



Governance Gazette

the newsletter of Brookdale Governance

Special Year-End Issue 2006-2007

Chair's message

As we end this year, I am struck by how Governance exemplifies "One Brookdale" at its best. It is no wonder that Governance is so effective, with a President who believes that better solutions result from involving all stakeholders in the decision-making process, a Steering Committee dedicated to identifying issues and ensuring that the process runs smoothly, co-chairs who lead committees to thoroughly investigate and analyze charges, and Forum members who offer feedback and suggestions. To all of you who participate in the process, thank you for your time and energy – the success of Governance is a direct result of your hard work.

Thanks are also due to the many behind-the-scenes people who are essential to this endeavor: John Popovitch, Marianne Drake and all of the folks at DTS who help the Forums run so smoothly; the folks at the Print Shop and Ben Broder, who ensure that Gazette goes out in a timely way; Pat Henn in scheduling; and the staff at Food Services.

In addition, I'd like to extend a special thank-you to my colleagues in the Writing Center, who have been so supportive as I juggled my roles of Governance Chair and Learning Assistant this year.

It has been a privilege serving with such intelligent, hardworking, and thoughtful people from across the institution, who devote themselves to the well-being of our Governance system and to Brookdale. I wish all the best to Maria Fernandez as she assumes the leadership of Steering and Governance. Maria's understanding of the college and her deep commitment to a respectful dialogue about the issues assure me that Governance is in very capable hands.

Kathy Vasile
Governance Chair

The Year in Governance

The academic year 2006-2007 has been a very busy one for the Steering Committee, all Standing Committees of Governance, and the permanent College-Wide committees. The Steering Committee wishes to thank each and every member of these committees for their hard work during the year and for their part in completing the work of Governance. Each of these committees has a report on their activities during the year in this Gazette, but first here is a summary of all the activities of Governance for the year.

There were twelve Forum meetings and a Special Forum held beginning September and ending in May. The Steering Committee began preparation for the year during the summer and used the results of the May Retreat, as well as the guidance of Dr. Burnham, to prepare the charges for the year.

**June, July
August** Steering Committee prepares the charges for the Standing Committees

September Review of charges

Educational Services Master Plan

Matrix Planning Discussion

Update on Smoking and ADA issues

October Endorsement vote of the Educational Service Master Plan.

Discussion on the Mentoring charge

Discussion on the College-Wide Web Site Regulation Draft

Mid-October Discussion on the Web Site Regulation Draft

Discussion on Non-Traditional Methods of Earning Credit

Discussion on Student Services

November Vote on the Mentoring Guidelines in a De-Centralized Environment

	Discussion on the Status of the Diversity Council	Mid-April	Discussion on Course Discontinuance
	Update on the Middle States Self-Study		Discussion on Student Recognition
Mid-November	General Education discussion		Vote on the Planning Calendar
	Discussion on the College-Wide Web Site Regulation Draft		Discussion on the 2008-2009 Matrix
	Vote on Student Services recommendations to address the needs of entering students	May	Vote On the Student Recognition Regulation
	Discussion on the Planning Calendar		Vote on Analysis of Expenditure
December	Vote on the College Website Regulation		Discussion on Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness
	Discussion on the Analysis of Expenditure		Vote on the recommendations on Student Government
	Discussion on Student Government		Vote on the recommendations on the Green Initiative.
February	Discussion on the Green Initiative Charge	<hr/> <div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> <p style="margin: 0;">STANDING COMMITTEE YEAR-END REPORTS</p> </div>	
	Discussion on Guidelines for Earning Academic Credits by Non-Traditional Methods	Academic Council	Academic Council appreciates and acknowledges the quality work done by the college community in developing the entire curriculum. Council considered and passed 45 new courses, 104 course revisions, 14 program changes, 8 new certificates or options, and 3 new programs. The new certificates, options, and/or programs are the following:
	Discussion of the General Education Model		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital Animation and 3D Design A.A.S. • Health Information Technology A.A. S. • Digital Animation and 3D Design A.A.S. - Game Programming Option • Math/Science A.S. - Environmental and Earth Sciences Option • Computer Science A.A.S - Web Site Development Option • Social Sciences A.A. - Anthropology Option • Electric Utility Technology A.A.S. • Humanities A.A. - Creative Writing Option • Social Sciences A.A. - Ethnic Studies Option • Computer Science A.A.S. - Programming Option • Human Service A.A.S. – Corrections Option
Mid-February	Discussion on the 2008-2009 Matrix		
	Discussion on Student Recognition		
	Discussion on the status of the Diversity Council		
March	Discussion on Student Government		
	Discussion on the Planning Calendar		
	Vote on Nontraditional Methods of earning credit		
	Vote on the General Education Regulation		
April	Vote on the Change of status of the Diversity Council		
	Discussion on the Green Initiative		
	Discussion on Analysis of Expenditure		
	Update on the Facilities Master Plan		
Special Forum	General Education Discussion		Council began discussion of discontinuance of courses: the scope of the problem, the process to discontinue a course, and possible criteria to define a course that might need to be discontinued.
	Update on the Middle States Self-Study		

For 2007-2008, Ellen Musen will continue as Co-Chair and will be joined by Barbara Burk as the new Co-Chair.

