before I then went for the master's so I can teach college. That was my goal -- was to teach college.

There's a well-established principle in urban revitalization.

I'll go real fast.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: I'm going to ask you to wrap it up.

MR. FULBROOK: Yes -- in urban revitalization that the residential component of revitalization always goes first. The commercial component follows it as the entrepreneurs see the opportunities for retail.

I've helped recruit and build this up in our neighborhood, and we're doing quite well. But there is a lot of work to do. This is going to destroy much of our effort. And the 60 or 70 Rutgers varsity athletes who now live in my neighborhood in Cooper Grant-- If these two campuses are joined, all the student athletes are going to be moving down here to Glassboro, because the varsity intercollegiate sports are certainly going to be based here, not in Camden. So you're going to have an out-migration of

tenants renting apartments and houses in Cooper Grant. How is that going to revitalize the neighborhood -- to be driving people out? And this is what we've been doing successfully.

I urge you to oppose this idea. It's a lousy idea. And the sooner it's defeated, the sooner we can get back. Because this has been a huge distraction on both of these campuses. It's not fair to the students and faculty to have to be even going all over -- doing here today. This shouldn't even be necessary.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY: Thank you very much.

This will conclude our hearing today. I thank everyone for participating.

That's it. Thank you very much. (applause)

(MEETING CONCLUDED)