



# Governance Gazette

*the newsletter of Brookdale Governance*

---

## Special Year-End Issue 2010-11

---

### ***Chair's message***

Hello everybody,

Reflecting on the past year in Governance brings to mind the myriad pieces of the Governance puzzle, each an important part of the whole. Starting with Steering's summer meetings to develop charges, and IPEC's summer meetings on the evolution of the Matrix, then continuing with the start up of committee meetings and Forums in the fall, the Governance process of research, discussions, incorporation of Forum suggestions, and final recommendations is amazing to behold. In this Gazette, you'll find the highlights of the Governance year, and the committee recommendations which will be assembled into the report to the President.

Continuing on the efforts of the past couple of years to increase the inclusiveness of Governance, for the first time, retreats (as well as Forums) were videoconferenced to the branch Campus and Higher Education Centers. Many thanks to all my coworkers in ETS for supporting my endeavors and contributing to the success of the Forum experience through their technical expertise. I'd especially like to thank Sue Desiderato, Mark Schmidt, John Popovich, Mark Ghezzi, Bart Coma, Kurt Hulit, Kevin Burkitt, Frank McGaughran, and Bill Van Note for help with the Forums; Cheryl Cummings and BTV for Forum live streaming; and Jeanne Vloyanetes for assistance with the Governance archival project.

A year-long goal of Steering was realized in April with the launch of the Governance Portal Community, aimed at facilitating communication with the college community and enhancing committee work. Thank you to Patty Kahn, Camille Shelley, Gail Harrigan and Steering members, and Robert Quinones for helping in this venture. Please check the portal in the fall for the new Governance calendar, committee membership lists, and charges. The IPEC blog is easily accessed here, as well as Professional Development Committee forms and themes. Thanks to Avis McMillon and the College Relations team for advancing Governance through publicity and support of Steering's goals.

A very special thanks to the Steering Committee, a unique, dedicated, supportive, and fun-to-be-with group whom I'll never forget! Thanks also to the President's office for advice and support, and to Dr. William Toms for embracing Governance immediately upon his arrival at Brookdale. It is gratifying to see the continued support for our unique system of Governance, which is celebrating 20 Years since its inception from a committee co-chaired by Ron Sopenoff and Tony Snyder. Please join previous chairs at the Year-End Governance Retreat on May 13, to discuss ways to keep Governance strong for the next 20 years!

*Best of luck* to Gail Harrigan and Amy Gingold as they assume the role of Governance Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively.

As ever,

*Marianne Drake*

Governance Chair 2010-2011



---

## THE YEAR IN GOVERNANCE

With deep appreciation, the Steering committee thanks every member of Standing and College-wide Committees for their dedication to committee work and commitment to Governance. Thanks also to Forum attendees, in Lincroft and at the Branch Campus and Higher Education Centers, for your time and participation in the Governance process. A special thanks to Chris Cummings, Student Steering Rep, for his dedication to Governance!

### June/July/ August

Governance Steering meets to set the agenda and charges for the coming year.

### September 2010

- President's Address to Forum
- Explanation of Charges
- Update on Governance Steering Charge from 09/10
- IPEC: Matrix Update

### October 2010

- Diversity Council -Programming
- Professional Development -Themes
- Steering: Student Steering Representative
- Smoking Cessation, Education & Enforcement
- Academic Standards –Students Repeating Courses
- Honors Committee – Developing criteria for designating a course as having Honors status
- College Life – Clearinghouse of Experts at BCC
- Student Development - Computer Resources, Network & Facilities Use

### November 2010

- Professional Development Committee – Themes and Programming
- Facilities Master Plan update
- IPEC Communication Update
- General Education Update
- Steering: Student Steering Representative
- Basic Skills Committee Update
- Diversity Council: Cultural Competence

### December 2010

- What's On Your Mind

- **VOTE!** Steering Charge: Student Steering Representative
- Report: Update from the Student Life Board
- Discussion: Academic Standards; Repeating courses, D2
- Update: Academic Council

### February 2011

#### Governance Mid-year retreat: Using technology in meetings and communication, 2/1/11

- Address by the President
- **VOTE!** Steering charge on the college-wide committees
- IPEC: Discussion on the Matrix
- Diversity Council: Discussion on Programming
- Honors: Discussion on course criteria
- **VOTE!** Academic Standards: Repeating courses

### March 2011

- **VOTE!** Honors Committee: Criteria for Honors courses
- Student Development: 2.900 Policy and Regulation Review, Discussion 2
- **VOTE!** Academic Standards Committee: Repeating courses
- Academic Standards Committee: Withdrawal policy, Discussion 1
- Professional Development: Programming, Discussion 2
- Academic Standards: Withdrawal Date, Discussion 1
- Professional Development: Programming, Discussion 2
- Diversity Council: Cultural Competence, Discussion 2
- College Life: Clearinghouse, Discussion 2
- General Education/Academic Council: Core Competency Review, Discussion 1
- Steering: Constitutional Changes, Discussion

### April 2011

#### Special Forum to discuss the proposed change in Core Competencies/assessment models, April 7, 2011

- Presentation by Dr. William M. Toms, Interim President
- **VOTE!** Student Development: 2.900 Policy and Regulation Review
- Academic Council: Update
- **VOTE!** College Life: Clearinghouse

- Academic Standards: Withdrawal policy, discussion 2
- **VOTE!** Diversity: Cultural Competency Vote
- Student Life Board: Update
- **VOTE!** Academic Standards: Withdrawal Vote
- **VOTE!** General Education: Core Competencies Vote
- IPEC: Matrix & Communication Update
- **VOTE!** Steering: Constitutional Changes Vote
- Basic Skills: Update

**2010-11 Steering Committee:**

Marianne Drake, Chair  
 Gail Harrigan, Vice-Chair  
 Phyllis Shafer, Immediate Past Chair

Louise Horgan, Ex-Officio  
 Sue Desiderato, Ex-Officio

Sue Kenney, Confidential Administrative Assistant

**Staff representatives:**

Amy Gingold  
 Frank DeVita

**Administrative/Exempt representatives:**

Jennifer Jordan  
 Jeana Malmros

**Faculty representatives:**

Jim Crowder  
 Cathy Goode

**Student representative:**

Christopher Cummings

Special thanks to Mary Ann Kerwin for filling in for Frank in the summer; and to Sondra Cannon for filling in for Jennifer in the summer and fall semester.

