MEMBERS PRESENT

DEANS: M. Conners, G. Kehrer, D. Lemcoe, J. Lewis, R. Luke

DEPARTMENT CHAIRS/DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS:
V. Blanco, R. Ellison, F. Gordon, H. Holbeck, J. Kruszewski, T. Montani

FACULTY: X. Balabkins, S. Biswas, B. Cavanaugh, E. Dikun, C. Dolan, P. Fleming, J. Gaspar, N. Granuzzo, A. Gincel, C. Harrington, V. Kanwal, C. Pean, E. Reid, C. Reilly, E. Schatz

STUDENTS: J. Cortese, R. Dzioba, F. Husein, J. Jacik, J. Pidich, T. Sitaca, G. Virasawmi

SUPPORT STAFF: L. Friedman, K. Gormish

TASK FORCE CHAIRS:
Academic Standards: S. Zale
Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities: M. Velez
Bylaws: B. Simon
Campus Diversity: L. Carter
Campus Life: J. Herrling
Community Concerns: A. Davis
Curriculum: G. Kehrer
Educational Resources: S. Rowley

GUESTS: F. Burke, H. Hyman, U. Narayanan, T. Orosz

PARLIAMENTARIAN: M. Laskowski-Sachnoff*

MEMBERS ABSENT
DEANS: M. Laskowski-Sachnoff*

DEPARTMENT CHAIRS/DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS: M. Maciolek*

FACULTY: C. Bowers*, J. Lasky*

STUDENTS: L. Campbell, C. Pena, M. Poandl, T. Robinson, D. Wesnowsky*, J. Willard, J.C.Yew*

SUPPORT STAFF: S. DeSantis*, J. Fuller, J. Slicner
*Excused

Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

With a quorum present, Professor Jeffrey Spector called the December regular meeting of the College Assembly to order on Thursday, December 7, 2006 at 2:10 p.m. in the Rose M. Channing Danzis Amphitheater, L'Hommedieu Hall.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Motion to approve minutes:
Mov: S. Biswas   Sec: P. Fleming
Minutes are accepted as presented.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
Professor Spector announced that the nominees for Chair-Elect of the College Assembly were Professor Richard Ellison and Dr. Christine Harrington. The biographies and goals of the two nominees were included in the packet of the minutes. The two nominees then gave their presentations. Ballots were collected and tallied by Professor Burke and Drs. Simon and Zale.

As a result of the vote, Professor Richard Ellison was elected as Chair-Elect for 2006-2008 and subsequent Chair of the College Assembly.

REPORTS OF THE STANDING TASK FORCES
A.   Academic Standards – Dr. Steven Zale, Chair
Charge:
> Review the college policy and procedure on drop/add. Consider allowing students to add a course without the signatures of the instructor and department chair during the first week of classes. Make the appropriate recommendations.

Recommendation:
> It is recommended that students be allowed to register for courses during the first week of classes without a signature provided that the class is still open. If the course is closed, then it is recommended that the student obtain the signature of the Department Chair or Dean, if the Chair is not available. It is also recommended that the student be informed in writing that it is his or her responsibility to make up the work that was missed in the course, if this is possible, and the student should be strongly encouraged to contact his or her professor as soon as possible. In addition, it is recommended that this policy be included in all registration related materials including the college catalog and website.

Rationale:
> The task force initially investigated the current policy and procedure and discovered that there was no written policy available in our college catalog or on our website. Dean Lemcoe informed us that the current policy, which was set by

Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

prior administration was as follows: *Students may register the first week for any class that has not met and has an open seat. If the class has met and there is an open seat, then the student needs the signature of the instructor and chairperson or Dean to register for the course at any point during the semester. This same procedure is true for a student changing sections.*
Dean Lemcoe indicated that the rationale for the instructor's signature was to make certain that the student understood what has been missed and the signature of the Chair or Dean was to review the overload situation.

In order to thoroughly investigate this charge, task force members contacted Deans, Chairs, all students in college governance, the Union President, the Director of Academic Advising, and the Bursar. In addition, this charge was posted on the infonet to gather input from the entire campus community. We contacted Faxian Yang at the Office of Research to inquire about the availability of data on students who add classes during this period of time and their level of success. Unfortunately, the way in which data is currently captured does not allow us to investigate this research question. The task force also gathered information on the add/drop policy at the other New Jersey community colleges.

