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4 P.M.
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Liberty Campus
BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Board of Trustees

Dr. Rosemary Gillett-Karam, Chair

Mr. Craig Thompson, Esq., Vice Chair

Dr. Donald A. Gabriel

Mr. Jay Hutchins

Dr. Mary E. Owens Southall

Ms. Pamela Paulk

Ms. Shelley Payne, Student Trustee

Dr. Gary Rodwell

Ms. Maria Harris Tildon
I. PRELIMINARY PRESENTATIONS (Awards, recognitions, honors, etc.)
   A. Employee Recognitions (College Staff)

II. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS
Mr. Eric March, President, E. North Ave. Community Development Corporation (CDC) and Mr. Andrew Frank, Special Advisor to the President on Economic Development, Johns Hopkins University

III. BOARD ACTIONS/CONSENT AGENDA (All actions requiring a vote.)
   A. Approval of the November 27, 2012, Agenda ............................................... TAB 1
   B. Approval of the October 23, 2012, Minutes .................................................. TAB 2

Action: Move to approve the Board Actions/Consent Agenda.

IV. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA (For discussion and vote.)

V. COLLEGE CONTRACTS ................................................................. TAB 3
   (Action)

VI. POLICIES .................................................................................. TAB 4
   A. Employee Legal Reporting Policy  (Action)
   B. Sexual Misconduct Policy

VII. MIDDLE STATES MONITORING REPORT .................................. TAB 5
    (Dr. Peggy F.J. Bradford, vice president of Academic Affairs) (Information)

VIII. COLLEGE REPORTS
   A. Student Government Association (Mr. Calvin Gore) .................................... TAB 6
      (Information)
   B. Faculty Senate (Dr. Brad Lyman) ................................................................. TAB 7
      (Information)
   C. AFSCME Local 1870 at BCCC (Ms. Charlene Gray) .................................... TAB 8
      (Information)

IX. COLLEGE PRESENTATIONS (Designated staff to present pre-approved information)
   A. Discussion with the BCCC Foundation Board of Directors .......................... TAB 9
      (Ms. Deidre Soileau, vice president of Institutional Advancement, Marketing and Research) (Information)

X. PRESIDENT’S REPORT (President Williams) ................................. TAB 10
   (Information)
   A. New Student Trustee Information ................................................................. TAB 11
      (Information)
   B. Vacancy List .............................................................................................. TAB 12
      (Information)
XI. BOARD COMMENTS (Board Members)

XII. NEXT MEETING:
    Tuesday, January 22, 2013, Liberty Campus
    ***There will be no Board meeting in December***

XIII. MOVE TO ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL ISSUES; PENDING PURCHASE OF PROPERTY FOR THE FUTURE NEEDS OF THE COLLEGE; AND, TO OBTAIN LEGAL ADVICE. (Chair Gillett-Karam)
TAB 2
Board Members Present: Dr. Donald Gabriel, Dr. Mary Owens Southall, Dr. Gary Rodwell, Ms. Maria Harris Tildon (via conference call), Ms. Pamela Paulk, and Mr. Craig Thompson, vice chair, presiding.

Board Members Absent: Dr. Rosemary Gillett-Karam and Mr. Jay Hutchins

CLOSED SESSION
The Board did not convene for a Closed Session meeting on October 23, 2012.

I. PRELIMINARY PRESENTATIONS (Awards, recognitions, honors, etc.)
President Williams recognized Trustee Paulk as the chair of the Tippany Circle for the Red Cross and for receiving the Asanti Award from the National Kidney Foundation. Dr. Peggy Bradford, vice president of Academic Affairs, and Dr. Brad Lyman, president of the Faculty Senate, introduced the following new faculty and staff: Ms. Meta Harris, associate dean of Education, Social and Behavioral Sciences; Dr. Hsin-Yuan Chen, director of Curriculum and Assessment; Mr. Duane Reid, project director for the PBI 4A Grant; Ms. Nemeka Mason, project coordinator for the PBI Formula Grant; Ms. Amrita Madabushi, assistant professor of Science; Ms. Maria Robinson, assistant professor of Nursing; Ms. Dionne Woolford-Hudgins, assistant professor of Nursing; and, Ms. Jasmin Haley, instructor of Dental Hygiene.

II. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS
None

III. BOARD ACTIONS/CONSENT AGENDA (All Actions requiring a vote.)
The Board voted unanimously to approve the October 23, 2012, consent agenda:
- October 23, 2012, Agenda
- September 25, Minutes

IV. ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA
None

V. COLLEGE CONTRACTS
None

VI. POLICIES
None

VII. PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT (PAR)
President Williams explained that the Performance Accountability Report (PAR) is the annual report sent to the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC). The PAR includes five year benchmarks and trend data for the College. Vice Chair Thompson asked if the College could determine if the previous benchmarks were met or exceeded. President Williams responded yes, noting increases in the developmental education rates, developmental completer rates, successful persister rates and college ready students.
Trustee Rodwell made note to the positive licensure rates for the LPN and RN programs and asked for clarification on the decline with the Respiratory Care program. President Williams stated that the Respiratory Care program was under advisement by the National Board. The College submitted a plan identifying how the Respiratory Care program would increase the pass rate for students taking the licensure exam. Trustee Gabriel asked if the PAR goes to Middle States. President Williams responded no.

**Action:** The Board voted unanimously to approve the Performance Accountability Report (PAR).

**VIII. DREAM ACT**
Vice Chair Thompson stated that during the last meeting the Board heard presentations on the Dream Act, which is a ballot referendum. Trustee Paulk motioned to publicly support the act. Trustee Owens Southall asked how the vote of public support will be publicized. President Williams stated that the College will distribute a press release.

**Action:** The Board voted unanimously to support the Dream Act.

**IX. BOARD SCHOLARSHIP**
Trustee Gabriel stated that during the Foundation Board retreat it was discovered that the Board of Trustees has two scholarships, totaling $9,000. He motioned to combine both scholarships for more efficient use of the funds.

**Action:** The Board voted unanimously to combine the two Board scholarships.

**X. COLLEGE REPORTS**

A. **Student Governance Association** *(Mr. Calvin Gore, President)*
Mr. Gore was unable to attend the meeting.

*Please see the September 25, 2012, Board of Trustees Open Session Board Book for the full SGA report.*

B. **Senate Executive Committee** *(Dr. Brad Lyman, President)*
Dr. Lyman stated that the Faculty Evaluation Committee submitted recommended changes to the Professional Development policy to the president and vice president of Academic Affairs, but was informed by President Williams that the changes would not be implemented this year.

Dr. Lyman noted concern that 64 students were removed from class mid-semester for non-payment. The Senate Executive Committee passed a resolution asking the College to explore collection methodologies that do not disrupt the academic process in mid-stream and deny students instruction.

He added that the faculty are also working on the draft Middle States Monitoring Report; meeting with the vice president of Academic Affairs regarding concerns about the new developmental education program; and, discussing how the SEC can be an active participant to increase enrollment. The SEC is also in discussion with the Administration about academic coordination, teaching loads and credentials, how classes are cancelled and how faculty are reassigned to other areas. Dr. Lyman indicated that he, along with Dr. Peggy Bradford, vice president of Academic Affairs, plan to meet with the liaison of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) at an upcoming conference to discuss removing the
College from the AAUP central list. He added that a faculty delegation is always available to meet with the Board to discuss any issues or concerns.

Trustee Owens Southall asked why students were dropped so late in the semester; how much money was involved; were the students in good standing; and why scholarships were not made available for those students. President Williams stated that these students were on a deferred payment program offered by the College that allows students to pay their tuition in three scheduled payments. These students were dropped because they missed their payment. However, all those students have been reinstated.