**YEAR-END REPORT**

**Steering Committee**

In 2009-10 the steering committee was charged by Dr. Peter Burnham to “Examine, and if necessary,

formalize the articulation between the Steering committee, the Standing committees, and the College-wide committees of Honors, Basic Skills, and General Education. “ During the summer meetings of Steering in 2010, further information was sought about how to create this articulation with the college-wide committees. Language was developed and presented to the Forum. The Governance Constitution was amended to incorporate the college-wide committees into the Governance structure.

The Steering committee also explored a charge to:

1. Clarify the role of the Student Representative on the Steering Committee.
2. Formalize the relationship between the Student Steering Representative and the Student Life Board President.

Discussions about this charge were brought to Forum and feedback was obtained. As a result, language changes were proposed to the Governance Constitution to formalize the relationships. These changes were also brought to Forum and were approved.

**STANDING COMMITTEES  
YEAR-END REPORTS**

**Academic Council**

Academic Council completed one of its busiest years in recent memory. Caroline Calogero was elected as a new co-chair, replacing Barbara Burk. Dan Leyes continued in his second year as co-chair, while Barbara Burk continued to serve as unofficial Secretary, keeping Minutes and maintaining the groups’ ANGEL page every week throughout the year. Over the year, three charges were addressed. They were:

- Conduct the ongoing work of oversight of the approval process for new and revised courses and programs.
- Collaborate with the Honors Committee to determine the criteria for designating a course as having Honors status.
- Collaborate with the General Education Committee to review the relationship between the current college

core competencies, The NJ state Gen Ed model , and Middle States Characteristics of Excellence Standard 12 for assessing General Education.

The first charge was the primary function of the committee, and in all, over 120 changes to curriculum were approved. These included twelve new courses and ten new programs. In an ongoing effort to keep the catalog current, twenty two courses were deleted and seven programs discontinued. Additionally sixteen course revisions and twenty program revisions were approved, as well as eleven prerequisite changes, nine credit changes, and eleven course description changes. Two course code changes and five course title changes were also approved. The specific changes were covered in the Council’s two presentations for the college Forum.

In consultation with Academic Council, the Honors Committee was able to develop clear criteria for designating courses as having Honors status. These criteria were presented, discussed, and ultimately approved at the Governance Forum. Academic Council would like to acknowledge Laura Neitzel and Jonathan Moschberger, and the Honors committee for their tireless work in the completion of this charge.

Finally, in a special mid-year charge, Academic Council collaborated with the General Education Committee to review the relationship between the current college core competencies, The NJ state Gen Ed model, and Middle States Characteristics of Excellence Standard 12 for assessing General Education. After considerable discussion and input from the college community during two forum presentations, the recommendation of the Gen Ed committee was approved by a vote at Forum.

At our final meeting of the year, it was decided that Dan Leyes and Caroline Calogero will continue to serve as co-chairs for the 2011-2012 academic year. The chairs would like to publicly thank both Barbara Burk and Bill Templeton for their many years of service to the committee as they both are stepping down from the committee and moving on to bigger and better things.

*Caroline Calogero and Dan Leyes, Co-chairs of Academic Council*

## Academic Standards

The Academic Standards Committee had two charges this year:

1. To investigate the frequency of students repeating courses, impact on students and the potential causative factors contributing to the need for students to repeat courses and
2. To review the withdrawal policy and make recommendations for change if needed.

The following information as well as extensive discussion contributed to the committee’s proposed recommendations regarding these charges. To determine the extent of the problem with regard to the frequency of students repeating courses, the committee reviewed data prepared by PAR as summarized below. The committee recognized that the data summarized here may not have been representative of all classes; however the committee felt that the data provided an adequate sample to identify trends and patterns.

### **Number of Repeaters in Selected Courses (prepared by PAR, September 2010)**

	Fall 09	Spring 10
Total Enrollment	18,686	14,864
# of repeaters	2,902	2,812
% of repeaters	15.5	18.9

### **Number of students repeating 2, 3, 4, and 5 times in selected courses (prepared by PAR, September 2010)**

# of attempts	# of prior enrollments, Sp10	# of prior enrollments, Fa09
2	38-284	37-294
3	4-72	37-294
4	1-23	2-22
5	0-9	1-9

The committee also surveyed New Jersey Community Colleges regarding their policies on repeating classes. Seven Community Colleges responded and a summary of the survey is listed below:

- Unlimited attempts to repeat courses
- May repeat 2 or 3 times without permission
- Third attempt requires permission and probation (1 College)
- Permission may be from Department Chair or Academic Dean
- All attempts and grades appear on transcripts
- Most Colleges use the highest grade for the GPA (1 College uses most recent, 1 averages 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> attempt)
- Transferred courses cannot be repeated

---

Official withdrawals are not counted as an attempt (2 Colleges)

The committee agreed early on in our discussions that there should be no limitation on the number of times a student can repeat a course but agreed that at some point there should be an intervention. Consensus was reached that the intervention should be with a counselor. When that intervention should occur and the consequences of that intervention became a topic of debate and multiple viewpoints were shared and considered. The committee agreed to include withdrawal from a course as a course attempt. After considering the feedback generated from two Forum discussions, meeting with various members of the College Community and a great deal of committee deliberation, the committee recommended a mandatory intervention with a counselor after the third unsuccessful attempt in a course.