Academic Standards

The chairs would like to thank all of the members of the Academic Standards Committee for their regular attendance of meetings, lively discussion and engaged participation. The Academic Standards Committee started off the year by working on the first of two new charges "Non-traditional Methods of Earning Academic Credit" by gathering information about the various practices and policies already in place at the college as well as about those used at other colleges. Maggie McMenamin gave a presentation about current policy, Nancy O'Shea shared information about the CLEP exam, Kim Toomey provided data about students who have received credit through examination, and Susan Craig described and answered questions about the Business Outreach Program.

Next, the committee designed, conducted and studied the results of a survey focused on the non-traditional methods of earning credit at the college. There were a total 49 total respondents and at least one respondent from 18 different academic departments. Respondents from ten different departments said they give credit for a course either by exam, portfolio, or a combination of the two, and respondents from eleven different departments said there was no CLEP exam for their courses or that they did not know if there was a CLEP exam or not; suggesting that members of the faculty were either confused about or unaware of the various non-traditional means of earning academic credit in their disciplines. The committee responded to the gathered data by creating both "Guidelines for Earning Academic Credits by Non-Traditional Methods" and "Recommendations for the College". After some final hour debate, both were approved by vote at the March 20 Forum.

The committee next worked on our second charge "Student Recognition" by reviewing Brookdale Community College standards for achieving Dean's List recognition, and the evaluation of such in comparison to other New Jersey colleges. When questions arose, guest Nancy Kegelman and member Kim Toomey provided clarification about the practices that are currently in place at the college. The committee spent time updating College Regulation 5.0032R, most notably changing the minimum grade point average requirement for Dean's List award from 3.7 to 3.5. Finally, the newly updated regulation as well as the committee's recommendation to note Dean's List achievement on student transcripts was presented for vote and passed at the May 1 Forum. The committee bids fond farewell to members Helen Antholis, Brent Costleigh, Guy Pellicane, Mitch Fisher and student representative Heather Hansen, and welcomes Laura Longo, Darlene Macomber, Carolyn McCreesh and Carol Schedel. We are in need of one faculty representative from the Business/Computer Science Division and two student representatives. Donna Flinn and Brian McKeon will continue to co-chair the committee next year.

College Life

The College Life Committee has had a rewarding and productive year; we took on two very distinct, yet vital charges which should make a difference in how we experience and relate to the actual and virtual worlds of our immediate and global communities.

Our first charge, regarding Regulation 2.9001R College-Wide Web Site Development Standards and Best Practices, asked us to:

1. Review the draft of the College Regulation 2.9001R College-Wide Web Site Development Standards and Best Practices.
2. Recommend any changes.

The research and data collection generated through the Committee's "Internal Communications" 2005 – 2006 charge pointed to the fact that the Web Site, while being one of the most important and utilized vehicles of communication for the College, was also in need of improvement. Because of the College's commitment to excellence and the wide and diverse audiences that the Web Site reaches, the Web Site is both a reflection of the college and a resource by which we can effectively promulgate our "Vision, Values, and Mission." To this end, it became necessary to put in place a policy for "Web Standards and Best Practices" that at a minimum ensured that the website is current, reliable, easily navigable, and accessible to all members of the community. Additionally, we noted that the policy must address the fact that the information presented must comply with all federal, state, and local laws dealing with copyright and intellectual property issues, libel, and harassment.

In order to provide the rationale and context for the possible revisions and changes we considered, College Life met extensively with various constituencies of the College, including College Relations, the Office of Information Technology, and the staff of the Teaching and Learning Center. After working from data previously assessed and collected through our "Internal Communications" charge and presenting our initial work and the charge to Forum, the committee separated into four groups, each responsible for looking at a different aspect of the initial draft Web Site regulation. One of the groups investigated issues associated with ADA compliance; another worked on the processes necessary to incorporate the needs and desires of students, clubs and organizations into the language of the regulation while the other two groups researched Web-related policies and standards found at institutions of higher learning across the country and non-academic institutions such as governmental agencies and corporations.

Through Forum input, the research efforts of the aforementioned sub-committees, and the committee's consultations with members and staff representatives of ITAC, the TLC, Public Relations, Student Life and Activities, and OIT, we targeted several key areas of concerns in the draft; these concerns included accessibility, content, and template standards as well as oversight. The data and analyses generated by the work of the sub-

committees and our consultations were considered in detail in our "Second Discussion Report" published in the *Gazette* and subsequently presented at Forum for our second discussion, all of which provided the necessary context for ultimately drafting and developing the recommended revisions to the current and revised version of 2.0091R. We were then able to begin the new year and the Spring term with a shift in focus from the viability and efficacy of our screens to the viability of "going green".

The College Life Committee's 2nd charge of 2006-7 was to:

1. Identify how Brookdale is addressing environmental issues/concerns.
2. Recommend initiatives that:
 - a) address the immediate concerns of recycling and storm drain pollution
 - b) promote an institutional culture that fosters a sustainable green campus.

The Committee thought to initiate work on the Green Charge by determining what environmental initiatives have been undertaken at the college to assess Brookdale's current environmental status. To do so, the Committee invited Lou Geotting, Executive Vice President, Admin, Operations & Info and Rich Frank, Executive Director of Facilities Planning and Engineering, to our first meeting of the semester. Lou initiated a discussion about the origins of the storm drain pollution and recycling aspects of the charge. He emphasized the need to promote a culture of environmental awareness at the college to encourage positive behavioral changes by members of the Brookdale community. Rich explained the specific aspects of how Brookdale must change in order to comply with all state and federal regulations and discussed a number of Green Initiative that have already been undertaken at the College. This prompted the co-chairs to request that a document be compiled by Lou's office to explain what Brookdale has already done in an effort to "go green".