President Williams added that if students do not make their final payments they will be dropped from class and there is nothing the College can do. Their tuition must be paid in full to be counted as an FTE by the state. Trustee Paulk mentioned that this was an issue reported during the last audit. President Williams responded yes. Since the College implemented the policy of dropping students for non-payment, the number of students dropped from classes has declined from more than 400 to 64 students. President Williams added that the College is open to exploring options similar to what is done at other colleges and universities such as withholding students’ transcripts. However, on average, our students take approximately six years to graduate and the College cannot carry debt that long. Vice Chair Thompson stated that the Board would like to get an update on the recommendations for a revised deferment policy. President Williams stated that a recommendation will be brought to the Board at a later meeting.

Vice Chair Thompson asked President Williams why she chose not to bring the recommendations on the Professional Development Policy to the Board. President Williams stated that since the Professional Development Policy is a college-wide policy she wanted to get input from other constituency groups on campus. Currently, AFSCME is reviewing the policy. The overall goal is to develop a college-wide policy if possible. Trustee Owens Southall asked when the Board could expect a revised policy. President Williams stated that the College could have a proposed policy at the November meeting if all constituencies have an opportunity to review and provide input. Trustee Rodwell reminded the Board that Middle States gave the College accolades for its professional development policy.

Please see the October 23, 2012, Board of Trustees Open Session Board Book for the full SEC report.

C. AFSCME Local at BCCC* (Ms. Charlene Gray, President)
Trustee Rodwell asked if the Union has an office on campus. Ms. Gray responded no. President Williams stated that the Union is not a sanctioned organization under the auspices of the College unlike the Faculty Senate. Trustee Paulk stated that this is a very complex issue and should not be discussed during an Open meeting.

Please see the October 23, 2012, Board of Trustees Open Session Board Book for the full AFSCME report.

XI. COLLEGE PRESENTATION*
Mr. Tony Herrera, Chief Information Officer, presented the ERP update. Highlights from the presentation are as follows:
An enterprise resource planning (ERP) system is the main administrative system of the College or IT infrastructure. The current ERP system is outdated and is no longer supported by vendors. This project will be the College’s largest project, spanning over the next 3-5 years, totaling approximately $13 million. Some next steps include meeting with vendors to review capabilities and fit for the College’s systems and setting detailed timelines for each module implementation.

Trustee Paulk asked if the funds for the ERP system will come out of the College’s operating budget. President Williams responded that the College has prepared for the project and has $12 million in fund balance. Trustee Paulk cautioned not to underestimate the training needed to implement the new system. Trustee Gabriel asked if the College will provide reports on the progress of the ERP system. President Williams responded yes.

XII. **PRESIDENT’S REPORT** (President Williams)
*Please see the October 23, 2012, Board of Trustees Open Session Board Book for the full President’s Report.*

XIII. **BOARD COMMENTS**
Vice Chair Thompson encouraged faculty and staff to keep up the great work, noting that the Board appreciates everyone’s hard work.

Trustee Owens Southall commended the College on the updated website.

Trustee Paulk thanked the faculty and staff for their hard work, noting that the College is very important to the City of Baltimore.

XIV. **NEXT MEETING**
October 23, 2012, Business and Continuing Education Division (BCED)

XV. **ADJOURNMENT**
The Board of Trustees meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolane Williams, Ph.D.
President

*Full report on file in the President’s Office*
ATTENDANCE:
Dr. Carolane Williams, President

BCCC Staff Present: Ms. Juanita Wingo, Mr. Scott Olden, Ms. Gabriela Walton, Mr. Douglas Weimer, Dr. Dennis Weeks, Mr. Andre Williams, Ms. Dorothy Holley, Dr. Peggy Bradford, Mr. Patrick Onley, Ms. Cynthia Webb, Dr. Brad Lyman, Ms. Amrita Madabushi, Ms. Marie Elalem, Mr. Rotimi Olojo, Ms. Kathy Styles, Ms. Wendy Harris, Ms. Jasmin Haley, Ms. Makia Robinson, Ms. Dionne Woolford-Hudgins, Mr. Tony Warner, Ms. Sylvia Rochester, Ms. Eileen Hawkins, Ms. Sabina Silkworth, Ms. Vera Brooks, Mr. Cedric Grant, Mr. Thomas Hampton, Ms. Betsy Mackey, Mr. Daniel Coleman, Ms. Brenda Wiley, Mr. Duane Reid, Ms. Nemeka Mason, Dr. Sophia Ward, Ms. Marlene Downs, Ms. Meintje Westerbeek, Ms. Michelle Jackson, Dr. Alicia Harvey-Smith, Ms. Kathy Odell, Ms. Karen Guilford, Ms. Jennifer Gross, Ms. Daviedra Sauldsberry, Mr. Joe Hutchins, Mr. Alvin Smith, Mr. Chima Ugah, Ms. Scott Saunders, Dr. Diana Zilberman, Mr. Mick Rigby, Ms. Lyllis Green and Mr. David Hase

