



# Governance Gazette

*the newsletter of Brookdale Governance*

**Mid-November 2006**

## *Chair's message*

A friend of mine recently ran the New York City Marathon. What struck him most was the enthusiasm of the spectators, who lined the entire course, wildly cheering the runners as they passed by. Their support gave him and the other runners the emotional energy needed to finish the physically grueling race.

At times, whether we are students, faculty, staff or administrators, the academic year can feel like a marathon. In Governance, we have already covered a lot of ground so far. And while the end is in sight – there are only two Forums left for the semester – there is still much to accomplish. Our next Forum, with three discussions and one vote, challenges us to absorb new information on important issues and offer our feedback.

Ever have to be at two meetings at the same time? IPEC will focus on how the college coordinates all of its major activities for maximum efficiency and best use of its most important resource – you. Your input is essential in helping them develop an integrated planning calendar.

What criteria do we use to determine General Education status for courses? How does our Gen Ed model compare to the state model and what are the implications for Brookdale if legislation or the state mandates General Education offerings? The General Education Committee is grappling with these important issues and will present their findings.

What are the changes College Life is proposing for the draft of the WebSite Regulation? Their report in the Issues section outlines their rationale for revision, and the suggested changes will be shared at the Forum.

The Student Development Committee is finishing last year's Student Services charge with a vote on their recommendations. Be sure to read their vote report in this issue so that you can cast an informed vote.

We're almost there...Let's keep up the great work!

Kathy Vasile  
Governance Chair

## **November 21—FORUM MEETING**

**11:45 in Navesink II**

**\*Also on Bluesnet and  
broadcast to Western Monmouth\***

### **Agenda**

1. Discussion on the Planning Calendar, led by Institutional Planning co-chairs Arnold Gelfman and Jess Levine
2. **VOTE!** Student Development: Student Services recommendations to address the needs of entering students.

3. General Education discussion, led by Shay Delcurla and Gail Harrigan co-chairs.
4. Discussion on the College-Wide Web Site Regulation Draft, led by College Life co-chairs, Roseanne Alvarez and Cari Gigliotti

## **COMMITTEE CHARGE**

**Committee: Academic Council/General Education**

**Charge: General Education Designation Criteria and General Education Model**

## ISSUES

### Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee

#### Planning Calendar Discussion

Steering charged the IPEC with the following:

The Committee should:

1. Identify the College's major planning processes in addition to the Educational Services Master Plan, Information Technologies Strategic Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Strategic Planning Matrix, and Major Institutional Effectiveness Indicators.
2. Develop a College-wide planning calendar that
  - A) integrates the major planning processes with other important timelines and deadlines, including but not limited to:
    - o Educational Services initiatives (e.g. flow sheets, faculty days, annual goals, budget hearings, program review due dates)
    - o Governance dates (Forums, Standing Committees, retreats)
    - o Department, Division, Cabinet, Board of Trustees Meetings/Retreats
    - o Support Services Work Flow (end of year audits, peak registration and financial aid times, grant deadlines)
    - o Academic timelines (grading, testing, peak workloads)
  - B) Reduces potential scheduling conflicts

#### Under "Explanation" Steering noted that:

According to the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, "Institutional planning is a disciplined and coordinated effort...." The College has made great strides in its planning process as it now plans and budgets in an effective cycle. In order to maximize the planning process, it is necessary to review planning activities at all levels and within the context of other scheduled operations of the college as well as in relation to special initiatives such as ESMP, Middle States, etc.. Such a review will allow the college to coordinate schedules to ensure maximum attendance at planning meetings, have a more focused input into the planning process, and an opportunity to avoid scheduling conflicts where unnecessary.

"This charge is intended to address the planning of institutional activities, not to serve as an events calendar."

The Committee should:

1. Compare the Brookdale General Education model to the current state model.
2. Discuss the implications if Brookdale were to adapt its General Education model to the state model.
3. Develop objective course designation criteria that will enable the committee to better evaluate course proposals for GE course designation
4. Using the new criteria, begin to re-evaluate current GE course designations to improve the integrity of information provided to our students and college community.