As the Facilities team compiled their data on the current "green" state of the college, the College Life committee began discussing the second aspect of our charge which dealt with the concept of "promoting an institutional culture that fosters a sustainable green campus". From the first discussions, it became apparent that the key to leading a successful environmental movement is to raise awareness regarding the impacts that our behaviors have on the degradation of the environment. To do so a campaign must be dedicated to educating all members of the Brookdale community on how one's individual actions can affect the whole.

As the committee engaged in lively discussions about methods to raise environmental awareness and about specific initiatives that could reasonably be undertaken at Brookdale, it became clear that while a campaign would start the ball rolling on a path to going green, having a long-term strategy in place to maintain any momentum that is generated is critical. The College Life Committee saw this as an opportunity to divide up these concepts and work in subcommittees address these issues. One committee was charged with researching green initiatives at other colleges

and universities and looking at their "green" model to find out the methodology by which environmentally sustainable decisions are evaluated and implemented and who comprises the environmental leadership structure. The second sub-committee's task was to identify strategies that could be implemented to lead the way for a cultural shift such that the Brookdale College community as a whole begins to view the local and global environment through a "green lens".

The results of College Life's work was to discover that indeed Brookdale has made considerable efforts toward environmental sustainability over the past 10 years as evidenced by the report from Facilities, but because their efforts have not been publicized campus-wide, a large portion of the campus community is unaware of these endeavors. This brings us back to the fundamental principle that guides any environmental movement...that is, any green plan must maintain its momentum by feeding off the support and ideas of all people who are impacted by the changes. Campus awareness and support of a green movement is critical to its success. The College Life Committee developed a 5-point set of recommendations which we believe will initiate a fundamental change in the way Brookdale sees our future "through the Green Lens".

1. Establish an Environmental Sustainability Action Team

comprised of students, staff, and faculty who will recommend and implement measures that can be undertaken to promote an environmentally sustainable "green" campus.

2. Make a public commitment to environmental sustainability to ensure that the implementation of green policies becomes a priority and policies are put into effect that drive the green momentum.

3. Establish a baseline understanding of Brookdale's current environmental status

by formally compiling and assessing all existing environmental data.

4. Addressing the areas of greatest concern

As Brookdale chooses to become a model of positive environmental change, then Brookdale should in its operations seek to reduce harmful impacts on the environment.

5. Foster a climate of environmental stewardship and responsibility by maintaining an on-going environmental awareness campaign to promote an institutional culture that models the principles of environmental stewardship and responsibility by its actions.

The College Life Committee is pleased to report that the recommendations were affirmed by the Forum on Tuesday, May 1, 2007, and we look forward to seeing the Brookdale Jersey Blues "Go Green".

The Committee would like to take this final opportunity to thank the College community and everyone who volunteered their time, effort and assistance throughout the year; we honestly wouldn't have space enough to list the names of all who stepped in to make these efforts come to fruition. But that, in the end, is the point. Through the collegial governance system at Brookdale,

we all have had a voice in helping to shape and articulate the vision and standards for the ways in which we work with and for our most vital human and natural resources: our students, community and the environment

Institutional Planning and Effectiveness

This has been an exceptionally busy year for the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC). In July, we started with a full-day committee retreat on the topic of Appreciative Inquiry. Aply facilitated by Linda Milstein and Sondra Cannon, the retreat helped the committee members establish improvement strategies. One tangible result was the convening of a full-professor focus group during one of the fall Faculty Days to gain their perspectives on the current state of the College, where they think it should be, and where they think it should go. This input was seriously considered by IPEC in the development of the FY 2009 Strategic Goals Matrix.

The original set of charges from the Steering Committee consisted of the development of the FY 2009 Strategic Goals Matrix and the updating/revision of the Major Indicators of Effectiveness, which were and are ongoing charges from year to year. Being gluttons for punishment, IPEC lobbied for a third charge that would call for the establishment of a College-wide Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Calendar that would highlight the dates for most major ongoing activities. In order to accomplish its many tasks, IPEC created the following three subcommittees: (1) Matrix, chaired by Terry Healy, (2) Calendar, chaired by Louise Horgan, and (3) Major Indicators, chaired by Webster Trammell.

In the early fall, IPEC presented the final version of the FY 2008 Strategic Goals Matrix to the Governance Forum. It then proceeded directly to the development of the FY 2009 Matrix. This was, by far, the most inclusive process that had been utilized up to this point. Aside from the full professors, advice was sought from the executive vice presidents and their staffs and from the other Governance standing committees. Three presentations were made to the Forum, the first of which showed major themes while the second and third laid out the subgoals. One major change was to have a first column that emphasized the teaching/learning process and that reflected more “from the classroom” information. More recent discussion centered on the strategic vs. tactical nature of the goals. Work will continue during the summer between the President’s Cabinet and IPEC that retains most of what was already developed but is also sensitive to changes that can arise when Governance is not in session.

The Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Calendar was unveiled to the Governance Forum during the fall to very positive feedback. Recommendations were evaluated by IPEC and a revised calendar was presented to the Forum in the early spring. Once again the feedback was very helpful. In April, the latest iteration was submitted to the Forum for a vote, which was passed overwhelmingly.

The Major Indicators Subcommittee decided to review all of the indicators to determine which were the most important. They chose to use a “dashboard” approach where much like on the dashboard of a car, lights would come on to warn that the vehicle might be in need of service. To avoid clutter and needless trips to the mechanic, only the most crucial lights would appear. The analogy for Brookdale would be to identify only those areas where negative change needs to be quickly identified and acted upon. A report on the Dashboard Indicators was presented to the last Governance Forum of the academic year. Work will continue over the summer in the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Research to provide the appropriate data for each of the Indicators and to recommend benchmarks, where appropriate.

Professional Development

Our first charge from the Steering Committee was a carryover charge from last year focusing on Mentoring. The three components of the charge were:

- 1. Identify current mentoring opportunities available to BCC employees.**
- 2. Determine “best practices” for mentoring.**
- 3. Develop guidelines for mentoring in a de-centralized environment.**

We finished the charge by developing Mentoring Guidelines, which were voted on and accepted at the Forum.

Our second charge concerned professional development expenditures at the College:

1. Create a database of the college’s professional development past expenditures
2. Analyze data
3. Communicate findings and recommend future professional development needs
4. Update the Professional Development Operations and Resource Guide in relation to funding procedures.

We developed recommendations which were voted on and accepted at the Forum.

In addition to our charges, the Committee carried out other activities during the year:

- Organized, hosted, and presented the Adjunct Faculty Reception in September 2006.
- Organizing, hosting, and presenting the A&E Professional Day in June 2007.
- Organizing, hosting, and presenting the Staff Luncheon in June 2007.
- Supported 2007 BIG grants with \$1300 funding and membership on the BIG Selection Committee.
- Supported the 2007 Outstanding Faculty Colleague Awards and 2007 Outstanding Adjunct Awards with \$2050 funding
- Supported the 2007 Outstanding Staff Awards with \$1000 funding and membership on Selection Committee.

- Supported Faculty Recognition Awards with funding and membership on Selection Committee.
- Funded Individual Professional Development for 103 Faculty with \$22,983
- Funded Individual Professional Development for 32 A&E with \$7,009
- Due to a shortfall in A&E funding, \$700 in requests were unable to be approved.
- Funded Individual Professional Development for 24 Staff with \$3,162

Guidelines for Mentoring in a De-centralized Environment

Components of Mentoring that should be common to all programs:

Goals of the Program:

- To increase retention.
- To support the ongoing orientation process for employees.
- To help ease mentees into their new job and reduce the stress associated with this transition; i.e. career advancement.
- To provide access to resources.
- To serve as a source of information and encouragement.
- To ensure a good start for the employee and create a sense of belonging and assimilation into the Brookdale community.
- To provide the development of good job-specific practices.

Commitment:

- Supervisors should integrate the mentoring program into their orientation of new staff members.
- Mentors/mentees should be given the time and encouragement to participate.
- Expectation of privacy regarding mentor/mentee conversations. *
- Resources should be sufficient to provide appropriate training and support for mentoring activities.
- Organizational systems should reinforce the value of mentors through recognition of their contributions (i.e. performance recognition factor, faculty promotion factor, component of personal

development plans, component of diversity development plans, etc.)

Formal Structure:

Selection of Mentors:

- Eligibility requirements for mentors should include a minimum length of service to ensure that the employee is adequately familiar with the workplace environment and has a satisfactory performance record, and understands and supports College priorities as evidenced through a discussion with the program coordinator and support from the supervisor.
- Mentors should be positive role models and well regarded by colleagues.
- Mentors should provide background information to coordinator that will assist coordinator in matching mentor with mentee.
- Mentee and Mentor should be consulted after 2-4 weeks to confirm that match is satisfactory. Make change if necessary.
- Mentees who request a mentor should be accommodated whenever possible.
- Supervisors will not mentor direct reports.
- Unless the program includes job specific coaching, mentors and mentees may be from different employment categories, departments, or divisions.
- Mentors will be expected to commit to the time needed to provide adequate support for the mentee.

Duration of mentoring relationship:

- Mentoring will generally last 3-12 months, or to be determined by the specific program.

Communications:

- Mentor-mentee communication is recommended optimally at least twice per week with face-to-face contact at least once per week.
- Mentors and mentees should utilize a variety of ways of staying in contact with

one another, including email and telephone.

- Communication may be a combination of social and business interactions.
- Communications should include introductions to one's colleagues and to individuals within the organizational hierarchy who will be important to the mentee.
- Content of communication should be guided by the program expectations and should include assurance that the mentee is oriented to those items essential to performance success and an understanding of the College in general, including**:
 - Facilities, including all off-campus locations
 - Technology, including all job required software
 - Governance, including attendance at Forums
 - Budget, including budget development process and how to process purchases, reimbursement requests, etc.
 - Strategic planning orientation, including relevance of Matrix, Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals to all positions
 - Professional development opportunities
 - Classroom and/or workplace management behaviors

Mentoring in a De-Centralized Environment:

- Mentors should arrange regular visits to Lincroft for mentees who are not located on the Lincroft campus – for visibility, orientation to the majority of offices, and so that, in general, the employee becomes comfortable navigating his/her way around the main campus.
- As noted above, mentees should be oriented to all Brookdale locations.
- Participation in professional development activities and committee work should be encouraged to meet people in different locations. Participation in monthly orientation sessions should be ensured to build camaraderie with a mentee cohort in addition to the

primary purpose of gaining information regarding the college.