Others Present: Mr. Richard Harris, Department of Legislative Services; and Mr. Bryan Perry, Office of the Attorney General
## COLLEGE CONTRACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT#</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001IT818868</td>
<td>Rooftop Chiller System Maintenance Services</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Approximately $120,000.00</td>
<td>3 YEARS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION:**
This is a preventative maintenance project that will service all the chiller units on the Liberty Campus and West Pavilion (except the CBIS building). The resulting agreement will be for three (3) years, and will be utilized on an as-needed basis. Operationally, it is anticipated that all the funding will not be exhausted during the projected period of performance. The College has recommended the inclusion of an escalation clause with support from procurement to provide protection in the event of potential project cost overruns. This contract will allow the College to maintain effective and efficient operations of our chiller units. This is only a precursor to the actual bid process. We will submit for Board approval the actual amount after the bid process is complete.
TAB 4
Title of Policy: Employee Legal Reporting Policy

Policy (check one): New  X  Revised  ________  Reformatted  ___

Applies to (check all that apply):

Faculty  ____  Staff  ____  Students  ____

Division/Department  ____  College  X  __

Topic/Issue:
Notifying the President’s Office of any legal matters affecting the College.

Background to Issue/Rationale for Policy:
The President’s Office needs to be aware of all legal issues affecting the College.

State/Federal Regulatory Requirements (cite if applicable):

Policy Language:
It is the policy of Baltimore City Community College that when any College employee is summoned, subpoenaed, or requested to meet with any person or organization in connection with a College related legal matter, they are to notify the Assistant Attorney General of the College of the request via the College’s AAG Services email account. The Assistant Attorney General will then notify the President’s office. Failure of an employee to notify the President’s Office and the Assistant Attorney General of the matter, could lead to disciplinary action up to and including termination.

The president of the College will then immediately notify the Board of Trustees of any serious allegations at the College via written status report as soon as reasonably possible. Notification to the Board shall also include updating the Board in writing of the findings of any subsequent investigation of the impropriety reported.

Implementation Date: Upon Board approval

Proposed by: Office of the President’s
Vice President/Senior Staff Member

Approved by the Board of Trustees:

Originator/Division: Office of the President

*This policy once approved by the Board of Trustees supersedes all other policies.
Title of Policy: Sexual Misconduct (i.e. Harassment/Assault) Policy

Policy (check one): New ______  Revised X  Reformatted ________

Applies to (check all that apply):

Faculty____  Staff____  Students____

Division/Department_____College X

Topic/Issue:
Sexual harassment violates federal civil rights laws, state fair employment laws, and the College’s nondiscrimination policy.

Background to Issue/Rationale for Policy:
Sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination that is prohibited by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Education Amendment Act of 1972. Baltimore City Community College’s policy on prohibiting sexual harassment is applicable to all Baltimore City Community College faculty, students, staff, volunteers, contractors and vendor. With this policy in place, the College places its community on notice that sexual harassment within the College workplace and within College educational programs will not be condoned and will not be allowed to interfere with the mission of Baltimore City Community College. Persons found to be in violation of this policy will be subject to disciplinary action and/or other appropriate sanctions.