After carefully reviewing all of the information gathered, it seemed that there were two primary issues. The first issue concerned wanting to help students make effective decisions by providing them with information obtained during the signature process versus emphasizing student responsibility, including choices and consequences. The second issue related to the administrative issue of course overloads and available space within the classroom. Several other issues included differentiating between open and closed sections, difficulty in finding faculty- particularly adjunct faculty, reducing the burden on students, the impact of missing information from the first class on overall performance, students improperly registering for courses (i.e., neither having pre-requisites nor taking courses that meet curricula requirements), the role of academic advisor, and specific programs where it is not possible to pass the course if you missed the first lab or class due to health, safety, or other reasons.

The rationale for not requiring a signature if the course is still open is our desire to reduce barriers and emphasize student responsibility. The task force also believes that it is important that the student be informed of his or her responsibility to make up any work that he or she missed. Moreover, depending on the nature of the work, it may not even be possible to make it up. It could even be encouraged (vs. required) that the student contact the faculty member prior to adding the course to aid his or her decision making or instruct him or her in the decision process. Since students are not allowed to use web registration once the semester has started, the student must physically go to the Registrar's Office to add or drop a course. The task force members believe that it is
Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

essential for this information about the student's responsibility to be communicated; therefore, a professional at the Registrar's Office would be able to accomplish this task. As for the specific programs where it is not possible to pass the course if you missed the first lab, it is suggested that these courses be closed as of the first day of the semester so that the student would not be able to register for that course without a signature as outlined below. As for the concern about students improperly registering for courses, the task force members believe that this would not occur any more frequently than it does during any other registration period where students are allowed to register without a signature.

The rationale for requiring the signature of the Chairperson or Dean once the section is closed is so the administrators can monitor overload situations and space issues. Although we believe that there are many competent professionals on campus, such as academic advisors and faculty, who could adequately communicate the student responsibility message, the task force felt that the Chairperson was needed to oversee overloads and would also have specific knowledge about the courses and their requirements. The Chairperson or Dean would be able to inform the student of his or her responsibilities. We did not believe that multiple signatures were required. It is important to note that the information we received from the registrar regarding the other community colleges indicated that only five other community colleges required two signatures to add, the majority requiring only one signature, and a couple not requiring any signature. As mentioned above, students could still be encouraged to speak directly to the faculty member. Once again, the task force believes that students should be responsible for their decision making, and it is important for the College not to make the process unnecessarily burdensome for them.

Motion to accept recommendation:
Mov: S. Biswas   Sec: P. Fleming

Discussion followed to insert, before the last sentence, the following, "It is strongly recommended that a student registering for a course during this time period speak with an academic advisor to determine if the course meets her/his graduation requirements."

Further discussion followed as to whether or not to use the word "required" instead of "recommended."

Point of Order - Mr. Kruszewski: To be consistent with the germane language of the recommendation the word "recommended" was proposed instead of "required."

Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

Motion to amend the recommendation to read: It is recommended that students be allowed to register for courses during the first week of classes without a signature

provided that the class is still open. If the course is closed, then it is recommended that the student obtain the signature of the Department Chair or Dean, if the Chair is not available. It is also recommended that the student be informed in writing that it is his or her responsibility to make up the work that was missed in the course, if this is possible, and the student should be strongly encouraged to contact his or her professor as soon as possible. It is strongly recommended that a student registering for a course during this time period speak with an academic advisor to determine if the course meets her/his graduation requirements. In addition, it is recommended that this policy be included in all registration related materials including the college catalog and website.

Mov: J. Kruszewski   Sec: Schatz

Vote on amendment:
App: 25 Opp: 4   Abs: 1

Discussion followed and Professor Balabkins called the question.

Motion to call the question:
Mov: C. Harrington   Sec: E. Reid

Vote to call the question:
App: 24   Opp: 5   Abs: 1
Question was called. Debate ceased.

Vote on amended recommendation:
App: 25   Opp: 4   Abs: 1
Motion passes.

B.   Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities -
       Ms. Martha Velez, Chair
No Report

C.   Bylaws – Dr. Beverly Simon, Chair
Professor Spector announced that the recommendation that was about to be presented and voted upon had subsequently been reported to the Assembly at the previous meeting, as outlined in the College Assembly Bylaws.