Evaluation and Assessment:

- Periodic evaluation by the program coordinator should be conducted, including early confirmation that the mentoring relationship is satisfactory; mid-program follow-up to determine if any obstacles to success can be removed; and yearly assessment of the mentoring program.

Development/Training for Mentors and Mentees:

- Training should be available to all mentors prior to assignment.
- First day orientation will include an explanation of the mentoring program and the expectations of both mentees and mentors.

Ownership of Programs:

- Human Resources is the coordinator of employee mentoring for staff and administrative positions.
- The Division Chairperson, Director, or other appropriate supervisor is the coordinator of the faculty and learning assistant mentoring programs. Department Chairs assign mentors.

* Privacy expectation cannot be maintained regarding matters that involve the possibility of harm to oneself and/or others, sexual harassment, or discriminatory behavior.

** Note that the mentor may not orient the new hire in all areas but will ensure that the orientation occurs. For example, technology orientation may be a combination of workshops, assistance from the TLC, and mentor demonstrations. Strategic planning orientation is a program topic for one of the monthly new employee orientation sessions.

Our second charge was the Analysis of Professional Development Expenditures.

Charge

- Create a database of the college's professional development past expenditures
- Analyze data

- Communicate findings and recommend future professional development needs
- Update the Professional Development Operations and Resource Guide in relation to funding procedures.

Recommendations

- Obtain budget reports on a quarterly basis from the Accounting Dept
- Send a broadcast email on a monthly basis to all approved PDC requestors to reply if funds were not used
- Revise PDC reports to collect detailed data for future use
- Raise PDC funding levels to approximately 1/2 of the average cost of PD activities

A&E	\$450
Staff	\$250
Faculty	\$450

- Increase PDC budgets in correspondence to new funding levels

A&E	\$16,000
Staff	\$10,000
Faculty	\$35,000
Total	\$61,000 (From \$42,000)

- Establish an annual staff professional development day
- Include PDC Application Form and information in the New Employee Packet
- Include PDC information in the 1st year new employee orientation program during the Governance Presentation
- Continue funding job-related activities and broad-based activities, i.e. Recognition Awards, BIG Grants
- Continue updating the Professional Development Operations and Resource Guide
- Revise PDC Financial Assistance Form

Student Development

The Student Development Committee worked on two charges this year: Student Services and Student Government.

Student Services. The Committee was asked to (1) report on the characteristics of students entering Brookdale over the next five years (2) identify the implications these characteristics have for the provision of student services and (3) make recommendations for addressing these needs to promote student success. In our discussions, we considered increasing student enrollment and expansion at the HECs in addition to the needs of the emerging millennial student population.

The Committee concluded that Brookdale currently offers a broad range of services to promote student success, but that the delivery of services may be challenged by the needs and expectations of the incoming student body. With access to services, awareness of services, and assessment of services in mind, we proposed fourteen recommendations for the provision of student services. The Forum approved the Committee’s recommendations on November 21, 2006.

Student Government. The Committee was asked to (1) identify current opportunities for student input into the decision-making process at the College, including Student Life Board (2) examine existing student government models at other like institutions (3) recommend a student government model which will provide opportunities for student leadership development and input in the decision making process at the college and (4) determine the relationship, if any, between the recommended Student Government model and the Governance system at Brookdale.

The Committee first identified student input opportunities at Brookdale. We developed a chart that identified the resource, the person/department responsible for the resource, how students are made aware of the resource, and what happens to student input once it is obtained. We then examined student government models at other institutions. We read the Constitutions and/or Descriptions provided by those schools and we reviewed the responses to a “Student Government Association Survey” conducted by Student Life and Activities Associate Director Robert Quinones. We concluded that student government models at peer institutions do not have a clear advantage over the existing Brookdale model.

We next met with Associate Director Quinones and learned that Student Life and Activities is undergoing important changes this year, including establishing connections with other community colleges, focusing on leadership development, and promoting student input opportunities. We also spoke to current members of the Student Life Board and learned that their preference is to work with and improve the existing model of student leadership at Brookdale – the Associated Students of Brookdale Community College/Student Life Board (ASBCC/SLB). The students are currently revising the Constitution, increasing their attendance at leadership workshops and training, and addressing inclusiveness of all constituencies.

After completing our research, the Committee proposed ten recommendations to support the existing model of student leadership at Brookdale – the ASBCC/SLB. The Forum approved the Committee’s recommendations on May 1, 2007.

The co-chairs of Student Development wish to thank our many hard-working committee members.

COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEE YEAR-END REPORTS

Basic Skills Committee

The Basic Skills Committee accomplished many things this year due to the dedication and hard work of the entire Committee, and particularly those who have participated in the State-wide meetings held to discuss and initiate standardized SAT waiver scores and Accuplacer cut scores.

The Committee spent considerable time this year examining the data compiled by the PAR office on the efficacy of our current cut scores for the Accuplacer and waiver scores for students who take the SAT. It is our hope that we can call upon PAR in the coming year to replicate some of the previous studies. In addition, we examined the Basic Skills profiles for student completion rates in each of the four areas for the past several years and spoke about changes in course curriculum which have led to better retention and / or student success rates. This in part led to the implementation of change from a Pass / No Credit grading system to a letter grade system for the English 095 course.

