

**MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE ASSEMBLY MEETING**  
**May 5, 2011**  
**MEMBERS PRESENT**

**DEANS:** M. Conners, D. Edwards, M. Laskowski-Sachnoff

**DEPARTMENT CHAIRS/DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS:**

V. Blanco, J. Dunning, M. Foley, J. Herrling, L. Lederer, R. Roy, T. Sabol

**FACULTY:** J. Altman, , E. Daidone, N. Dhanda, N. Granuzzo, V. Kanwal, L. Nagarajan, U. Narayanan, J. Ostacher, N. Picioccio, C. Reilly, J. Saborido, T. Young, S. Zale

**STUDENTS:** M. Broad, D. Fade, D. Gillet, L. Hernandez, Z. Hou, S. Lee, M. Scognamiglio, L. Serzan, D. Stevens, M. Wyatt

**SUPPORT STAFF:** G. Jurick, R. Nunez, T. Varites

**TASK FORCE CHAIRS:**

**Academic Standards:** T. Young

**Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities:** V. Kanwal

**Bylaws:** A. Picardo

**Campus Diversity:** B. Serrano

**Campus Life:** R. Foley

**Community Concerns:** T. Halasinski

**Curriculum:** J. Lansinger

**Educational Resources:** N. Picioccio

**GUESTS:** R. Cole, P. Farrett, P Fleming, K. Hays, N. Heller, R. Kim, A. Miller, J. Nickerson, K. Pearle, A. Picardo, D. Zimmerman

**PARLIAMENTARIAN:** J. Kruszewski

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**DEANS:** M. Brinson\*

**DEPARTMENT CHAIRS/DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS:**

**FACULTY:** S. Biswas\*, C. Bowers\*, E. Christensen\*. C. Pean\*, S. Zale\*

**STUDENTS:** M. Carringer\*, C. Freund\*, M. Madurski\*, K. Mrowiec\*, N. Robles\*

**SUPPORT STAFF:** M. Ambroziak\*, M. Hilton\*, R. Nunez\*

\*Excused

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

With a quorum present, Theresa Orosz called the May regular meeting of the College Assembly to order on Thursday, May 5, 2011 at 2:10 p.m. in the Rose M. Channing Danzis Amphitheater, L'Hommedieu Hall.

Dr. La Perla-Morales thanked the College Assembly for its work conducted this academic year, and recognized the outgoing Assembly members for their service.

The following received Certificates of Recognition:

|                   |                      |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Teresa Alston     | Matthew Madurski     |
| Matthew Broad     | Karolina Mrowiec     |
| Matthew Carringer | Jane Ostacher        |
| Naresh Dhanda     | Claire Pean          |
| John Dunning      | Nicholas Picioccio   |
| Deborah Fade      | Nidia Robles         |
| Michelle Foley    | Richard Roy          |
| Christina Freund  | Matthew Scognamiglio |
| Darlene Gillet    | Linnaea Serzan       |
| Nanette Granuzzo  | Dora Stevens         |
| Zhenyu Hou        | Terry Varites        |
| Gabriela Jurick   | Mariia Wyatt         |
| Luisa Hernandez   | Tracy Young          |
| John Herring      |                      |
| Steve Lee         |                      |

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to approve minutes:

Mov: S. Biswas Sec: C. Reilly

Minutes are accepted as presented.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

### **REPORTS OF THE STANDING TASK FORCES**

#### **A. Academic Standards – Professor Tracy Young**

Charge:

Report on the implementation status of recommendations submitted by your task force in 2009-2010, approved by the college assembly, and forwarded to the college president for signature.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

Report:

**2009-2010 charge:** Investigate the feasibility of faculty members administratively withdrawing students who never attended their class by the mid-term point of the semester. What are the advantages and disadvantages? Make appropriate recommendations.

**Recommendation:** The Task Force recommends that we continue with the current policy and the committee does not recommend administrative withdrawal.; however, it is recommended that a statement be added to the college catalog and other appropriate documents (i.e. course abstracts, the pathfinder) stating that failure to attend class does not constitute a drop; students must follow the policy and procedures for withdrawal from a course.