Academic Standards second charge was to review the withdrawal policy and make recommendations for change if needed. The committee's recommendation was based on thoughtful discussion and careful consideration of the following information:

A review of thirty Colleges withdrawal policies: 15/30 had withdrawal dates between the 9<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> week; 8/15 had withdrawal dates at the 12<sup>th</sup> week or later and 7/15 had withdrawal dates earlier than the 9<sup>th</sup> week.

Informal department surveys suggested that a majority were in favor of a late withdrawal date and were not in favor of implementing a process that would allow faculty to withdraw a student from the course. The majority also felt that the responsibility of officially withdrawing should remain with the student. Informal student surveys suggested that, of those students surveyed, a majority were in favor of a late withdrawal date to provide them with as much information as possible before they make a decision to withdraw from a course.

A literature search did not demonstrate a correlation between withdrawal date and completion rate.

A review of past completion rates for Brookdale Community College (1995 -2010) with varying withdrawal dates (halfway thru the semester, at the 2/3<sup>rd</sup> point in semester and the 4/5 point in the semester) reported completion rates between 70.8% and 75.2%.

A meeting with a representative from financial aid revealed that if a student withdraws from **all** of their

classes any time prior to the completion of 60% of the semester, their financial aid is adversely affected.

After careful consideration of the above information and feedback/comments from Forum discussion and various constituents of the College, the Academic Standards Committee recommended that no change be made to the current withdrawal policy, at this time.

*Kathy Pultar and Glen Noé, Co-chairs*

## College Life

The College Life Committee had the following charge for the 2010/2011 academic year:

“Create a clearinghouse of subject matter experts, topics, and publications from the Brookdale community for use by internal and external constituencies for such purposes as professional development, in-house training, student programming, conference follow-up, student and community programming, and public relations/marketing.”

The committee last presented to the Forum community on March 29 and received some feedback.

Based on the feedback received, two topics were added to the final recommendations:

The clearinghouse speakers' service will be free.

Membership is only for current, permanent Brookdale Community College employees.

At the April 12 Forum, the college community voted and approved the recommendations listed below:

Create a clearinghouse of subject matter experts, topics, and publications from the Brookdale community.

Develop a web-based, searchable database with a user friendly front-end.

Subject matter experts will self-identify and renew annually.

The clearinghouse speakers' service will be free.

Membership is only for current, permanent Brookdale Community College employees.

College Relations will maintain the clearinghouse.

The clearinghouse will be promoted both internally and externally.

A special thank you goes out to all of our committee members who worked so diligently this year.

*Anne Marie Sparaco and Alison Fitzpatrick, Co-chairs*

## Diversity Council



The Diversity Council was given concurrent charges this year: to create and implement cultural competency programs/initiatives for the college community and to assess the impact of the program(s); to develop a cultural competency model at Brookdale that takes into account the attitudes, structure, policies and services; and to use the model as a framework to conduct ongoing planning and implementation of programs/initiatives for the college community that support the development of a culturally competent learning and working environment.

The Diversity Council successfully collaborated with a number of committees to sponsor or produce several programs, including multiple sessions on *Dealing with Prejudice and Bullying* with Detective Dave D'Amico of the Monmouth County Prosecutors Office, a presentation and discussion on *Diversity and Higher Education* with former NJ Secretary of State and internationally renowned speaker Dr. Rev. DeForest "Buster" Soaries, Jr., and a ASBCC co-sponsored media competition for students to express their experience of diversity at Brookdale.

Meanwhile, the Council examined numerous scholarly sources and researched cultural competency models from various academic and health care institutions before presenting a working definition of cultural competence. Thanks to meaningful discussion and input from the members the Forum in November, the

following definition of cultural competence at Brookdale was developed and approved: *The awareness, knowledge-base and learned skills needed to create an inclusive environment where members of the community effectively and sensitively interact, educate and serve people from diverse backgrounds and social identities.*

The cultural competence definition provided a framework for the Diversity Council's subsequent work this year. Using the definition, Diversity Council Co-Chair Rasheda Young and Susan DeMatteo of Planning Assessment & Research successfully collaborated on an updated, quantitative assessment tool to measure the impact of programming on the development of cultural competency among students and employees. This assessment tool was used for the diversity council-sponsored programs.

The definition also formed the basis for the Brookdale Cultural Competence Model that Diversity Council presented to Forum in April. This model, which was approved by Forum vote, includes a flow chart that begins with the College Mission, Policies and Governance, includes every constituency group within the college, covers Training & Professional Development, Policies/Procedures/Practices, Recruitment and Retention, and terminates with culturally competence in Environment, Curriculum and Communications. The flow chart model and a series of criteria statements to accompany the flow chart will be posted on the Diversity Council's portal site.

The Diversity Council has summer work sessions planned to incorporate the approved cultural competence model into subsequent planning of programs/initiatives for the college community.

*Dina Long and Rasheda Young ,Co-chairs*

## Institutional Planning and Effectiveness

As has been the practice over the past many years, the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC) began its official activities well before the September opening of the Governance year. During the summer, IPEC met first with the President to obtain his feedback regarding the 2012 Strategic Planning Matrix. Prior to that meeting, a few changes had been made to the Matrix based upon feedback from the final Governance Forum of the 2010

---

academic year. The President indicated that he felt the Matrix captured most of the important goals and effectively represented them in the document. He shared the outcomes of a June Board of Trustees retreat which resulted in the establishment of priorities for the coming years and remarked how much they dovetailed with what IPEC had put together. A very significant priority initiative would be the expansion of Brookdale's Western Monmouth presence. As a result, the Matrix was revised to reflect this. He also indicated that the Board did not believe it would be in the College's best current interests to move forward with residential life; however, the doors were not closed. Accordingly, the goal was removed from the Matrix.

Shortly after the meeting with the President, IPEC also met with the President's Cabinet to obtain their Matrix perspectives. That discussion led to an increased emphasis on professional development and succession planning. It was noted that "Safety and Security" should be added. Cabinet members also discussed ways in which the Matrix can become more usable and meaningful. Much of the discussion centered on making the Matrix more outcomes oriented.