#### Explanation:

In 2000, the state adopted a model for general education, A General Education Foundation for Associate in Arts and Associate in Science Transfer Programs in New Jersey's Community Colleges (5/20/99), created by the New Jersey Community College Academic Officers Association and approved by the New Jersey Council of Presidents. Its purpose was to provide a standard model to ensure ease of transfer of core general education courses between two- and four-year schools and provide "an efficient path toward an in-state bachelor's degree for New Jersey college students who begin their studies at a community college." At the time, Brookdale did not adopt this model, but instead has a variation of it, which is broader than the state model. Instead, the college did develop an "Articulation Agreement with New Jersey State Colleges and Universities" as a way to respond to this issue.

Recently, citing the failure of state community colleges and public four-year schools to remedy transfer difficulties on a volunteer basis, the state legislature is considering passage of the Lampitt Bill, which would mandate the guaranteed transfer of core gen ed courses in addition to improving the transfer rate of degree objective courses. In response, the Academic Officers have convened and are examining the issue again; a new workgroup has been formed at the state level to create a gen ed model for all 19 community colleges. It is likely this model will be based on the 2000 model.

In addition, there have been concerns that Brookdale needs clearer internal guidelines to determine if courses currently listed as general education truly meet this designation. Because it is likely that compliance with the state gen ed model will be mandated, Brookdale needs to be proactive in examining its own Gen Ed model in relation to the existing state model as well as to better clarify what determines a Gen Ed designation for existing and future courses.

---

**Questions raised by Steering:**

1. Who are the people involved in the various planning processes?
2. How are the different constituencies affected by the current planning calendar?
3. What items in the calendar have non-negotiable deadlines and which ones are flexible?
4. How should this calendar be accessed by the campus?
5. How will the calendar be compiled and maintained?
6. What preparation needs to be in place in order for the planning process to be effective?

**Introductory Comments from the IPEC**

The genesis of this charge stemmed from three important items / events. First, a very simple planning calendar had been in use and maintained by the President's Office for use in some very basic planning and coordination of events as well as a sort of overview as to what was happening when. Second, the Co-Chairs of the IPEC, while in discussion of general planning and Matrix items, began to feel that there should be some sort of *campus wide, or "public"* calendar that would not only reveal what we were planning but *when* we planned to do it. Third, the evolution of the Matrix into its present and perhaps clearer form, and even more important, its at long last coordination with the regular rhythm of planning and assessment on campus, drove the committee to see a need to not only place but also *explain* the placement of the Matrix within some sort of planning calendar. Steering's concerns about this planning calendar not becoming an events calendar are shared by IPEC. Further, IPEC feels it is important to consider whether or not such a calendar should be loaded down with the minutiae of individual department and area meetings, for example.

**Discussion of the planning calendar should thus focus, in most part, as to what gets to be included on in the calendar, where it is logically placed, and how it can be used and accessed campus wide as a valuable planning tool in the planning process.**

At the November 14th, 2006 Forum, copies of the *second rough draft* of **The Assessment, Planning and Budgeting Calendar** will be distributed. It is not included in the Gazette as it is a **color coded document** in 8.5 X 14 sideways form, and is undergoing its second draft revisions just prior to the Forum.

**General Education****General Education Designation Criteria and General Education Model**

The General Education Committee has begun discussion regarding the finalized version of the new charge published in this issue. Key issues to be discussed this year center around the current State General Education model for community colleges. In addition the committee is continuing to review changes in programs which have been to Academic Council.

The committee is still seeking representatives from the Arts and Communication Division and the Business Division. If you are interested in filling one of these positions contact Shay Delcurla or Gail Harrigan.