Charge:
       Re-examine the current quorum requirements for standing task forces of
       the College Assembly. Make the appropriate recommendation.

Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

Recommendation:
       The Bylaws Task Force recommends the following change to article 1.0704
       Quorum of a Task Force of the Bylaws:

Presently:

>One third of the members of a task force or committee shall constitute a quorum for those Task Forces or Committees of 15 or more members. For those Task Forces or Committees of less than 15 members a simple majority of the membership shall constitute a quorum.

Revision:

>One third of the members of a task force or committee shall constitute a quorum except for the Bylaws Task Force, which shall require four members to constitute a quorum.

Rationale:

>The only task forces, which have fewer than 15 members, are the Bylaws Task Force and the Community Concerns Task Force. To reduce the quorum of the Bylaws Task Force to one third of the members would allow only two members of the 6-member committee to make recommendations. We felt this number was too low to represent the entire committee and left the quorum at the present number of members, four. The membership of the Community Concerns Task Force is 14. According to the present Bylaws, a quorum for this task force required the presence of eight members. This is more than the quorum of the Academic Standards Task Force whose membership is 20 (1/3 of 20 is 7). To be fair to all task forces and to promote the possibility for the Community Concerns Task Force to conduct business we recommend reducing its quorum from 8 to 5 (1/3 of 14).

Motion to accept recommendation:
Mov: E. Schatz   Sec: X. Balabkins

Vote on recommendation:
App: Unanimous Opp: 0   Abs: 0
Motion passes

The Bylaws Task Force submitted the following recommendation as a report to be voted on at the next College Assembly meeting, as outlined in the College Assembly Bylaws.

Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

Charge:

>Investigate the need for a conflict of interest statement in the Bylaws. Make the appropriate recommendations.

Recommendation:

      The Bylaws Task Force recommends the following change to article
1.0300 Article III of the Bylaws:

           Presently:

               The College Assembly is responsible for making recommendations affecting academic, student, and other college affairs to the President of Middlesex County College. Subject to the legal responsibilities of the Board of Trustees and the President of the College, the College Assembly will make recommendations concerning the operations and management of the College, leaving the details of administration to the President of the College and the administrative staff.

           Revision:

               The College Assembly is responsible for making recommendations affecting academic, student, and other college affairs to the President of Middlesex County College. Subject to the legal and ethical responsibilities of the Board of Trustees and the President of the College, the College Assembly will make recommendations concerning the operations and management of the College, leaving the details of administration to the President of the College and the administrative staff.

Rationale:

      The only change we made was to add the word "ethical" to the article. The Board of Trustees already has a Code of Ethics and each employee of the college is subject to the Ethics, Conflict of Interest statement as delineated by the Purchasing Department, http://infonet.middlesexcc.edu/purchase/control.cfm/ID/94. We felt that these two documents were sufficient and did not see the need to add a Conflict of Interest statement to the Bylaws

D.   Campus Diversity – Professor Leslie Carter, Chair

Report:

      The Task Force on Diversity met on Thursday November 16, 2006. Several things were accomplished at the meeting and they are as follows:

Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

1.   The first charge regarding merging with the Task Force on Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities is still under discussion.

2.   The task force moved on to its second charge which is to "conduct surveys and/or focus groups of faculty, staff, administrators and students

to ascertain campus concerns regarding campus diversity and ways to improve awareness of other groups on campus….." The chair met with Dr. Faxian Yang in the Office of Institutional Research to find out whether his office has conducted similar research in the past. He also sought assistance in implementing an effective way to gather information related to the charge. Based in part by the meeting with Dr. Yang, the task force decided to use focus groups as its preferred method of gathering information related to the second charge.

3. The task force's goal for the remainder of the semester is to become familiar with the focus group process. Toward that end, Professor Alice Picardo will attend the next meeting and share her experiences doing a number of focus groups for the First Year Experience. The task force will also establish a timetable for the focus groups, decide what it wants to know, determine the number of focus groups and the populations to be interviewed at its final meeting of the semester.

**E.	Campus Life – Dr. John Herrling, Chair**
No Report

**F.	Community Concerns – Ms. Audrey Davis, Chair**
Report:
Responding to charge #1, the Community Concerns Task Force feels a manual should be developed to describe procedures on how departments should go about developing promotional material for their departments. It would also include some standard graphic and editorial guidelines.