At its first official meeting in September, IPEC discussed the August meetings with the President and the President's Cabinet. The focus of those meetings was whether and how the prioritization of College goals that the Board of Trustees had developed during a June retreat was reflected in the Strategic Planning Matrix. IPEC returned to that topic and made recommended changes to the 2012 Matrix that was then presented to the Governance Forum the following week.

The Committee also discussed the two major charges developed by Steering. As in the past, the decision was made to establish subcommittees. One of the subcommittees would be responsible for the drafting of the 2013 Matrix. Chairing that committee were Barbara Boyington and Joe King. A second subcommittee chaired by Louise Horgan would work on the development of a companion document which would reflect outcome statements for each of the goals of both the 2011 and 2012 Matrices. Environmental scanning would be handled by a third subcommittee chaired by Jeanne Vloyanetes and Jim Cody. The committee also discussed varying approaches to keeping the College community

informed about major issues. Some examples were considered for presentation at the upcoming Governance Forum.

At the same time that the 2012 Matrix was being "put to bed", IPEC, under the leadership of Barbara Boyington and Joe King, embarked upon the development of the 2013 Matrix. It is important to note that this Matrix's goals would be slated to start in July 2012, almost two years from the time that they are initially considered by the IPEC subcommittee. The first presentation of the 2013 Matrix to the Governance Forum occurred in February.

At its March 1 meeting, IPEC discussed the 2013 Matrix input from the February Governance Forum. Some of the topics included globalization, "Virtual Brookdale", and student success, and Governance. Based on Dr. Sulton's feedback at the Forum, the consensus was to remove "Virtual Brookdale" from the Matrix. The other topics were referred to the Matrix Subcommittee chaired by Barbara Boyington and Joe King.

Using its environmental scanning resources (as discussed later in this report), IPEC also discussed in some depth the national attention being paid to student success. Initiatives such as Achieving the Dream, Voluntary Framework for Accountability, and the Committee on Measures of Student Success need to be closely followed. Some concern was expressed with regard to the equating on the part of some of student success and college completion. It was felt that if completion means that students achieved appropriately rigorous and meaningful outcomes that would be a strong positive. On the other hand, we need to guard against trying to increase student success and completion rates by lowering expectations. It was also recommended that we pay even more attention to providing comparative data with other institutions through benchmarking.

The consensus was that Matrix development was significantly ahead of the usual schedule. That led to a discussion of whether it would be advisable to continue the recent tradition of convening focus groups. Concern was raised that the volatile nature of recent budget developments might get in the way. Conversely, members felt that the focus groups provided a very good vehicle for people who have limited opportunities to participate in Governance to be heard. This topic was slated to be discussed again

---

at the next standing committee meeting. Subsequent events precluded this option.

The change in presidential leadership and associated political fallout resulted in a delay in further Matrix development. IPEC once again revisited the priorities set by the Board of Trustees at its June 2010 retreat. Were they still relevant? The 2013 Matrix was also examined with regard to potential changes. A consensus emerged that the basic strategic directions were still sound but that the tactics and timelines might have to change. Dr. Toms met with IPEC on April 25 and affirmed the committee consensus. He also recommended that the strategic planning window be expanded to five years and beyond. After his very helpful presentation, IPEC agreed that the next version of the 2013 Matrix should contain only a few changes. That Matrix was presented to the Forum the next day. Feedback will be considered as IPEC, in coordination with the President and President's Cabinet, refines the Matrix during the summer.

Under the very able leadership of Jeanne Vloyanetes and Jim Cody, an environmental scanning subcommittee functioned very effectively throughout the year. All one has to do is look at this site: <http://www.bccipec.blogspot.com/>, to see some of what has been accomplished. The Environmental Scanning Subcommittee is the primary vehicle for advancing IPEC's goal of developing and maintaining an informed community. Throughout the year, the IPEC Blog was continuously updated with information that could be used for the development of the Matrix and most other planning initiatives (e.g., the Information Technology Strategic Plan, Facilities Master Plan, etc.). Metrics were developed and implemented to measure Blog usage. Every issue of the Gazette and many issues of "Inside Track" had sections provided by IPEC regarding noteworthy environmental scanning information. IPEC presented the Blog to the Forum on two occasions in the fall. At the November Forum, IPEC led a discussion on "student success". Forum participants were asked to describe what they thought constituted student success at Brookdale. That discussion allowed the sharing of information from many of the ongoing nationwide examination of that issue. A major advance this Governance year was the initiation in April of the Governance Portal which hopefully will make it far easier for members of the College community to access the IPEC Blog,

IPEC had hoped to present a companion document to the Matrix that would allow drilling down to the division, department, and unit levels for the specification of tactical activities, expected outcomes, and timelines. Under Susan DeMatteo's leadership, major strides were made in the development of the appropriate templates and with creating access via the new IPEC portal. Patty Kahn's expertise and assistance allowed IPEC to be the first group to have real editing capabilities on the portal. However, implementing the companion document required the attention of people that after the budget reductions and leadership changes were not readily available. IPEC will revisit this area over the summer.

*Mary Ehret and Dr. Arnold Gelfman, Co-chairs*

## Professional Development



**Charge:** *Identify 2011-2012 college-wide Themes and Priorities in accordance with the Professional Development Blueprint.*

**Charge:** Continue implementation of the Professional Development Blueprint and collaboration with Diversity Council on programming.

An annual review of priorities and themes directs the development selection, and support of professional development programs. The Diversity Council has been charged with defining cultural competency at Brookdale and planning/ implementing programs that support development of a culturally competent learning and working environment. In-house programming is an important venue for professional development for many employees. The collaboration between the two committees will accomplish the goal of fostering dialogues that reflect the cultural competency model.

## Overview of Research Conducted and Resources Consulted



The results of our latest survey were collated based on feedback submitted by 181 college employees (26.6% staff, 44.6% faculty, 28.3% administration, and 1.6% police).