**Status:** Signed by the President and implemented without problems

**2009-2010 charge:** Review the credit-by-examination (CBE) process and reaffirm the process or make recommendations for change.

**Recommendation:** The Task Force recommends the establishment of an Ad Hoc committee to review and establish written guidelines detailing the method and procedure for establishing and maintaining CBE at Middlesex County College.

**Status:** This was not signed by the president.

**2009-2010 charge:** Review the proposal submitted by the Department of Dental Auxiliaries Education regarding changes to the Standards of Progress for the Dental Hygiene Program. Make appropriate recommendations regarding request for approval.

**Recommendation:** The Task Force recommends that the changes be accepted as stated.

**Status:** Signed by the President and implemented without problems

**2009-2010 charge:** Investigate the enrollment process at MCC for students who have been homeschooled. Take into consideration the enrollment management policies of other New Jersey community colleges. Make appropriate recommendations.

**Recommendation:** The Task Force recommends that we accept home school diplomas. It is also recommended that the college catalog be amended to reflect the acceptance of home school diplomas

**Status:** Signed by the President and implemented without problems

**2009-2010 charge:** Revisit the way in which honors courses are designated in course listings and on transcripts to ensure consistency. Make appropriate recommendations.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

**Recommendation:** Since honors courses and sections are currently designated only by appending “H” to the end of the course code (e.g. BIO 105H), the Task

Force recommends that the parenthetical designation “(HONORS)” be added to the end of the course title to clarify and emphasize the honors status.

**Status:** Signed by the President and implemented without problems

**2009-2010 charge:** Investigate the transferability of courses to MCC from other institutions when there is a credit difference between the MCC course and the course being transferred from the sending institution. Develop guidelines for the evaluation of these courses and how they should be accepted. Will students be expected to take a part two of a course with a one credit difference? Make appropriate recommendations.

**Recommendation:** When students transfer courses to Middlesex County College from a regionally accredited institution of higher learning; and where there is a difference in credits between the course at that institution and MCC; for instance the sending college transcript has an accounting course for 3 credits and ours is 4 credits, the course will be accepted under the following conditions:

- The course must be reviewed and accepted for transfer by the appropriate Department Chair (comparison of course content with MCC’s course content)
- The course will transfer at exactly the number of credits given by the sending school whether the credit awarded is greater or lower than the MCC equivalent; thereby not requiring the student to take the course over for the additional credit required at MCC.
- Students that completed science coursework at another institution without a lab component and the MCC course requires a lab component, at the discretion of the Department Chair, would be instructed to either complete the lab component at MCC or retake the course at MCC to fulfill the required course components.
- Student’s overall transcript will need to be evaluated to determine if there is a need for an additional course to meet graduation requirements with the reduction in the number of credits. Students will need 60 or more credits to graduate and therefore, the loss of one credit will in most cases not bring the student’s total credits earned below the number of credits required to graduate. In cases where a student will need to make-up additional coursework to graduate the student will be notified by the Registrar’s Office in their credit evaluation notification which is sent after transfer credit has been posted to the student’s record. This notification will further direct the student to consult with their advisor for assistance in program planning.

**Status:** Signed by the President and implemented without problems.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

Charge:

Survey the college community regarding course opportunities for students who have been placed into Reading 009 (Reading Skills for College I). Report findings and make appropriate recommendations.

**Recommendation:**

Department chairs and faculty should be encouraged to create new credit bearing courses and/or learning communities for RDG009 students. The classes and learning communities need to meet the unique needs of RDG009 students. Students who take these courses should be advised to use the many student support services on campus that promote student success such as the tutoring center and the new learning center.

**Rationale:**

After many months of investigating this charge, it is clear to the Academic Standards Task Force members that there is no one-size fits all solution to this charge as the capabilities of this student population vary greatly. However, current policy dictates a one-size fits all solution by allowing only SPE121, SSD101, the proper math placement and a foreign language as the credit-bearing courses a student placed into RDG009 can take. This policy does not adequately serve all students in this population. Providing additional credit-bearing course opportunities would make it easier for RDG009 students to create a full-time schedule of 12 credits and it would allow them to progress in attaining their academic goals. In addition, a policy that adequately serves the RDG009 student could improve retention rates for this student population.