Here is what we would anticipate being included:

The manual would be divided into three sections. The first section would talk about the process departments and organizations should follow: who they should contact, how to prepare information, timelines, etc. This would include procedures for requesting postings on the Infonet, Campus Cruiser and the website. It would also discuss options regarding multi-lingual formats.

The second would discuss editorial style. This would not be a comprehensive style manual, but it would go into style guidelines unique
Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

to higher education and to Middlesex County College. This would go a long way to maintaining consistency in our voice.

The third would talk about graphic style – how to maintain a consistent graphic look in all internal and external communications.

G.   Curriculum - Dean Grace Kehrer, Chair
Recommendations:

CSC 130 - Computers, Society and Ethics
      New Course

Motion to accept recommendation:
Mov: P. Fleming   Sec: E. Schatz

Vote on recommendation:
App: Unanimous   Opp: 0   Abs: 1
Motion passes.

Dental Assisting Certificate of Achievement: New Curriculum

Motion to accept recommendation:
Mov: C. Dolan   Sec: C. Harrington

Vote on recommendation:
App: Unanimous   Opp: 0   Abs: 0
Motion passes

H.   Educational Resources - Dr. Steven Rowley, Chair
Charge:
      Report on the implementation status of recommendations submitted by your task
      force in 2005-2006, approved by the College Assembly and forwarded to/signed
      by the College President.

Report:
      Regarding a recommendation made by this Task Force to the College Assembly
      on March 13, 2006:

      **That an annual program of upgrade, maintenance or refreshing be
      resourced and implemented to enable an increasing percentage of
      technology mediated classrooms and learning spaces that support the use
      of digital media services.**

Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

      **That a specification for technology mediated classrooms and learning
      spaces is developed and updated annually (e.g. ceiling mounted data/video
      projector and PC with DVD player + Internet/network connection to support
      Video on Demand services).**

      **That new flexible learning spaces are designed to include and enable the
      flexible use of media technology.**

The installation of Media Enhanced Classrooms on campus has begun this semester.

The current specification of Media Enhanced Classrooms is as follows:

> Ceiling mounted data/video projectors with XGA resolution 2000+ lumens installed with a wall switch and pall plate and security.
>
> Dell PC with monitor and DVD/CD drive.
>
> DVD/VHS dual video deck.
>
> Wall mounted speakers

Minor Capital funds from 2005/06 were allocated for 10 Media Enhanced Classrooms in ED (3), LH (1), MH (4), Lib (2)

Minor Capital funds from 2006/07 were allocated for 4 Media Enhanced Classrooms in LH (3), PEC (1)

Vocational Education funds for 2006/07 were allocated for 12 Media Enhanced Classrooms in TSC (7) and LH (5).

Currently we are awaiting the installation of the first 10 rooms this semester. It is anticipated the remaining 16 will follow.

Charge:
> Evaluate the requirements for computer lab management software. Review the investigation previously done by the Information Technology department. Consider implementation priorities. Make the appropriate recommendations.

Recommendation:
> That the College adopt the Synchron Eyes software for lab management.

Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

Rationale:
> There has been a demonstrated need for laboratory management software on the MCC campus. Instructors would benefit greatly from the ability to demonstrate to students directly on the student's computer screen in a laboratory. On campus, the need for laboratory management software currently exists in both the English and Computer Science departments. As the use of computer laboratories grows and new pedagogies emerge, the need for laboratory management software will also grow.

The <u>Synchon Eyes</u> software package allows management of student computers in a computer lab through the existing network. It allows instructors to view students' computer activities in the laboratory and to block access to areas such as the internet should the instructor deem such areas a distraction from intended laboratory activities. The package also allows instructors to display the screen of a specific computer on all screens in the laboratory. An attached sheet further describes the software.

The Information Technology department reviewed several laboratory management software packages and found <u>Synchron Eyes</u> to be best suited for the College's needs on both cost and implementation bases. Campus wide use of this software package would cost less than the installation of a previously used laboratory management package into a single laboratory. Implementation of the software would require no further modification of rooms in which it would be used.

A group of faculty members reviewed several laboratory management packages in May of 2006 and found the Synchron Eyes package to be the "easiest to work with and the most intuitive."

Members of the Task Force met with Edwin Onyschak in October for a demonstration of the <u>Synchron Eyes</u> software package. We found the package to be versatile and intuitive. The fact that the software required no additional hardware other than the existing network was a very attractive feature.