The following have been identified as college-wide themes, and therefore the barometer with which the committee makes funding decisions about applicants' chosen activities: Technology, Communication and Collaboration, Student Services and Student Development, Curriculum Development, and Leadership Management.

The aspects most important to meeting the college-wide themes and development needs, according to survey participants: Participation at conferences, attending in-house technology workshops, participating in professional organizations, participating in service to the community, and participating in mentoring.

### 2010-2011 Year End Summary



- Committee instituted virtual meetings via the ANGEL learning management system program once per month. This created meetings with strategic conversation, many voices and opinions communicated, as well as the ability to fact-check and record minutes while we "met."
- Committee used technology to store information and improve communication through the current LMS, ANGEL. This allowed committee members to check agenda, consult minutes, as all information was accessible to all members, at all times.
- Sub-committee formed to update Professional Development presence on the website / portal. The group researched all information outlets on the web connected to Brookdale

professional development. After the analysis and revision of information and separate links, a consistent and "one-stop" professional development page was created and may be utilized by all constituencies through provided links.

- Faculty sub-committee formed to create its own page, linked from the Professional development web page (Administrative page was already in use; a Staff page is under construction at this time.)
- Supported the 2011 Outstanding Faculty Colleague Awards and 2011 Outstanding Adjunct Awards and membership on Selection Committee.
- Supported the 2011 Outstanding Staff Awards and membership on Selection Committee.
- Supported the 2011 Outstanding Administrator Awards and membership on Selection Committee.
- Supported Faculty, Administrator, and Staff Peer Recognition Awards.
- Funded Individual Professional Development for Faculty, Staff, and Administrators.



- Supported Community College Innovator Showcase, sponsored by the League for Innovation in the Community Colleges' webinar "Innovator Showcase." The program included over 25 presentations by some of the brightest minds in the community college. Participants journeyed through the Virtual Expo hall to visit and explore each award winning innovation in detail. Keynote speaker was Dr. Mark Milliron, Deputy Director of Post Secondary Improvement at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, who engaged attendees in a highly interactive plenary

moderated by Jonathan Finkelstein, Learning Times Executive Producer.

Topics included:

- Learning and Teaching
- Leadership and Organization
- Workforce Preparation and Development
- Student Services and Activities
- Basic Skills and Developmental Education
- Resource Development and Foundation Management
- Research, Assessment, and Accountability
- Sustainability



### Final Comments, 2010-2011

To our knowledge, we have retained our budget allocation with which to effectively carry out our mission, and meet the development needs outlined in our results. We have been diligent, strategizing within the budget allocation we have had, and plan to spend next year exploring and creating options for even higher levels of efficiency as we face FY 2013.

*Dara Evans and Norah Kerr-McCurry, Co-chairs*

## Student Development

### Charge:

Review, revise if needed, and reaffirm, the committee's findings of '07-'08 on "Student Email Account Guidelines" in the context of the current review of the student email policy.

Evaluate and recommend appropriate changes to Policy 2.9000 Computer Resources, Network & Facilities Use along with the companion Regulation 2.9000R to include proper usage of the portal, ensuring access and security.

Recommend strategies to keep future technology advances in line with revised Policy and Regulation.

### 1. The Committee should:

Review, revise if needed, and reaffirm, the committee's findings of '07-'08 on "Student Email

Account Guidelines" in the context of the current review of the student email policy.

### Background Information:

The Student Email Account Guidelines [Student Development Committee Recommendations – May 2008] should be reviewed as part of this charge.

The committee should revise the Guidelines, if needed, and reaffirm these findings.

In the academic year 2007-2008, the Student Development Committee was charged with the following:

1. Identify the types of information that the college conveys to students via their Brookdale Community College email accounts.
2. Examine the mechanics and identify constraints of our current email system and make recommendations as needed.
3. Develop guidelines for the administration and student use of email accounts.

The current Student Development Committee was asked by Steering to re-visit these charges, and revise and reaffirm the recommendations that were made.

With input from Patty Kahn, Executive Director of Information Technology, and Ben Broder, Director, Technical Services, the Committee reviewed the 2008 Recommendations, and made the following observations:

Background Information from Student Development Committee Recommendations: 2007-2008

"Currently, the 2007-2008 College catalog states: "All students are assigned a Brookdale e-mail address upon registration. You will receive critical information such as grade and graduation notices and registration announcements. It is vital for you to regularly check your Brookdale e-mail." (Page 21) However, the college has not determined what critical information is to be or should be sent via email, and students have raised issues regarding storage, SPAM, retrieval, etc. In a continuing effort to address the need to more effectively communicate with students, and in anticipation of implementing the 2006-2007 "Green Initiative", which recommends using e-mail over paper, guidelines need to be put in place to maximize the effective use of e-mail. Responsibility of the e-mail account on the part of both the student and the college must be addressed in the guidelines. Because

email to students may contain sensitive information, these guidelines should be consistent with all state and federally mandated regulations concerning the security of student records.”

### Implementation

At our committee meeting on October 12, 2011, we reviewed the 2008-2009 Power Point presentation to forum, and we reviewed the updates to the Brookdale E-mail Recommendations from 2008. We discussed the re-wording of the recommendation about the College’s communication with students and how/if this impeded a faculty member’s prerogative to communicate with students via personal e-mail. On October 19, 2010, the Student Development Committee presented to the Governance Forum its review of the Committee’s ’07-’08 recommendations on “Student Email Account Guidelines. (See Governance Gazette, Mid-October 2010) At that forum, the Committee stated that many of the constraints with the student e-mail enumerated in the recommendations from 2007-2008 had been resolved through the implementation of Google Apps for Education and MyBrookdale Portal. However, the Committee found that there is still no formal policy covering e-mail other than what is afforded by the Acceptable Use Policy (2.9000R) and that authorized access and disclosure needs to be revised. In addition, the Committee endorsed the Guidelines for Administration and Student Use of Email Accounts originally set forth in 2008.