Evidence suggests that there are credit-bearing courses other than those listed above that RDG009 students can successfully complete with a passing grade of 'C' or better. Some RDG009 students manage to enroll in credit-bearing courses other than those listed above and we looked at the completion rates of RDG009 students enrolled in credit-bearing courses over the past 3 years. Roughly, half of the RDG009 students completed credit-bearing courses they concurrently took with a 'C' or better. This supports the claim that the one-size fits all policy does not adequately serve all students in this population. For example, over the past 3 years 25 out of 33 (76%) of RDG 009 students who concurrently took PSY123 passed PSY 123 with a grade of 'C' or better.

In conclusion, we should not have a one-size fits all policy for this student population. Department chairs and faculty should create courses in their departments that are appropriate for students placed into RDG009.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: M. Laskowski-Sachnoff      Sec: N. Picioccio

Professor Alice Picardo, Director, First Year Experience and Learning Center, asked if this would only be for new courses. Professor Young responded that it would be at the

discretion of the department as to whether it's a new course or a variation of existing course and/or learning community. When asked if ESL students were separated in the data collected. Professor Young confirmed that the data collected separated out ESL students from RDG009 students.

Vote on recommendation:

App: Majority Opp: 1 Abs: 1

Motion passes.

Charge:

Investigate the enrollment process at MCC for students who have completed a high school diploma via a correspondence program. Review policies at other New Jersey community colleges and make appropriate recommendations.

Recommendation:

The recommendation is to accept work from an accredited correspondence school as high school graduation equivalency.

Rationale:

The traditional high school diploma is universally accepted by colleges, military recruiters and employers. In keeping with this thought process and polling the other community colleges they too agree that there are some correspondence schools which are not accredited and do not align with State and National Standards for graduation. This would place the students and college who may be eligible for financial assistance in jeopardy of not receiving said funds because the program would not satisfy the standards for graduation.

However, some correspondence programs are accredited by certain bodies such as: the Commission on Secondary Schools, the Distance Education and Training Council and the Council on Higher Education Accreditation. Correspondence schools that are accredited by the above named accrediting bodies would be considered acceptable as high school graduation equivalency. If a student has attended a correspondence school which is not accredited they would then be admitted under the ability –to- benefit criteria.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: N. Picioccio Sec: V. Blanco

Vote on recommendation:

App: Majority Opp: 1 Abs: 0

Motion passes.

**Charge:**

Explore changing the current course repeat policy which states: "Students must file a written appeal with the Academic Advising Center, located in Chambers Hall, to repeat a course more than three times..." to requiring a written appeal to repeat a course more than four times.

**Recommendation:**

Based on the data and responses we received, we believe that the current policy of three attempts is sound. However, the more pressing concern is diagnosing why students are unable to pass a course, especially a developmental course, after three attempts, and what can be done to help them. More robust support and intervention for at-risk students appears necessary. We recommend that an ad hoc committee be set up to look at whether there is a more effective way to counsel and follow-up with these students.

**Rationale:**

In most community colleges in the state, the repeat policy is more stringent than our policy at MCC. Eight allow only two attempts without authorization. Permission to repeat courses is granted by the department chair or dean in every college. MCC is the only college where the advising center grants permission. In comparison to other New Jersey community colleges, our current policy is the most lenient.

The results of appeals for the period of January-June 2010, according to the Director of Academic Advising, show that no appeals were denied.

Data from the Registrar's Office in regard to the success rates of students repeating courses for a fourth, fifth, and sixth time indicates that less than half the students successfully complete a course on the fourth try. If you do a significance test for the percent passing to percent failing/withdrawing, it is highly significant that more students are not making it through. The crux of the matter seems to be why and what interventions do students need at this juncture to help them succeed to the best of their abilities.

**Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011**

None of the Chairs who responded to our email concerning their views on the current course repeat policy were in favor of raising the limit from three to four attempts. Neither dean is in favor of increasing the limit.

The two responses in favor of raising the limit stipulated that something more diagnostic and prescriptive as an intervention might be in order.