State/Federal Regulatory Requirements (cite if applicable):
• Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended
• Title 20 State Government Article, Annotated Code of Maryland
• Title 5, Subtitle 2, Annotated Code of Maryland State Personnel and Pensions Article
• Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972
• Executive Order-01.01.2007.16 Maryland Code of Fair Employment Practices
• EEOC Policy Guidance on Sexual Harassment, Number N-915-050
• Maryland Criminal Law Article (CR 3-305)

Policy Language:
It is the policy of Baltimore City Community College to neither tolerate nor condone any form of sexual harassment. Employees or students found to be in violation of this policy will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action. Baltimore City Community College adheres to the sexual harassment definitions promulgated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the Office of Civil Rights of the United States Department of Education (OCR).

Proposed Implementation Date: Upon Board Approval
Proposed by: Tony Warner, Executive Director-Human Resources
Dr. Alicia B. Harvey-Smith, Vice President for Student Affairs Shawn Harrison, Interim Director of Public Safety
Vice President/Senior Staff Members

Approved by the Board of Trustees:

Originator/Division: President’s Office/Human Resources, Division of Student Affairs and Division of Business and Finance.

Approved by the Board of Trustees:

*This policy once approved by the Board of Trustees supersedes all other policies.*
TAB 5
PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE MIDDLE STATES MONITORING REPORT
Student Government Association
November Board Report

**Voter Registration Drive**
**October 1st-October 16th**

The Office of Student Life and the Student Government Association conducted a massive voter’s registration drive to encourage faculty, staff and students to register and vote in the Presidential Election.

**Breast Cancer Awareness**

The Office of Student Life and the Student Government Association supported Breast Cancer Awareness through sponsoring several activities throughout the month of October. **The Making Strides Against Breast Cancer Walk** was held on October 14th and approximately 60 faculty, staff and students participated in this important event. **Keeping Abreast With Your Health Seminar** was held on October 22nd, and was presented by BCCC staff member and registered nurse, Tanya Deshields. Seventy-nine faculty, staff and students were in attendance. The participants learned valuable information about breast cancer and breast cancer prevention. On that same day the college community was asked to wear pink, to support of **Paint the College Pink Day**. Those events also included Bake Sales.

**Real Talk Discussion**
**October 10th**

The Office of Student Life, in conjunction with the Office of Judicial Affairs and the Student Government Association, held its first **Real Talk Discussion Series** and kickoff event with guest facilitator, Milton Hunt. The topic was **Dispelling the 13th Grade Myth: How Do You See Yourself Now?** This event focused on stereotypes and how students should conduct themselves in an academic environment. One hundred eighty-one students, faculty and staff were in attendance.

**Expo Mania**
**October 11th**

The Office of Student Life, in conjunction with the Student Government Association, held a **Community Exhibition**, recently renamed **EXPO MANIA**. All spaces were sold out and 27 vendors and exhibitors were in attendance.

**Mental Health Symposium**
**October 16th**

The Office of Student Life, in conjunction with the Office of Judicial Affairs and the Student Government Association, held its annual Fall Mental Health Symposium. This
event focused on military veterans and mental health. This event was held in the Student Services Atrium and was attended by approximately 80 students, faculty and staff.

**Respect the Craft**  
October 16th

The Office of Student Life, in conjunction with the “Definition Club” and the Student Government Association, held its second Open Microphone Event for the school year - “Respect the Craft.” This event was held in the College’s cafeteria. Once again, this event provided the students an opportunity to share their artistic abilities through song, poetry, and dance. Approximately 100 people were in attendance.

**Passport to Leadership**  
October 24th

The Office of Student Life, the Business, Management and Technology Department in conjunction with the Student Government Association continued the successful Passport to Leadership Program Series. The second topic entitled “Small Business Administration” was held in the Mini Conference Room. We are pleased that this session was well attended and drew a crowd of 137 participants.

**The Memory Guy**  
October 25th

The Office of Student Life and the Student Government Association held day and evening Memory and Study Skills Seminars facilitated by Mr. Dave Farrow “The Memory Guy”. Dave Farrow is a Guinness book of World Records Holder for his outstanding memory. The students, faculty and staff were really impressed with his presentation and memory techniques that could be used to help them perform better in the classroom, especially freshman students. We are pleased that these sessions were well attended and drew a crowd of 102 participants.