### Recommendations:

A) All official College communication initiated by the College will be sent through assigned Brookdale Community College e-mail accounts.

This new policy and regulation will not impede the faculty’s prerogative to communicate through desired means (e.g., ANGEL), and the student’s prerogative to forward Brookdale e-mail to personal e-mail.

B) Guidelines for e-mail use should be created and implemented, and the authorized access and disclosure statement should be reviewed.

### Rationale:

It is the current Committee’s view that the 2008-2009 Student Development Committee’s recommendations and final report to Governance laid out in a comprehensive way the need for e-mail guidelines and the necessity for the continued promotion and use of the Brookdale portal. That report should be read again, and the recommendations implemented as soon as possible.

### Suggested Timeline for Implementation:

As soon as possible.

### Overview of Research Conducted and Resources

#### Consulted:

2008-2009 Student Development Committee

Recommendations to Governance Forum.

President Burnham’s Response to Governance – 2009

Dr. Patricia Kahn – Executive Director, ITAC

Ben Broder – Director of Technical Services

Committee members from 2008-2009

#### Procedure for Assessment:

An overview of the e-mail policy and the college’s use of Brookdale e-mail for official business should be conducted by the appropriate college official on a yearly basis. If necessary, adjustments/changes should be made.

#### 2. & 3. The Committee should:

Evaluate and recommend appropriate changes to Policy 2.9000 Computer Resources, Network & Facilities Use along with the companion Regulation 2.9000 to include proper usage of the portal, ensuring access and security. Recommend strategies to keep future technology advances in line with revised Policy and Regulation.

#### Background Information:

President Burnham’s Response to Student Development Recommendations – 2009-2010 -“In conjunction with Steering, I would like to charge Student Development with evaluating and recommending appropriate changes to College Policy 2.9000, Computer Resources, Network and Facilities Use, and its accompanying regulation, 2.9000R, Acceptable Use of Computer Network, Resources and Facilities.”

### Implementation:

At our committee meeting on September 14, 2011, the Student Development Committee reviewed and discussed President Burnham’s response and our charge for this year. Co-chair Diana Glynn suggested a two step approach to the charge:  
Review Policy 2.9000 and Regulation 2.9000R  
Compare and contrast Brookdale’s policy and regulation with comparable college policies  
Donna Bastedo, Daniel Lopez and Karen Archambault agreed to research the computer use policy of Anne Arundel, Miami-Dade and Sinclair Community College. In subsequent meetings, the Committee discussed ways of comparing college policies with Brookdale. Chad Anderson developed outlines of our three comparison colleges and Brookdale’s current policy, and added Loma Linda University (four year college) to

our list. The Committee also invited Dr. Patricia Kahn, Executive Director, Information Technology Services, to our meeting to discuss her initial draft to consolidate networking resources and e-mail issues into one document.

In our review of Policy 2.9000, the Committee evaluated the above statement and found no need for revision or change.

Current Policy: 2.9000

“To prevent the misuse and abuse of the College’s computer network, resources, and facilities, and to establish appropriate conduct for all users of the College’s resources, the President is authorized to establish rules, procedures and guidelines for using the College’s computer network, resources and facilities.”

Current Regulation: 2.9000R

Regulation Statement

“In accordance with the Board Policy on Computer Resources, Network and Facilities Use, and the Board Policy on Academic Freedom, the following is to establish appropriate conduct for all users and promote acceptable usage of College computer resources, networks and facilities. *This includes the use of social networking sites, blog posting or creation of a blog, and email using a Brookdale e-mail account.*”

The Committee found that the regulation statement should be reworded to keep technology advances in line with policy and regulation (e.g., general statement covering technological advances.) The Committee recommends replacing the last sentence of the regulation with the following:

*“This policy includes all current technology with an audit of technology recommended every 18 months to incorporate future technologies.”*

The Committee also found that under the regulation statement there is no discernable difference between “Acceptable Use” and “Permitted Use,” and recommends that these sections be collapsed into one category.

The Committee recommends that the order of sections in the regulation be re-ordered to provide a more consistent flow of information. (e.g., “Authorized Use” followed by “Unauthorized Use” and “Penalty of Violation.”

In the current regulation there is no detail as to what occurs upon violation of the policy or regulation. The Committee recommends adding the following statement:

*“Alleged violations will be investigated. Students may face charges as outlined in the Student Conduct Code*

*and may face sanctions as deemed appropriate by a Student Conduct Board up to and including expulsion. Brookdale Community College employees found to be in violation could face disciplinary action up to and including termination.”*

During its evaluation of Regulation 2.9000R, the Committee found no information regarding FERPA and no citation for Digital Millennium Copyright Act. We also found no links to other important information, such as Student Conduct Code, Teaching and Learning Center, etc.

The Committee sees the need to add a section to regulation 2.9000R called “Revision History” to make it easier to follow changes from year to year.

In conclusion, these are the recommendations of the Student Development Committee with regard to our charges:

Recommendations:

A) The Regulation Statement should be reworded to keep technology advances in line with Policy and Regulation:

“In accordance with the Board Policy on Computer Resources, Network and Facilities Use, and the Board Policy on Academic Freedom, the following is to establish appropriate conduct for all users and promote acceptable usage of College computer resources, networks and facilities. This policy includes all current technology with an audit of technology recommended every 18 months to incorporate future technologies.”

B) Add a statement that details what occurs upon violation of Policy or Regulation:

“Alleged violations will be investigated. Students may face charges as outlined in the Student Conduct Code and may face sanctions as deemed appropriate by a Student Conduct Board up to and including expulsion. Brookdale Community College employees found to be in violation could face disciplinary action up to and including termination.”

C) 2.9000R should be re-ordered to keep the information from being confusing and redundant and to provide new information and links to additional content. It should also A) The Regulation Statement should be reworded to keep technology advances in line with Policy and Regulation:

“In accordance with the Board Policy on Computer Resources, Network and Facilities Use, and the Board Policy on Academic Freedom, the following is to establish appropriate conduct for all users and promote acceptable usage of College computer resources, networks and facilities. This policy includes all current technology with an audit of technology

recommended every 18 months to incorporate future technologies.”