General Education Survey 2006

Mean => 3.25

- Fit within at least one of the knowledge areas
- Assure proficiency in communication skills through appropriate assignments
- Assure proficiency in critical thinking skills through appropriate assignments
- Incorporate one or more of the identified core competencies
- Transfer as a general education course, to four year college/universities
- Emphasize principles and methods of analytic, critical and systematic inquiry and reasoning
- Provide the foundation for success in additional courses and/or academic or vocational programs
- Be broad-based and general rather than narrowly focused on an academic or vocational specialization
- Be suitable for non-majors and not specific to any one discipline
- Transfer as a general education course to the majority of four year colleges/universities to which most Brookdale students currently transfer

**College Life Committee****Second Discussion Report:  
College-Wide WebSite Regulation  
Draft**

"Brookdale embraces technology as an enhancement of teaching and learning and as an enabling resource to provide effective access to service, information and knowledge." This excerpt, taken from the College's "Vision, Values, Mission" statement, speaks to the fundamental guiding principles of College Life's on-going

efforts in addressing the *College-Wide Web Site Regulation Draft* charge. We understand that the College Web Site is a technological vehicle that can offer the embedded promise of the above citation: to *enable*, to provide *access*, to *serve* the College community, and to enhance and support our student-centered institution. 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 becomes necessary to put in place a policy for "Web Standards and Best Practices" that at a minimum ensures that the website is current, reliable, easily navigable, and accessible to all members of the community. Additionally, 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.

The College Life Committee is diligently researching the various facets of our charge in an effort to produce a comprehensive revised draft for review and comment by Forum.

#### **Context and Charge: Purpose, Explanation, and Guiding Principles**

According to the language of the charge, the committee will:

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

According to the explanation provided for the charge,

"The College Life Committee presented guidelines on internal communications, which were approved by the Forum in May 2006. The committee also requested regulatory language to establish standards and protocols and ensure efficacy in internal communication. The College Website was identified as one of the most frequently used forms of communication and one of the most compelling in need of improvement. In response to the College Life Committee's recommendations, a draft of College Regulation 29001R—*College-Wide Web Site Development Standards and Best Practices* has been written by the College Relations Department. Participatory governance mandates that those "affected by college-wide policies, regulations, practices, and procedures have the right and responsibility to participate in developing, reviewing and recommending them." Because this regulation will affect all members of the Brookdale community, all constituencies should have an opportunity to review and respond to this important regulation early in the process."

All of our discussions, research, and ultimately, the initial revision recommendations to be presented at Forum are founded upon not only the extensive "external" research and data collection produced and assessed by our four sub committees, but also the extensive and on-going internal consultations with relevant and informed constituencies at the College, as well as the guiding principles and documents of the College. The significance of supporting and promoting the efficacy of the College's Web Site and thus, forwarding a regulation recommendation is founded on following:

- College Life Committee 2005-06 Charge: Internal Communications Recommendations and Internal Communications Guidelines (please see our First Discussion Report published in the October *Gazette* for full context regarding the Communications Guidelines)
- ESMP: Technology Chapter
- ITSP II
- Brookdale's stated "*Vision, Values, Mission*":
  - "Brookdale incorporates and uses technology in its academic and learning environments as well as its operations, not just as an end in itself but as a means of exposing students to technology's use in learning, research, and vocational applications, and as a tool for improving communications and expanding knowledge and skills. Further, operational technology is directed toward creating improved services to students and members of the community, as well as improving the efficiency, effectiveness, and diversity of services Brookdale can provide."

#### **Context, Rationale & Procedures: Research Sub-Committees**

In order to provide the rationale and context for the possible revisions and changes we are considering, College Life has separated into 4 distinct sub-committee groups each responsible for looking at a different aspect of the web regulation. One of the groups is investigating issues associated with ADA compliance. Another group is working on how to incorporate the needs and desires of students, clubs and organizations into the language of the regulation. The other 2 groups are researching Web-related policies and standards found at... (1) institutions of higher learning across the country and (2) non-academic institutions such as governmental agencies and corporations. The findings of each of the groups are summarized below:

##### ***Higher Education Group***

Findings:

- 1) Purpose: to research available information on college and university web site regulations at other institutions

- Research continues to show that policies regarding individual pages typically follow academic freedom guidelines and support freedom of expression (and even dissent). Most colleges utilize disclaimer statements that address legal issues like copyright infringement, libel, obscenity, and harassment.
- Many colleges referred to general web standards, such as those articulated by The Web Standards Project (<http://www.webstandards.org>).
- A few colleges set up models that separated their web policies based upon the types of different web developers. For example, Drew University has separate policies in place for (1) academic departments (2) administrative departments (3) clubs and organizations (4) personal home pages.
- A commonality amongst nearly all colleges investigated is recognition that the academic and administrative departmental web pages published on the college's URL do represent the identity of the college and as such, seem to be subject to a larger number of standards to maintain a professional appearance than for other college-sponsored websites.
- In many cases the disclaimer statements utilized clearly indicated that the responsible party is not the college/university, it is the website developer who is responsible.