**Developing the Professional Leader with Ethics**  
October 26th

The Office of Student Life and the Student Government Association held a leadership conference and etiquette dinner called Developing the Professional Leader with Ethics. This event was moderated by Professor Ja’Hon Vance and co-presented by Professor Edward Jackson and Ms. Kathy Styles. This event was attended by approximately 40 students.

**Scream Night Custom Party**  
October 26th

The Office of Student Life, the Student Government Association, the Panther Ladies Pep Squad and the Definition Club held a Scream Night Costume Party. This event was a collaborative event of newly formed clubs and organizations and was well attended. Approximately 150 people were in attendance.
The College-wide Assessment Council (CWAC) met on October 24, 2012. Co-Chairs Professor Carole Quine and Vice President Soileau convened the meeting. The CWAC will review and coordinate the outcomes assessment processes of all the College divisions.

On October 25, 2012 the first draft of the monitoring report for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education was received. It was distributed to the Senate Executive Committee for review. The SEC discussed the draft at the November 2 meeting. Professors Lyman and Webb prepared a set of proposed revisions and submitted them for consideration on November 5. The monitoring report is due December 1, 2012.

On October 26-28, the President of the Senate and VPAA Bradford attended the American Association of University Professors Conference on Shared Governance in Washington D.C. In addition to attending sessions on a variety of governance issues, we met with Dr. Anita Levy regarding the censure of BCCC. We discussed actions required to remove the College from the censure list with Dr. Levy of AAUP. The College must seek to locate the complainant in the case and make an attempt at redress. The College must include sufficient protections of academic freedom and due process to create “tenure like” protections. These protections would be added to the Faculty Handbook. Finally the AAUP will send a representative for a campus visit before making a recommendation for action to remove Censure next June.

On November 1, 2012, Professor Webb and I met with VPAA Bradford and VPSS Harvey-Smith (and various staff members). We had a fruitful discussion regarding the relationship between our divisions and the Faculty Senate. We will meet again in the future.

The SEC has received three sabbatical leave requests for 2013-14. The SEC will make its recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs before November 30, 2012.

At the November 2, 2012 Senate Executive Committee meeting, the election of three faculty members to the Academic Rank and Promotion Committee was announced.

Professors George Andrews, Kathy Berlyn and Brian Lazarus were elected to two year terms. They join four faculty from last year’s committee.

The SEC discussed the fall 2012 enrollment decline at its November 2, 2012 meeting. Professor Ennels as the SEC representative on the Strategic Enrollment Committee was
directed to offer the cooperation and assistance of faculty to the recruitment efforts for
the Spring Semester.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brad Lyman, PhD.
President of the Faculty Senate
November 5, 2012

**Attachments:**
Minutes of Senate Executive Committee – October 5, 2012
Minutes of Senate Executive Committee – October 19, 2012
Minutes
Approved by SEC on 10/19/12)

President: Brad Lyman “x”
Vice President: Cynthia Webb “x”
Secretary: Edward Ennels “x”
Membership ("X" indicates meeting attendance)
Meeting began at 2:09 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEC Members</th>
<th>Standing Committee Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>delCastillo, Beatriz ME</td>
<td>Dr. Shawn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate: Gieger, Marianna</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laditan, Adewale NPS</td>
<td>Prof. Albert Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate: Okereke, Emmanuel</td>
<td>Program Review &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fakinlede, Solomon BMT</td>
<td>Prof. Jacqueline McNair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate: Osztreicher, Tibor</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNair, Jacqueline NAH</td>
<td>Prof Beverly Constantine-Fraser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate: Taty, Terry</td>
<td>Grievance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallenberger, Karen ESBS</td>
<td>Dr. Katana Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate:</td>
<td>Faculty Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOARD AGENDA
TAB 7-Information
November 27, 2012
### Call to Order
Dr. Lyman called the meeting to order at 2:09 p.m.

### Approval of the Agenda
**Action:** Dr. Katana Hall moved to accept the agenda with no additions and Dr. Anne Ritter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Lyman asked for a motion to accept the September 21, 2012 SEC minutes.