Motion to accept recommendation:
Mov: E. Schatz   Sec: P. Fleming

Vote on recommendation:
App: Unanimous   Opp: 0   Abs: 0
Motion passes.

NEW BUSINESS
None

Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

REPORT OF THE CHAIR
1. All Curriculum items that came before the College Assembly at the December 7, 2006 meeting were approved by the College President.   To be implemented by the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

2. The next regular meeting of the College Assembly will be held on Thursday, February 1, 2006.

RECOGNITION AND HEARING FROM THE PUBLIC

Professor Spector introduced the following invited guest speaker:

Mr. Brian Richards, Director of Instructional Design and Media Services and Chair for the Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education: The committee was established approximately one year ago by the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. Initially, 23 members volunteered for the committee. We had a set of charges which included assessing the current level of involvement in Distance Education, to identify course programs being planned, to identify courses and programs being offered, to review enrollment and to review success rates. In addition, the committee was charged to recommend a strategic plan for the future of distance education, to identify software and hardware needs, to recommend a timeline for the implementation of the plan, and to identify course and program evaluations, strategies and timelines. During the past year we have worked on these charges and have struggled with some definitions, particularly the definition of what is a hybrid course. We have looked at various guidelines for recommending to faculty on how to develop courses. We have developed an approval process and an application form to allow faculty to develop on-line courses. The process which I'm going to announce today is in its second iteration. It was run once in September and had about 5 applications. One was not really for a distance learning course and was not considered. Four were considered and approved, and in the end three went forward. One was withdrawn for reasons that the faculty member identified later as being a concern. We are now in the second round and we have a process which I will run through with you now. I have copies of the form for anyone that is interested to read and or give to a colleague. The process is a three page form which the faculty completes.   The first stage is to confirm the validity and the need of the course among their peers and supervisors. To consult with the Director of Instructional Design and Media Services, and to secure the signatures of their chair, dean and myself on the application form. The submission date for proposals is February 16, which will give faculty plenty of time to consider and discuss what they might want to do.   Once proposals are received, the subcommittee of the Distance Education Committee will review and evaluate the proposals, and make recommendations to the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. Proposals that are not approved, will be returned to the faculty member with suggestions in case the faculty member wishes to resubmit in the future. Those that are recommended, will be forwarded to the Vice President and in consultation with the Deans Council, the Vice Meeting of the College Assembly – December 7, 2006

President will then notify the committee and the Director of Human Resources if their are any faculty contract issues involved. The Dean will then notify the Chair who will notify the faculty member of the outcome of his/her request. The process is basically that we review recommendations, they are then discussed with the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs and then the information is sent back to the individual, chair and dean. Once the course is approved, the instructor will then be required to fulfill a number of requirements. They need to participate in a course development workshop or workshops, depending on what is available. They need to follow the guidelines for best practice to which we have adopted from the New Jersey Virtual

Community College Consortium and is included with the application document. They need to make the online materials available for review and feedback in the development phase. They need to make the completed course material available for review and sign off prior to the delivery of the course. One of the prime requirements of the Virtual Community College consortium is that all course materials are fully developed prior to the course actually being delivered to the students. We have also developed a timeline because of contractual conditions with full-time faculty who will obtain a certain amount of remission time to develop a course. We have developed two timelines. One, which is a long term timeline where faculty would get a semester to develop a course. For example, they would get 3 credit hours remission if they are developing a 3 credit hour course. If they wish to develop that in a more accelerated fashion we have made an arrangement where payment can be made instead of remission of time. For full-time and adjunct faculty who want to develop a course in an accelerated mode we have a second timeline, which is identified on the form. The application form has a number of questions, which I will leave you to review after the event. We are also trying to help faculty with this process and to actually give them more information. The committee has decided to collaborate with CELT and we have held one session. The session was held on November 27, 2006 and there were 15 attendees, which was very encouraging. We are going to do a second session on January 18, 2006, and the specific time will be published on the InfoNet and circulated widely. Information sessions include members of the committee and some who have taught online courses. It is a roundtable discussion where people get the opportunity to ask questions about what is online learning, what is involved and to ask questions about the application process.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion to Adjourn:
Mov: S. Biswas   Sec: E. Schatz

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Spector
Chair, College Assembly

JS:ls