2) Purpose: to conduct research on electronic communication and academic freedom concerns

- While academic freedom and freedom of expression must be upheld, the threat of litigation forces us to restricted freedom to an extent by any applicable laws that pertain, i.e. child pornography, defamation, harassment, copyright infringement, etc.
- Accessibility standards must apply: the legal principle that came from the case of Bruce Maguire vs. SOC Olympic Games said "under Federal disability discrimination legislation, it is unlawful for anyone who supplies goods and services to discriminate on the grounds of disabilities. And that covers websites." (<http://ausweb.scu.edu.au/aw03/papers/yates2/paper.html>)
- One of the critical aspects identified in the research was to note that the regulation of a website should not be wholly centralized; it must be a collaborative effort amongst a central overseeing body and all collaborators (ie. Information providers).

3) Purpose: consulted with OIT, the TLC staff, and members of ITAC to gain an internal, pedagogical perspective on electronic communications and regulatory needs

- Discussions generated feedback on target areas of the regulation that require further review and/or revision.

#### ***Web Standards 'Non-academic' Group***

Findings:

1) Purpose: with the college and university environment perceived as a business with education as the "good/service" provided, an investigation was made of how web standards differ outside of academia in the business world

- Government and corporate websites are for the most part centralized and overseen by some type of marketing or public relations branch.
- A comprehensive legal review of all posted materials is typically done to minimize the threats of litigation.

#### ***Student Club and Organizations Group***

Findings:

1) Purpose: to attempt to find where the students "fit" into this draft regulation

- Our student representatives informally polled students in clubs and organizations on campus and determined that the needs/desires of Clubs and Organizations are:
  - They want to link to their own sites through the BCC Web Site
  - They do not mind the utilization of a template as long as they have the ability to alter it
  - They want to know exactly what they can and cannot put on a website according to BCC
  - They want tutorials on the use of BCC's new website software, SiteBuilder
- Students are currently left out of the original draft and must be included
- The language in the draft should likely refer to the Conduct Code in the Student Handbook.

#### ***ADA Compliance Group***

Findings:

1). Purpose to ensure that Brookdale's website is accessible to the members of the community with disabilities.

- At the K-12 grade level there is an absolute expectation and regulation about what must be done to be compliant for students with disabilities. At the college-level it is not nearly as stringent. Brookdale provides services like screen readers, keyboarders, note takers, etc as a service to students not as a governmental mandate.
- As a rule, the Brookdale Disability Office will provide accommodations for computers services

for all students with disabilities. If a conflict arises where a student with a disability is unable to access some aspect of the website, the Disability Office will recommend changes to be made.

- Include the language: ‘The Brookdale Community College Office of College Relations, in conjunction with Human Resources and the Disability Services Office, will ensure that all web pages must be accessible to all users, including users with disabilities, compliant with Brookdale Community College policies in compliance with Section 508 of the American with Disabilities Act.’

### **Regulation Review: Areas of Concern**

Through Forum input, the research efforts of the above discussed sub-committees, and the committee’s consultations with members and staff representatives of ITAC, the TLC, Public Relations, Student Life and Activities, and OIT, College Life has targeted several key areas of concern in the current draft of the regulation. What follows is a brief synopsis that will be explicated and detailed in full at our second Forum discussion:

- **Content & Standards**

Our internal and external research has demonstrated that the content management model offered in the current draft of the regulation does not fully meet and reflect the needs of a flexible and dynamic post secondary academic institution. Concerns raised in our previous Forum discussions, subsequent College community feedback, committee and sub committee research, as well as constituency consultations point directly to the problematic of “appropriate material” and the current drafts focus on “violations” and disciplinary actions. In order to ensure a regulation that supports the guiding principles and the integrity of the College’s stated “Visions, Values, Mission,” as well as the expanding understanding of academic freedom in electronic communications (see, in particular, the report by the AAUP, “Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications”

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/electcomm-stmt.htm?PF=1>), the committee has come to consensus on the need to address the specific concerns on content regulation and disciplinary actions, including typos and time sensitive information, “appropriate” materials and monitoring.