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: V. Blanco      Sec: D. Edwards

After some discussion regarding the types of support and intervention that may be needed for students repeating a course after three attempts, a vote was taken.

Vote on recommendation:

App: Unanimous    Opp: 0    Abs: 2

Motion passes.

B.    Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities -

Dr. Virender Kanwal, Chair

Charge:

Investigate various issues concerning campus facility accessibility (i.e.: distance from the College Center parking lot to the theater) as well program accessibility for persons with disabilities and mobility impairments. Make appropriate recommendations.

Recommendation:

The Task Force is requesting additional handicapped parking spaces in Lot #16. Installation of an ADA approved ramp, automatic doors as well as lighting and signage upgrades at the location (as explained in the pictures).

Rationale:

Please see attachment.

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: J. Dunning      Sec: J. Ostacher

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

Discussion followed. Questions were raised regarding the demand for additional handicap parking in Lot #16. It was stated that there is a higher demand for parking during special events at CC/PAC. Mr. Balint noted that for special events and for graduation additional temporary handicap spaces are made available, however they are not ADA approved and this could possibly be an issue. Another question was raised regarding handicap parking at the CC/PAC flagpole area. Mr. Balint stated that this is not possible due to the high volume of pedestrian traffic, enforcement issues and parts of that area is designated as a Fire Lane.

Discussion continued regarding handicap parking in the gated area of Lot #3. It was stated that although handicap parking in that area does not fill up as quickly as the lower area of Lot #3, it's an uphill path to the College Center/Performing Arts Center. It was noted that there is an ADA entrance in the area of Lot #16 which provides direct access into the building.

Given the cost of installing an automatic door and ramp on the side of the College Center that faces Lot #16, discussion ensued to strike out the last sentence of the recommendation and replace it with "However, it is recommended that the investigation of other cost-effective options for handicapped access to the College Center should be undertaken by Facilities Management, with consideration given to the possible conversion of spaces in Lot #16 as part of an economical and financially feasible option.

A motion was made to amend the recommendation to read: The Task Force is requesting additional handicapped parking spaces in Lot #16. However, it is recommended that the investigation of other cost-effective options for handicapped access to the College Center should be undertaken by Facilities Management, with consideration given to the possible conversion of spaces in Lot #16 as part of an economical and financially feasible option.

Mov: M. Laskowski-Sachnoff    Sec: M. Foley

Vote on amendment:

App: Majority    Opp: 1    Abs: 0

Amendment passes.

Vote on amended recommendation:

App: Majority    Opp: 1    Abs: 0

Motion passes.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

**C. Bylaws – Professor Alice Picardo, Chair**

No Report.

**D. Campus Diversity – Ms. Blanca Serrano, Chair**

Charge:

Report on the implementation status of recommendations submitted by your task force in 2009-2010, approved by the College Assembly, and forwarded to the College President for signature.

**Report:**

The implementation status of recommendations submitted by the Campus Diversity Task Force in 2009-2010 were signed by the College President. New charges were developed for the Diversity Task Force to continue.

**Charge:**

Examine the depth and breadth of diversity content in MCC's existing curricula and make recommendations to adequately address gaps in course offerings, should they exist. Consideration should be given to the racial, cultural, linguistic, ethnic makeup and sexual orientation of the total student body with respect to whether adequate representation is reflected in the curricula.

**Recommendation:**

After examining the depth and breadth of diversity course content in MCC's existing curricula, the Campus Diversity Task Force finds that there is adequate representation of the total student body in the diversity courses. However, The Task Force on Diversity would like to recommend reviewing, some of the listed (35) Diversity courses to fulfill the Humanity and Social Sciences requirements as well.

**Rationale:**

1. To make the diversity courses appealing to the students.
2. To fulfill graduation and transfer requirements.
3. To avoid lack of enrollment for some of the diversity courses.
4. To give students better options.

**Motion to accept recommendation:**

Mov: N. Picioccio      Sec: M. Laskowski-Sachnoff

**Vote on recommendation:**

App: Unanimous    Opp: 0    Abs: 1

Motion passes.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

**E. Campus Life – Professor Ronald Foley, Chair****Charge:**

Review the Code of Student Conduct policies and procedures at other colleges. Consider strategies to improve the Code of Conduct policies and procedures at MCC. Make appropriate recommendations.