**Discussion:** Dr. Ritter requested revising the language in the minutes so it is clear that the SEC is requesting that all personnel changes be reported in the Board Report so faculty have access and know what is going on.

**Action:** Dr. Laditan moved to accept the minutes of September 21 with amendments and Prof. Webb seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### Old Business
There was no old business to report.

### New Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Academic Affairs Organization – Dr. Brad Lyman</th>
<th>II. Faculty Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the spokesperson on the issue was not yet present, the item was postponed.</td>
<td>Professional Development Policy 2021 pertains to faculty and staff. This policy supersedes all other policies. The Faculty Evaluation Committee was charged by the SEC to revise the policy for the faculty. Professor Webb hoped that the Board would be farsighted and include</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal – Dr. Katana Hall

the staff in the revised policy. Professor Fakinlede commented that Human Resources will probably have some input on the revised policy before it goes to the Board.

Revisions were made to the Professional Development Proposal submitted by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. A meeting was held on October 4, 2012 to discuss the Professional Development Policy for Faculty with President Williams and VPAA Bradford. Drs. Lyman and Hall, Professors Webb and Leshan were in attendance. An agreement was reached to eliminate the 40 hour requirement in favor of the faculty member and the associate deans agreeing on what professional development is needed and the professional development activities being included in the Faculty Evaluation Process. There were a number of proposed changes by the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs; however, the group reached consensus on removing a specific number of professional development hours for faculty to complete each academic year. In the 2013–2014 Academic Year professional development will become part of the evaluation process, but will not include a specific number of professional development hours. Faculty goals will need to incorporate professional development.

Other changes to the proposal include faculty members consulting with their associate deans regarding professional development opportunities and getting their approval. The group suggested reducing the number of signatures in the approval paths. Associate Deans will have five business days to respond to travel requests. Some professional development training may be facilitated by the department. Both supervisors and faculty will be trained on faculty the evaluation process. The President recommended that faculty be trained for measurable goals. The training of supervisors and faculty would occur every two years, or immediately for new hires.

Dr. Lyman concluded the discussion by saying that the process followed by the SEC provides an exemplary model of how we can get things done. The Faculty Evaluation Committee began its work over the summer and followed through on everything that was asked. Kudos to all committee members for a job well done! Dr. Lyman called for a motion.

**Action:** Professor Fakinlede moved to approve the professional development proposal dated 10/5/12 with the recommendations. Professor Jacqueline McNair seconded the motion. The
III.  SEC Presidents Report – Dr. Lyman

- Dr. Lyman reviewed his Faculty Senate Report presented at the Board of Trustees meeting, dated August 28, 2012 (see attachment for full report). He provided an update on the Professional Development Proposal in the September Board meeting and also informed the Board members that the SEC would like a delegation of SEC representatives to meet with the Board members to discuss the vote of no confidence for the President, Dr. Carolane Williams. Dr. Lyman is addressing the AAUP censure issue. He voiced concerns that there was no focus group with faculty on the climate survey. The final report of the focus groups on the climate survey will only include input from two faculty members. He noted that the item that received the lowest rating on the survey, from the academic affairs group, was “he president is leading the college in a positive direction”.

- There was a teleconference on September 28 that Dr. Lyman attended with VPAA Bradford and her staff on a computer program to administer the student course survey through Blackboard. The survey would be the same as before simply administered electronically rather than paper. A major concern of the SEC is who will have access. Professor Leshan and Dr. Hall (Faculty Evaluation Committee) will serve as liaisons with Dr. Diana Zilberman and Mr. Charles Wilson.


- Middle States Monitoring Report. Dr. Lyman also provided each SEC Representative and Officer with a new timeline. It is due December 1, 2012. Dr. Chen has been hired as the new Director of Assessment. She will be compiling the report.