- **Templates, Technology & Standards**

It is understood that the image of the College, its dedication to excellence, including accessibility, standardization, and efficacy are the driving forces behind the current draft’s focus on standards for both template and format. In fact, software and hardware concerns, the fact that the College is currently underutilizing and is in the process of transitioning toward SiteBuilder 2.X as the common tool for the College as a whole, presents many of the reasons as to why the regulation points to specific template restrictions

and guidelines. However, the committee’s extensive research on the current and projected communications and web development and support needs of both academic and non academic departments across the College explicitly point to the necessity for more flexibility in the regulatory language regarding but not limited to the following: server hosting restrictions, third party software, meta tags and files, scripting languages, and databases.

- **Oversight**

Responsibility in terms of oversight and consequence have been a recurring theme in discussion across the board during both Forum discussion to date, committee meetings, and solicited input from the College community. In meeting the commitment to collegiality fostered and supported by our College, the committee believes that Guideline 8 of the College’s Internal Communications Guidelines must be supported:

*“Communication modalities reflect the involvement of the various groups who utilize them most; therefore, the input from those who most utilize a particular modality should be significant as regards maintaining, upgrading and/or replacing any of these modalities.”*

While the support and oversight roles of the TLC and College Relations are defined in the regulation and elsewhere (see: “Internal Communications Guidelines” and the “Technology” chapter of the current draft of the ESMP), college wide input needs to be a priority built in to the regulation to ensure collegiality, efficacy, and transparency, as author Ross Yates notes in the report “Heterogeneous University Web Collectives: Managing to reduce risk in an evolving web landscape”: “The key to the successful implementation of processes [ . . . ] will require the active participation of all key stakeholders in seeking a solution. [ . . . ] Whilst consultation may not provide solutions to some of the more complex issues regarding web site governance, the role of regulator may rest with an overarching body that receives recommendations from key stakeholders across the organization. Policy implementation arising from this body would demonstrate a commitment to transparency and accommodate the disparate needs of the departments, thereby facilitating the change process” (<http://ausweb.scu.edu.au/aw03/papers/yates2/paper.html>).

### **Forum Presentation**

College Life looks forward to presenting our research and initial revision recommendations for discussion and review at the next Forum. Your input has made and will continue to make a difference as we move toward the final stages of the charge. Questions, concerns, ideas?

E-mail the committee: [collegelife@brookdalecc.edu](mailto:collegelife@brookdalecc.edu)

---

---

<b>VOTE</b>
-------------

## **STUDENT DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

### **Student Services**

Description of the Charge (2005 – 2006 Charge):

1. Report on the characteristics of the emerging cohort of students entering Brookdale over the next five years.
2. Identify the implications these characteristics have for the provision of student services.
3. Make recommendations for addressing these needs to promote student success.

### **Recommendations**

1. Brookdale should continue to offer services that promote student success. Evaluation of college services should take place every five years in accordance with College Regulation 2.0024R, "Evaluations of College Services" (Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, Section 1.3034m). To ensure assessment of student services at all Brookdale Community College (BCC) locations, the College Regulation should be revised to include the following evaluation criteria:
  - a. the need for the service at all locations;
  - b. service accessibility at all locations;
  - c. how the service is publicized;
  - d. how the service is delivered.
2. Information regarding all student services should be readily accessible on the BCC Website. To ensure assessment of the website component of the service, College Regulation 2.0024R should be revised to include whether:
  - a. the service is easy to find and placed logically on the Website;
  - b. the service can be reached through an effective website "Search Engine";
  - c. the service site is easy to navigate;
  - d. the description of the service is clear, complete and current;
  - e. the service includes an effective delivery component;
  - f. a service lacking a delivery component could incorporate one;

- g. a student evaluation component could be incorporated into the service's site.