The Committee also began examining some of the literature related to "Learning Communities" that link Basic Skills courses with thematic college-level courses. A prior attempt at Brookdale was discussed and a few models currently in place at community colleges in the United States were explored for possible implementation at Brookdale. Work on this initiative will continue in the coming year to determine the feasibility of initiating learning communities at Brookdale and the structure that would best serve students.

Finally, Outreach 2007 was the best attended conference we have held to date, with a record 77 high school participants in attendance. The Committee returned to an earlier format of devising theme-based breakout sessions which enabled participants to discuss innovations and challenges with their colleagues; something they have been requesting on their Conference Survey each year! We once again hosted a panel of Brookdale students to share their stories and have Oly Malpica Proctor and Howard Miller to thank for their hard work in interviewing, training, and moderating the students.

The latest survey responses again look very positive and the Committee will host a focus group in early June and again in October to encourage active participation and engagement with the high school professionals, and to offer programming that will expand our linkages in Monmouth County's educational community.

The Basic Skills Coordinating team of Arminda Wey of Math, Linda Simpson of Reading, and Laura Miceli of Counseling will continue in their roles for the 2007 -2008 academic year, with Jim Cody of English as their Chair, and look forward to a challenging and productive year!

Diversity Council

Sondra Cannon and Avis McMillon, co-chairs

This has been an exciting year for the Council given the primary focus on the charges assigned by the Steering Committee. Members participated in a review of the Diversity Council's mission as it related to the College's Vision, Values, Mission and Goals. We conducted an assessment of the campus community on the topic of diversity needs and view of the status of this Council. The final element was to recommend the most appropriate status for the Council within the Governance structure of the College.

As a result of the work completed by Council members, the "Statement of Purpose" was deemed consistent with the aims and needs expressed by the College. The "Belief Statement", however, was amended to provide a definition for diversity. The Council approved using the definition developed by the Society for Human Resource Management as the basis for a general definition. We define diversity *in its broadest context, diversity is defined as recognizing, appreciating, valuing, and utilizing the unique talents and contributions of all individuals, regardless of age, career experience, color, communications style, culture, disability, educational level, employee status, ethnicity, family status, function, gender, language, management style, marital status, national origin, organizational level, parental status, physical appearance, race, regional origin, religion, sexual orientation, thinking style, speed of learning and comprehension, etc.* The group also recognized the need to provide a more specific definition that would change based upon the institutional needs of the College.

Involving the campus community was a key aspect of meeting the requirements of the charges. Council members reached out to gather answers to the following questions:

- 1) What are the differences in the status between governance standing and college-wide committees?
- 2) What are the diversity needs / goals of the department?
- 3) What role should the diversity council play in helping to meet those needs?
- 4) Can this be effectively accomplished through a college-wide committee? Through a standing committee?
- 5) What are the possible negative impacts of becoming a committee?

The results of the Council survey revealed that there are several common themes for needs related to diversity throughout campus.

Staffing issues were focused on increasing the diversity of employees to meet the needs of our students; difficulties in hiring diverse faculty; and committee assistance in recruiting, hiring and retaining faculty and staff.

Learning Environment / Culture was another category of identified needs linked to student preparation for work in a global society; discussions about the diverse ethnic and social population of students and how to impact their learning; creating a "champion" for an inclusive

environment; sensitizing the student body about issues of diversity; integrating diversity across the curriculum; promoting activities that identify and celebrate diversity; work to dismantle communications and cultural barriers to diversity and an inclusive environment; and supporting a safe environment to have diversity-related discussions.

Training / Programs represent a third area of campus-wide needs that build on diversity awareness, inter-departmental collaboration, faculty engagement, expanded programming to enhance the College.

The Diversity Council recommended that diversity join the ranks of Standing Committees to ensure a college-wide, collegial and effective mechanism for participation in the development, implementation and assessment of issues, policies and procedures on diversity and inclusion. We further recommend that this committee become the campus champion for building an organization that supports diversity and inclusion. The members of the forum overwhelmingly supported this recommendation and the Council members look forward the implementation of Standing Committee status.

The campus community has challenged the members of Council to fulfill its organizational role by addressing the following items:

- 1) Creating an operational definition of diversity at Brookdale,
- 2) Developing a diversity mission statement,
- 3) Providing statistics about diversity,
- 4) Acting as role models to embrace diversity,
- 5) Developing a newsletter devoted to informational topics in our changing cultural landscape,
- 6) Provide information to build awareness for the value of diversity,
- 7) Creating venues for campus-wide discussions of diversity-related workplace issues,
- 8) Being proactive in determining the Council agenda developed by governance,
- 9) Examining policies, procedures and practices related to employment.

During the 2006-07 Academic Year the Diversity Council served as a clearing house for diversity-related programming. The Council collaborated with, co-sponsored and sponsored activities throughout the College. We frequently promoted activities developed by the International Center, Student Life and Activities, the Holocaust Center and the Diversity Movie Series. The Council sponsored a “Katrina Talk” with former co-chair, Pamela Quatse and a Diversity Brown Bag Discussion facilitated by Diversity Manager, Pat Golden. We supported the production of the *Vagina Monologues*, the Black History Month activities, Women’s History Month programs, and NCBI Training for Student Leaders. Council members encouraged dialogue on diversity within their departments.