**Report:**

At the present time, the Campus Life Task Force will make no recommendation with regard to this charge.

The Code of Student Conduct has been rewritten to reflect new law regarding anti-bullying. In addition to reviewing the Code of Student Conduct at every student orientation, Middlesex County College will email the Code (which includes the anti-bullying legislation) to students at the beginning of each term. The new edition of Pathfinder includes the updated code.

**Charge:**

Investigate the feasibility of installing gates at all staff parking lots, issuing key cards to faculty, staff, and adjuncts to provide access to the lots, and reinstating student parking decals. Make appropriate recommendations.

**Recommendation:**

Installing and maintaining gates at staff parking lots would be prohibitively costly and may create new, unforeseen problems such as delays in traffic. The Campus Life Task Force therefore recommends that none be built. Middlesex County College is currently re-introducing student car decals that will be distributed at student orientation. While their primary purpose is to raise the visibility of the college as students drive about off-campus, the decals may become a useful component in an improved parking plan for students. The Campus Life Task Force recommends that administration consider the decals as a part of a future student parking policy rather than just a promotional tool.

**Rationale:**

It is common knowledge that many students often ignore the rules and park in the more convenient staff-only lots. In order to quantify the problem from the staff side, the Campus Life Task Force surveyed adjuncts and a significant number reported being inconvenienced by students filling up reserved spaces.

**Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011**

Parking gates are not the solution. The estimated cost to install each parking lot is \$18,000 - \$30,000. This initial cost, plus maintenance, would not be a good use of college funds.

While student car decals are presently viewed as a promotional tool for the college, they could become part of a student parking policy that would accomplish the goal of greater adherence to parking rules. Among the possibilities would be an escalating the fine structure to address repeat offenses.

**Motion to accept recommendation:**

Mov: M. Laskowski-Sachnoff    Sec: V. Blanco

Vote on recommendation:

App: Unanimous Opp: 0 Abs: 0

Motion passes.

**F. Community Concerns – Dr. Thomas Halasinski, Chair**

No Report.

**G. Curriculum - Dr. Janet Lansinger, Chair**

Criminal Justice – Correction Administration Option A.S.

Change in Curriculum

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: D. Edwards Sec: J. Herrling

Vote on recommendation:

App: Unanimous Opp: 0 Abs: 0

Motion passes.

Criminal Justice – Police Science Option A.S.

Change in Curriculum

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: D. Edwards Sec: T. Sabol

Vote on recommendation:

App: Unanimous Opp: 0 Abs: 0

Motion passes.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

ENR 106: Introduction to Solving Engineering Problems Using Computers

New Course

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: M. Foley Sec: J. Herrling

Vote on recommendation:

App: Unanimous Opp: 0 Abs: 0

Motion passes.

Engineering Science A.S.

Change in Curriculum

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: M. Laskowski-Sachnoff Sec: C. Reilly

Vote on recommendation:

App: Unanimous Opp: 0 Abs: 0

Motion passes.

## **H. Educational Resources - Professor Nicholas Picioccio, Chair**

Charge:

Investigate the feasibility and benefits of providing every incoming first semester student with a laptop computer (include in the discussion the cost and how these could be rolled into tuition and/or fees). Survey other two and four year institutions with regard to providing students with technology. Make appropriate recommendations.

Recommendation:

It is not practical to provide a laptop or tablet device to every student upon entering the college. Instead, it is more practical to provide these devices to particular groups of students based upon need. Need could be based on the student's major, particular courses they need to take, or students who are financially disadvantaged who would rely on financial aid to cover the cost of the device.

As an alternative to providing a laptop or tablet device to each student, the students who have a need for the device could be provided with a list of acceptable laptops or tablet devices that fulfill a core list of computer requirements appropriate for their course work. Core components would include a required amount of memory, c.p.u. processor speed, hard disk space needed, required software, and the ability to connect to a wireless network.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

Rationale:

Providing laptops or tablet devices to particular students and not all students at once will provide a phased in approach to deploying computers to students on an as needed basis. This will also provide opportunity for the college to phase in wireless access across the campus that would be needed in addition to phasing in the use of the laptops or tablet devices as a teaching tool presented by trained instructors.