B) Add a statement that details what occurs upon violation of Policy or Regulation:

“Alleged violations will be investigated. Students may face charges as outlined in the Student Conduct Code and may face sanctions as deemed appropriate by a Student Conduct Board up to and including expulsion. Brookdale Community College employees found to be in violation could face disciplinary action up to and including termination.”

C) 2.9000R should be re-ordered to keep the information from being confusing and redundant and to provide new information and links to additional content. It should also include a “Revision History” page to follow changes:

1. Collapsing “Acceptable Use” and “Permitted Use” into one category.
2. Reordering subject content to the following:
  - A. Use
    1. Authorized Use
    2. Unauthorized Use
    3. Penalty of Violation
  - B. E-Mail Police
  - C. Confidentiality Agreement
  - D. Privacy Issues
  - E. Copyright and Responsible Regard
  - F. Software Compliance and

Distribution

3. Include information on FERPA and Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA, 1998)

4. Add additional links to the following important information:

Student Conduct Code

Human Resources Code of Conduct

Teach Act (2002)

Teaching and Learning Center

Education Technology Services

Office of Information Technology

5. Add “Revision History” page to include the following:

Date

Revision #

Description of Change

Referenced Section

Rationale:

In its discussion and research, the Committee’s rationale was to simplify and collapse into one document networking resources and e-mail guidelines. By reviewing other colleges’ computer policies and regulations, we were able to refine Brookdale’s regulation and provide consistency and a

smooth flow of information. The Committee also wanted to provide links to resources that would provide additional information. During its evaluation of Regulation 2.9000R, the Committee found no information regarding FERPA and no citation for Digital Millennium Copyright Act. We also found no links to other important information, such as Student Conduct Code, Teaching and Learning Center, etc. The Committee feels that by providing a “Revision History” page, it would be easier to track the changes or adjustments to the regulation.

Suggested Timeline for Implementation:

Moore’s Law of Technology implies that technology advances every 18/24 months. With this in mind, the Student Development Committee recommends an audit of Brookdale’s technology every 12/18 months to ensure that technology being used in the classroom and by the college is current.

Overview of Research Conducted and Resources Consulted:

Dr. Patricia Kahn – Executive Director, I.T. Services

Ben Broder – Director, Technical Services

Brookdale Community College Policy 2.9000

Brookdale Community College Regulation 2.9000R

Information Technology Guidelines - Draft

Acceptable Use of Information Technology – Sinclair Community College

Manual of Procedures – Ann Arundel Community College

Manual of Procedures, #7900 – Miami Dade College

Computer, Network, Internet, Extranet and Intranet

Use – Loma Linda University

FERPA Guidelines

“Guiding Principles for Communication with Students”

document – 2001-2002 Student Development Charge

2007-2008 – Student Development Committee

recommendations on “Student E-mail Account

Guidelines

Budgetary Implications: (If applicable) – This can only be determined after a technology audit/assessment.

Procedure for Assessment:

An assessment/audit should be conducted by I.T.S. each year so that Brookdale can assess our technological abilities, and based on that information can determine what the priority areas are, and make

the necessary adjustments, changes or implementations to the 2.9000R.

*Dr. Diana Glynn and Rosemary Kochman, Co-chairs*

## COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEE YEAR-END REPORTS

### Basic Skills Committee

The Basic Skills Committee once again is proud of its accomplishments this year. Its commitment to the mission of Basic Skills, opportunity, access, proper placement, and improving student learning is reflected in the following results for the academic year 10/11:

- ✓ Assessed student achievement in selected learning outcomes in developmental courses.
- ✓ Worked with PAR for researching appropriate basic skills and college level course success for the Basic Skills Program Review.
- ✓ Wrote the Basic Skills Program Review and Outcomes Assessment Document.
- ✓ Continued the process of the implementation of learning communities for developmental students.
- ✓ Researched additional modes of developmental course offerings. Initializing some pilot programs including workshops on text anxiety.
- ✓ Increased the use of software in developmental mathematics and maintained use in reading and writing as a follow up to previous technology use assessments.
- ✓ Continued use of Angel shell for committee use to preview and discuss basic skills presentations and program review documents.
- ✓ Established a webpage for Basic Skills as a communication vehicle for teachers, students, and academic departments.
- ✓ Continued to offer timely discipline specific workshops, study skills workshops, and anxiety workshops for students and offer training workshops for faculty.
- ✓ Scheduled fall meetings to plan the agenda for Outreach 2011 Conference and to maintain working relationships with and among Monmouth County high school and middle school professionals.

- ✓ Planned and completed Outreach 2011 with Best Practices as the theme. There were 49 participants from high schools and middle schools, and 50 participants from Brookdale.

### General Education Committee

The General Education Committee was busy this year on a variety of fronts. They approved general education status for a variety of courses and approved the general education component of several new or revised programs. The committee also implemented the use of the newly adopted NJCC President's Council rubrics for evaluating courses for general education status. These rubrics can be found on the Academic Affairs homepage under General Education and should be utilized as the tool for evaluating whether courses meet the criteria for general education status. The major work of the committee this year was our charge through Academic Council to review the relationship between the current college Core Competencies, the NJ state General Education framework model and the Middle States Characteristics of Excellence Standard 12 for Assessing General Education, to determine if sufficient relationship exists to fold the core competencies into the NJ state General Education framework in order to simplify assessment of General Education at Brookdale, and to develop a strategy for implementation if such a change was desirable and approved. A coordination plan was developed through the office of Academic Affairs that supplied background information on the three standards that the college is currently assessing and the degree of coordination between the three.

After much discussion, both the Academic Council and General Education committees felt there was enough coordination between the categories identified by all three models to recommend that all core competencies, except personal development, could be folded into the general education model for purposes of assessment. The committees felt that although students who successfully graduated from our programs demonstrated personal development, there was not enough coordination between the general education categories and personal development to have it folded into the general education model. This recommendation was accepted by the voting body at governance on April 26, 2011.