Current and former Diversity Council members participated in a two-day workshop facilitated by the *American Conference on Diversity* designed to increase

understanding of the language of diversity, social identity, privilege, and the cycle of prejudice. Participants shared their stories related to issues of diversity in their lives and at Brookdale. This experience serves as the springboard for “action planning” and strategic development for diversity at the College. These efforts will continue through the summer month to create a plan for the transition period from college-wide to standing committee.

The work of the Council encompassed many aspect of the College community and we would like to acknowledge the members: Genyne Applegate, Kerry Behler, Victoria Carney, Amy Clark, Bryan Clark, Dale Daniels, Marianne Drake, Gwen Evans, Pat Golden, Keith Heiman, Eve Holliday, Frank Lawrence, Dina Long, Didity Mitra, Chris Morgan, Richard Pfeffer, Robert Quinones, Carol Schedel, Maureen Sherman, Maryann Smith, Deanna Spencer, Sheri Stanford, and Sherri West. We have also appreciated the support of former Council leaders Helen Elliott, Linda Hoffman, Floresta Jones, Pamela Quatse and Linda Wang.

We look forward to a productive summer of preparation for the transition to a Standing Committee and encourage those interested in the work of our group to contact a member and join us. Thank you to the campus community for the support for diversity!

General Education Committee

A. Membership

- Members: Karen Abramski, Shay Delcurla, Alice Dresner, Chris Elliott, Shawnda Floyd, Gail Harrigan, Ann Tickner- Jankowski, Shahin Pirzad, Marty Mc Dermott, Laura Miceli, Nancy Kegelman , Nancy Liu , George Rekelaitis , Robin Smith , Delores Steinhauser, Barbara Tozzi, Linda Wang, Dave Wiseman, Jennifer Wright and Pat Wuelfing
- General Education began the year with new co-chairs Gail Harrigan and Shay Delcurla and several new members including: Dolores Steinhauser, Dave Wiseman, and Karen Abramski who volunteered to fill in a 1 year vacancy from the Counseling Division.
- Meetings were held regularly in the ATEC Building between 12noon and 1:30 during the Fall and Spring semesters.

For the entire academic year we were unable to fill one vacancy from the Arts and Communication Division and one vacancy from the Business Division

B. Charges

The Committee received and worked on two charges this year. Both charges were driven by pending state legislation regarding general education criteria for associate degrees and the desire for full credit transfer of degrees to state baccalaureate institutions.

1. General Education Designation Criteria and General Education Model

- During the Fall semester, the committee reviewed material regarding the pending changes in the state general education criteria.
- Nancy Kegelman reported at each meeting on the work of the Academic Officers Association to develop a statewide General Education Model.
- Additionally, at Dean Kegelman's suggestion, the committee began to examine language preceding the General Education requirements in the catalog in order to make it consistent throughout the catalog.
- The committee reviewed drafts of the catalog to ensure implementation of the new regulation during the transition year at the college.

2. General Education Regulation

In addition to the information gathered from Nancy Kegelman, co-Chairs Gail Harrigan and Shay Delcurlo met with Dr. Peter Burnham and Dr. Margaret McMenamin as additional resources for the charges.

The committee re-wrote the General Education regulation and after two Governance forum presentations it was voted on and passed at the March 20, 2007 Governance forum. Vote 38 for, 3 against, 1 abstention

After the regulation was passed, the committee began to evaluate the General Education courses listed in the College catalogue. Initial review showed that while most of the General Education classes would meet the new statewide model, most of the General Education Elective courses would not. Additionally, twelve classes that had General Education status would not meet the requirements of the new model. Courses which had a (d) designation in the old model, were placed under the category of Cultural and Global Awareness, but were not granted General Education status in any other category unless the course met the new model definitions.

The Committee finished the year by presenting at a special Forum on April 8, 2007 and at a College Faculty meeting on April 19, 2007. The Committee shared the new list of General Education classes with the Faculty. Faculty worked with committee members and General Education committee members on a group exercise to review the impact of the new regulation on programs and courses. Faculty also provided feedback on the criteria for General Education course status.

C. General Education Classes (Regular Business)

The committee continued to evaluate the General Education distribution in new programs and changes in programs forwarded by Academic Council. No new courses sought General Education status this year. The following programs were reviewed.

Programs

- Accounting Certificate (withdrawn)
- Environmental Studies A.S. (approved)
- Computer Science A.S. (approved)
- Electric Utility A.A.S. (approved)
- Digital Animation and 3D Design A.A.S. (approved)
- Health Information Technology A.S.

Honors Committee

This was another very successful year for the Honors Committee. The purpose of this committee is to review the Honors Program requirements, to discuss the development of new honors general education and seminar courses, to provide greater awareness of the Honors Program across the campus, and to monitor the progress of students in the program. All of these objectives were met this year.

During the 2006-2007 academic year, 23 students could potentially graduate with Honors. That would increase the number of Honors graduates in the history of Brookdale Community College from 37 to 60! The 23 students are as follows:

- Jameela Ashour
- Mallory Chosak
- Jennifer Conticchio
- Amanda Espinosa
- Alexander Festa
- Robert Heugle
- Melissa Hordichuk
- Andrew Macomber
- Karen Mathews
- Katherine Minor
- Gerard Monroy
- Milana Naumenko
- Sarah Olsen
- James Percy
- Angel Quiles
- Suzanne Reynolds
- Jill Rizzo
- Hassan Sheikh
- Jessica Soimes
- Philip Sphatt
- Rani Sullivan
- Anthony Vodola
- Lisa Zaffarese

Congratulations graduates!