Students (e.g., the Brookdale Student Computer Club) might be encouraged to take part in the evaluation and recommended improvement of the BCC Website. The Club should also be encouraged to help the cohort of "non-traditional" students with limited technology skills.

3. Information regarding all student services should be published in the Student Handbook. A stand-alone list of services and contact information should be distributed at orientation and available at Student Centers in all locations.
  4. Address the abilities and expectations of the emerging technology-savvy cohort and keep current with four-year college and employer expectations. Develop a formalized method to assess departmental technology needs.
  5. Expand utilization of ITV Broadcasting to provide services at all locations.
  6. Expand accessibility of Image Now Technology through the purchase of additional licenses.
  7. Evaluate "Handicap Access" in all buildings at all locations. The BCC Website and the Course Catalog should include information on the location of Handicap Parking Spaces for all buildings.
  8. Implement an awareness program designed to inform student with disabilities of the services available to them.
  9. Explore the possibility of increasing student employment opportunities on campus. Consider tuition reimbursement in departments that do not have a student help budget.
  10. Investigate models of peer tutoring and study groups.
  11. Maintain a safe and secure environment at BCC locations (e.g., well-lit parking lot). Continue to publicize and make available data regarding the safety of all Brookdale sites.
  12. Continue current mechanisms designed to elicit student feedback (i.e., *Student Satisfaction Surveys, Tell it to Brookdale, Help Me, Monthly Forum, Suggestion Boxes*). Develop a mechanism to share input from the various sources.
  13. Investigate the feasibility of establishing a "Student Government" at Brookdale.
  14. Ensure that the quality of existing services is not compromised by the introduction or expansion of new services.
- 
-

---

---

## REPORTS

### Report on the November 7<sup>th</sup> Forum

The Forum started with Governance Chair Kathy Vasile welcoming everyone.

Next Shane Evans requested a faculty member or staff to volunteer as advisor to the Mountain Sports Club. Anyone interested should contact Shane Evans at (732) 757- 7470 or [sevans3@mail.brookdale.edu](mailto:sevans3@mail.brookdale.edu).

The Forum continued with committee reports by Academic Council, Academic Standards, College Life, Institutional Planning, Professional Development, Student Development, Honors, Diversity Council, General Education and Basic Skills.

The Forum continued with a brief update by Greg Liano and Bernice Eng on the changes made to the language of the Guidelines for Mentoring in a De-centralized Environment.

Kathy Vasile indicated to Forum members that we would be using a different method for voting. Attendees were provided with a paper ballot to vote and results would be made available before the end of the meeting. The proposed Guidelines for Mentoring in a De-centralized Environment were approved with 78 votes for, 4 against and 1 abstention.

The Forum Continued with an update on the Middle States Self Study by Jayne Edman and Richard Pfeffer. The first part of the report will be based on the documents only committee work. This report will be distributed to the college community first followed by the report based on the work of selected topics committees. The quality and amount of information provided by the committees are reflection of the type of institution we are.

The next presentation on the agenda was led by Sondra Cannon and Avis McMillon, Co-Chairs of the Diversity Council, who presented an overview of the role of the Diversity Council and its evolution since 1993. They explored the advantages and disadvantages of changing the Council status to a standing committee.

Several comments were made from Forum participants related to membership and lack of representation of small departments on standing committees. Another comment stressed the need to carefully examine the consequences of changing the constitution. Another suggestion was made to associate the Diversity Council with the International Center since they both advocate for diverse educational experiences. Presenters indicated that in order to determine the status that will enable the Diversity Council to better achieve its goals, community expectations needed to be identified. The Council's membership also needs to be re-examine to allow proper representation of all college constituencies. Presenters indicated that if we accept

Diversity as an organizational imperative, then we should consider changing the status of the Diversity Council to accurately reflect its importance in the future of Brookdale Community College.

## IMPORTANT DATES IN November

**November 28: Standing Committees**

**November 29: General Education**

**November 30: Diversity Council**

**Basic Skills**

**December 5: Forum**