---

## Honors Committee

This year, the Honors Committee was charged, through Academic Council, to “determine the criteria for designating a course as having Honors status.”

In 2000, the Honors Committee determined criteria for Honors courses but we revisited this issue in light of the reorganization of the program in the 2009-2010 academic year. Since the new program consists solely of Honors sections of transferrable, general education classes, it was especially important to define the differences between regular and Honors sections.

Through Committee discussions and with the input of the College community at Forum, we proposed that:

- **Honors courses use the same syllabus and course learning objectives as regular sections;**
- **Differences in pedagogy, course materials, course requirements, and assessment will be described in the addendum to the syllabus;**
- **Instructors of Honors sections should consult the Honors Course Criteria Rubric developed as a result of this charge to guide them in the development of their course.**
- **This rubric will also be used by the Honors Committee to determine whether a course should receive Honors status.**
- **The criteria described in the rubric are broad guidelines. Specific criteria will differ according to academic discipline.**

The College voted on the Honors Course Criteria Rubric at Forum on March 8, 2011. It passed (94Y, 4N, 18A).

In addition to addressing our charge, the Honors Committee worked to implement the changes to the program mandated by the revised College Regulation that was passed at Forum last year. Our projects included:

- Developing the course for the Capstone Symposium requirement of the revised program. We developed a syllabus and new course proposal that was passed by Academic Council;
- Determining a rubric for reviewing applications to the Honors program;
- Establishing the curriculum for the 2011-12 cohort;

- Creating the process for students to enroll in single Honors courses (without applying to the program);
- Developing marketing strategies to recruit students within Brookdale to the program;
- Working with the International Education Center to offer the study abroad experience for Honors students;
- Creating an Honors Club for students;
- Revising and updating the Honors website;
- Planning and hosting Honors luncheons in the fall and spring.

We wish to thank the dedicated members of the Honors Committee for an extremely productive year!  
*Jonathan Moschberger and Dr. Laura Neitzel, Co-chairs*

### REPORT OF THE APRIL 27, 2011 FORUM

Marianne Drake and Gail Harrigan introduced the **Governance portal community** to the Forum. This site will be an entryway into Governance communication and committee work.

☞ **VOTE! Diversity Council’s Cultural Competency Model** was brought forward. The measure passed: yes 66, no 8, abstentions 8.

A Basic Skills committee report was given by Arminda Wey and Brooke Batchler highlighting the work of the committee for the year.

**Student Life Board** President, Armen Sahakyan gave the Forum an update on the busy semester filled with activities support by the Student Life Board. He also introduced incoming Student Life Board president Tim Hart, Vice-President Chris Cummings, and Treasurer David Zohn.

**Academic Standards** brought forward their recommendations not to change the withdrawal date.

☞ **VOTE!** The measure passed: yes 62, no 17, abstentions 18.

**General Education** brought forward their recommendation to fold core competency categories into the General Education knowledge areas to facilitate assessment.

---

☞ **VOTE!** The measure passed: yes 54, no 23, abstentions 14.

Arnie Gelfman and Mary Ehret led a discussion about the impact of changes at the college on the **Matrix** and about the current Matrix language. They thanked Jeanne Vloyanetes and Jim Cody for their work on maintaining the Blog and keeping abreast of relevant topics for discussion within the campus community.

Last, the **Steering Committee's** proposed changes to the Governance constitution which included language incorporating the college-wide committees and clarification of the role of the student Steering representative were brought forward for a vote.

☞ **VOTE!** The measure passed: yes 57, no 1, abstentions 3.

### EDITOR'S NOTE

#### 20 YEARS OF GOVERNANCE AT BROOKDALE

Ron Sopenoff and Tony Snyder co-chaired a committee to review and develop a governance structure at Brookdale to replace what was then call the Faculty Senate. It was an effort to create a collegial governance structure for decision-making, something few thought was possible in a collective bargaining environment. This spring, we complete the 20<sup>th</sup> year of this structure which has worked through many issues over the years. As I look to start my year as chair of this valuable and unique part of Brookdale, I reflect on how previous chairs have managed the role. I know advice and ideas are close at hand because many of the past chairs are still contributing members of this institution. Here is a list of all the Brookdale members who have served as chairs of Governance since its inception:

1991-92: George Abel  
1992-93: Maris Lown  
1993-94: Carl Calendar  
1994-95: Richard Pfeffer  
1995-96: Joel Morgovsky  
1996-97: Steve Cooper  
1997-98: Steve Curto  
1998-99: Darrlyn White  
1999-00: Jess LeVine  
2000-01: Arnie Gelfman  
2001-02: Virginia Lee  
2002-03: Jack Ryan  
2003-04: Nancy Noé  
2004-05: Ann Tickner-Jankowski

2005-06: David Stout  
2006-07: Kathy Vasile  
2007-08: Maria Fernandez  
2008-09: Avis McMillon  
2009-10: Phyllis Shafer  
2010-11: Marianne Drake

I'd like to thank all of the various Governance committee co-chairs and members for your dedication and helpful advice as I developed in my role as Vice-Chair of Governance and editor of the Gazette. I appreciate your patience and support as I learned what being in this role means on a day to day basis. I also want to thank you for the work you have done to create the Gazette. In the midst of busy work schedules, you found the time to prepare clear summaries of your committees' work so the campus community could stay informed. My inbox is a testament to the number of emails it takes to keep this process moving forward!

Finally, I am grateful to Chair Marianne Drake for her continual advice, support, and friendship over the past year. Her great mind and wonderful memory have kept us on course.

I look forward to working with incoming Vice-Chair, Amy Gingold, the rest of the Steering committee and the Governance community as we meet the challenges facing our institution and engage to have a voice in its future.

Sincerely,  
Gail Harrigan  
Vice-Chair, 2010-11

---