Due to such high demand, the honors program has expanded its offerings in Spring 2008 to a record 10 honors courses. These 10 courses include two new courses: a seminar entitled Personhood and Personality and a general education course, PHIL 227: Introduction to Ethics.

I would like to thank the committee and my co-chair, Bob Mellert, for his help and support.

Lastly, the Honors Committee would like to extend our appreciation to all faculty, staff, and students who have helped make this program a success. Thank you for all of your hard work and diligence! It is because of all of the work that you do that the program is successful and has continued to grow.

REPORTS

Report on the May 1st Forum

Kathy Vasile, Chair of Governance, initiated the Forum by welcoming participants to the last forum of the academic year. She also indicated there would be a change in the order of the agenda to allow for additional time to count the votes on the four committee recommendations on the agenda.

The Forum continued with Webster Trammell's presentation on Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness. The college started with about 131 major indicators and reduced the list to about 51. Indicators are used to measure institutional effectiveness. We set benchmarks based on data from prior year's performance as guides of institutional performance.

Indicators related to **Access Measure**: Enrollment in credit and non-credit programs

Supporting Factors: Tuition cost, student diversity, financial aid and it includes:

- Enrollment Percentages
- -County, State, HEC's
- Racial / Ethnic Makeup
- -Staff, Students, County
- Tuition and Fees
- -State, Nationally
- Financial Aid
- -Grants and Foundation

Indicators related to **Community Measure**: Number and depth of community partnerships. Supporting Factors are: Volume and variety of a stakeholder that benefit the college – students, businesses, local government, government agencies, schools and other colleges and includes:

- Community Enrollment
- -OBCD, ESL, GED
- Partnerships
- Community Participants at College
- Community Participation by the College

Indicators related to **Quality and Excellence Measure**:

Student academic success at 4-year institutions, employer satisfaction with graduate's skills

Supporting Factors: Student learning outcomes, student satisfaction

and student engagement and it includes:

- Instruction
- Library
- Technology
- Support Services
- College Life

Indicators related to **Student Success Measure**: Student achievement of goals and objectives, graduation, employment and transfer

Supporting Factors: Completion rates, retention, goal achievements and it includes:

- Graduation Rates
- -State, National, Local
- Persistence and Retention
- -State, National, Local
- "Mini Graduations"
- Basic Skills completion
- Transfer vs. Career Rates
- Students Achieving Objectives
- -Maryland Model

If any of the indicators fall below the institutional benchmark it is a sign that the institution is not performing as well as expected. It will also signal areas in need of attention.

Kathy Vasile announced the results of the standing committee elections and announced the positions that are still open on standing committees. She encouraged forum members who are interested in serving in those committees to contact her. Members of the college community can be appointed to open positions. She also reminded participants of the end of the End of the Year Retreat on May 11 in ATC 218.

The forum continued with the vote on Academic Standards recommendations on Student Recognition Regulation. The recommendations were approved by forum members with a vote of 82 for, 5 against and 4 abstentions. The next item on the agenda was the vote on the Analysis of Professional Development Expenditures. The committee recommendations were approved by the forum participants with a vote of 81 for, 2 against and 5 abstentions. The forum continued with a vote on Student Development committee recommendations on Student Government. The recommendations were approved by the forum with a vote of 80 for, 7 against, and 4 abstentions. The last vote on the agenda, College Life recommendations on the Green Initiative were approved by the participants with a vote of 91 for, 2 against, and 2 abstentions.

The forum continued with committee reports from Academic Council, Academic Standards, College Life, Student Development, Professional Development, Institutional Planning and Effectiveness, Honors, Basic

Skills, Diversity Council and General Education. The forum concluded with all participants thanking Kathy Vasile for her outstanding work as Governance Chair.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Maria Fernandez

Here we are again at the end of the year retreat! I remember last year when David Stout handed the baton to Kathy Vasile as if it were yesterday. As I started writing this message I realize how much has been accomplished during this past year by the standing and college wide committees. This year we prepared for Middle States and faced the challenges of a new state general education model. I am proud of being a member of a college community that devotes an incredible amount of time and energy to committee discussion and forum presentations, the essence of the Governance system. Thank you for showing me, one more time, the value of collaborative effort and the strength of our community.

I am indebted to Kathy Vasile for the constant support and advice as I followed her this year. Kathy has been an incredible role model who always reminded me what Governance is all about. Thank you, Kathy, for your invaluable advice about the Gazette, for creating a governance footprint for all staff members to follow. You represent the best our community has to offer. Thank you!

I want to thank the members of the Steering Committee who provide incredible insight on the issues. Thank you Eric Johansen, Carolyn McCreesh, Linda Mass, Earl Teasley, Laura Longo, Phyllis Shafer. I learned a lot from you. I want to extend a warm welcome to the newly elected Steering members Brent Costleigh and Jennifer Wright and Avis McMillon, Vice-Chair of Governance. You bring incredible experience and expertise to Steering.

See you at the Forum!