To phase in the laptop or tablet device program, a mandatory pre-requisite is campus wide wireless access. The cost to setup three of the largely used classroom buildings on campus, including Edison Hall, Main Hall, and the Instructional Resources buildings as a form of a phased process installation to allow wireless access is approximately \$130,000. Additionally, the cost to setup the remainder of the college that is not currently part of the wireless

infrastructure is approximately \$550,000, including both the New Brunswick and Perth Amboy Centers. Wireless connections would need to be established for all the laptops or tablet devices, as well as the printers and ceiling projectors. In many cases, the printers and ceiling projectors would need to be replaced with devices allowing wireless connectivity.

In our survey of two and four year colleges, we found a small number of technical two year colleges outside of the state of New Jersey who have implemented a successful student laptop program. Currently, there are no county/community colleges in New Jersey that offer a student laptop program. There are a few private colleges in New Jersey that do have a student laptop program.

The Educational Resources Task Force posted a request to a Community College library listserv. They asked for reaction to: "Requiring purchase of a laptop by all incoming students." To summarize the feedback on the Listserv, most respondents indicated that requiring laptops for all incoming students would be cost prohibitive.

Based on the results of the student survey collected at the beginning of April 2011, there were responses from over 1600 students. With half the students citing the need to print, providing wireless access to a printer network should increase print capability without increasing the need for additional computer labs. Over 65% of the respondents stated they would not be willing to pay additional costs through fees to pay for the laptop or tablet device.

For those select applications where laptops or tablet devices will be provided, pricing for the laptop or tablet device would be largely dependent upon the software needed for each individual students' needs based upon their major, the specific courses they take, and the type of course they take, including both

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

online and in-person courses. Alternatives to purchasing the laptops or tablet devices could be to either rent or lease the devices, where prices would vary extensively based on the equipment contents and the quantity of devices to be purchased, rented, or leased.

Benefits to providing laptops or tablet devices to students would include: (1) Compensating for the shortage of labs and would eliminate time constraints imposed by current lab hours. (2) Printing without the need to get to a computer in a computer lab to print by providing printing lounges. (3) Allowing e-books to be read versus paper books where ever possible. (4) Savings on paper for those students who can read electronic media instead of printing the content. (5) Would provide an immediate communications device and tools necessary for students to more easily complete their course work and communicate with their instructors and fellow students.

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: M. Foley    Sec: J. Ostacher

Discussion followed and it was noted that in order to require certain students to purchase a laptop or tablet that the wireless infrastructure must first be built and provisioned to allow the use of laptops or tablet devices. This would include wireless access to the network, printers and ceiling projectors.

Discussion continued regarding the positive and negative aspects of requiring certain students to purchase a laptop or tablet. It was stated that there are no other county colleges in NJ that require students to purchase a computer. On a national level fourteen colleges require students to purchase a laptop in the start-up process, and it was noted that few of these programs were successful. In addition, it was stated that many of the software packages required could run the cost of the computer well over \$1,000. For some students this could impact their financial aid, requiring larger loans, and would defeat the purpose of a low cost open door policy for community college students.

Discussion continued until Professor Foley moved the question.

Vote to move the question:

App: Unanimous    Opp: 0    Abs: 0

A 2/3 vote was reached and the question was moved. Debate ceased.

Vote on recommendation:

App: 1    Opp: 10    Abs: 11

Motion denied.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

Charge:

Examine the current technology available for faculty – both in their office and in the classroom. Investigate migrating the faculty computers to laptop computers and eliminating the need to purchase and/or maintain computers in the classrooms. Make appropriate recommendations.

Recommendation:

Using a phased approach, start providing laptops or tablet devices to faculty members who teach courses within curriculums that require the students to have similar laptops or tablet devices. This would provide the greatest impact in the most efficient manner by enabling those classes, curriculums, faculty, and students the ability to utilize mobile technology in the classroom and across the college campus.

A second phase of laptop or tablet device deployment would be to provide individual faculty the same technology being discussed thereby enabling them to prepare and present course materials in the technology enabled classroom.

It is further recommended that first, the wireless infrastructure must be built and provisioned to allow the use of laptops or tablet devices to be utilized effectively for educational needs. This includes wireless access to the network, wireless access to printers, wireless access to ceiling projectors, and wireless access on the laptops or tablet devices.

**Rationale:**

A survey was sent to both full time and part time faculty in the beginning of April 2011 which provided approximately 350 responses. The responses indicated a broad acceptance and need for portable mobile technology to provide state of the art instructional technology.

The survey indicates a diverse current use as well as a desire to have one portable device to perform preparation, presentation, and assessment of course materials both on and off campus. The survey further indicates that most faculty are actively engaged in the use of computer technology and applications and wish to further their use of technology to prepare, present, and assess course activity.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

Motion to accept recommendation:

Mov: J. Saborido Sec: C. Reilly

Discussion followed on cost effectiveness and non-effectiveness of migrating faculty and adjuncts to laptop computers.

Discussion continued until Professor Foley moved the question.

Vote to move the question:

App: Unanimous Opp: 0 Abs: 1

A 2/3 vote was reached and the question was moved. Debate ceased.

Vote on recommendation:

App: 6 Opp: 7 Abs: 9

Motion denied.

**NEW BUSINESS**

None

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

1. The curriculum items that came before the College Assembly at the April 7, 2011 meeting that were approved and signed by Dr. La Perla-Morales and forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs for implementation were:
  - MAT 113: Mathematical Structures I  
New Course
  - MAT 114: Mathematical Structures II  
New Course
  
2. The following Fast-Track curriculum items were approved:
  - Business Administration A.S.  
To include CSC 106 as an alternative to CSC 105 in the Business Administration degree. In addition, in the section Requisites/Comments it should read: Students may select an alternative to Computer Science (GE MST) course for which they have appropriate academic advisement and preparation in mathematics, such as CSC 106.
  - Environmental Technology Program  
Since the program was cancelled, the remaining course designations will change from (ENV) to Science (SCI).

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

3. Dr. La Perla-Morales signed the following recommendations by the College Assembly on April 7, 2011 and subsequently forwarded them to the various offices for implementation.
  - a. Changes to the College Assembly Bylaws according to the new organizational structure.  
This recommendation is to be implemented by the College Assembly Office.
  - b. To recombine the Task Force on Community Concerns with the Task Force on Campus Life.  
This recommendation is to be referred to the Bylaws Task Force.
  
4. The recommendations from the Accessibilities for Persons with Disabilities Task Force regarding adaptive technology services at the New Brunswick and Perth Amboy Centers were not signed. While services for students can be provided at the centers on an individual basis, given their designations as centers, it is not

the intent of the institution to offer the same level of services at the centers that is being offered on the main campus.

]

5. The recommendation from Educational Resources Task Force to expand hours and staffing in particular departments during peak periods was not signed as it was felt that this issue is currently being addressed and is a decision best left to the various divisions and/or individual departments.
6. Ms. Orosz thanked the students, faculty, administrators and support staff who have willingly served on the College Assembly and its task forces. She thanked John Kruszewski for being the Parliamentarian and webmaster for the Assembly, and Lisa Sgro, Department Assistant to the Assembly, for their service. She also thanked Dr. Hays, Office of the vice President for Academic and Student Affairs for the refreshments that were provided for the meeting.
7. Ms. Orosz announced that the Middle States Self-Study celebration was currently underway in the Brunswick Room of Crabiel Hall. She encouraged everyone to stop in and celebrate our Middle States success.
8. The first meeting of the College Assembly for the 2011-2012 academic year will be Thursday, October 6 at 2:00 p.m.

Meeting of the College Assembly – May 5, 2011

## **RECOGNITION AND HEARING FROM THE PUBLIC**

None

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to Adjourn:

Mov: M. Foley    Sec: J. Saborido

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Theresa Orosz  
Chair, College Assembly

:ls