- Professor Ennels was appointed by Dr. Lyman to coordinate the election process for faculty to serve on the Academic Rank and Promotions Committee. Dr. Ritter, Professor Coleman, and Professor Paraskevoudaki volunteered to assist with the process. Professor Ennels reported that he met with Dr. Ritter, Professor Coleman, and Professor Paraskevoudaki on Wednesday, October 3, 2012 to develop a plan for electing faculty members to serve on the Academic Rank and Promotions Committee. It was a very productive discussion. The
committee grouped the academic areas by deans and confirmed that there are three academic areas under the Academic Affairs Division. Since the faculty in the Promise Academy and Developmental Education Program overlap with the English and Math Department, the committee decided it would be sufficient to count only three academic areas instead of four.

Professor Shiree Avree, Professors Dariush Kochesfahni, Tracy Leshan, and Patricia Woodward have one year left on their term on the ARP committee and provide representation across all three academic areas. According to the constitution, the Academic Rank and Promotions Committee consists of seven members. With four members continuing their service, three slots are vacant. The committee will do an "at large election" to fill the three vacancies. The process for electing three faculty to fill the vacancies will be as follows:

Today, October 3, 2012, with the permission of the SEC the committee would like to send out an email asking for nominations to serve on the Academic Rank and Promotions Committee. All full-time faculty are eligible to serve including former committee members who have completed their term and have not served in over a year. All nominations need to be emailed to Professor Paraskevoudaki by COB Friday, October 12. Faculty may nominate themselves or someone else with their permission. Professor Paraskevoudaki will verify all nominees before adding their names to the ballot. He will then email Professor Ennels all nominees at the end of the day on Thursday, October 18, 2012. Professor Ennels will create a ballot that will include the names of the nominees, in alphabetical order, with instructions that faculty select three names. The ballot will be shared at the Friday, October 19, SEC Meeting and then emailed to all faculty following SEC approval.

Faculty will have until Friday, October 26, 2012 by 12:00 noon to complete the ballot. Faculty members will be instructed to place ballots a sealed envelope and sign the back. The drop off location for the ballots will be ballot boxes placed in Mr. Peirce’s office (LSB 212) and Mrs. Tunstall’s office (MNB 253). Ballot boxes will be collected on Friday, October 26, 2012, after voting has closed. The election committee will meet on the same day at 12:30 p.m. to count the votes and see who the top three choices are. Ballots will be separated from the envelopes before counting, so no one is aware who voted for whom. Professor
V. Standing and Ad Hoc Senate Committee Reports – Dr. Lyman

Ennels will prepare a final report of the election results and send it to the SEC President to follow up with those faculty who are selected to serve on the Academic Rank and Promotion Committee.

Professor Ennels received summary reports from all of the Standing Committee Chairs prior to the SEC meeting. He compiled all of the summary reports into one document that was distributed to the SEC Reps. by Dr. Lyman. He encouraged the representatives to review the documents and then took questions (see attachment for Standing Committee Chairs’ Summary Reports). Professor McNair reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee report was missing from the document. She reported that there were no updates. This error will be corrected. Dr. Lyman plans to meet with Program Evaluation Committee within the next couple of weeks. An appeal was sent out by the SEC for more faculty to serve on the College-wide Committees. The SEC Secretary reported the final list was sent out on September 27, 2012 by the President’s Office. Dr. Lyman will be picking a faculty member from each College-wide Committee to be the liaison for the SEC and provide summary reports to the SEC Secretary by the 2nd Friday of each month. Professor Webb pointed out that every one of the committees is chair by an administrator. It was suggested that the committees be chaired or co-chaired by a faculty in the spirit of “shared governance.”

Dr. Lyman would like to consider another location for the SEC meetings. He feels that the lecture format of LSB 120 is not conducive to the kind of meetings where people can see each other and engage in active dialog. He would like to have a room where everyone can sit around a table. Professor Ennels suggested using LSB 253. Dr. Lyman stated that following the meeting he and Professor Webb would look at LSB 253 to make sure the space is big enough for the group. Other possible considerations include LSB 241 or the Mini-Conference Center.

VI. Time and location of SEC Meetings – Dr. Lyman

Reorganization of Developmental Program

Professor Chapple raised the concern about the reorganization of the math department into college level and developmental level faculty. This change has already occurred in the
English Department. The English Department never met to discuss this reorganization. The math department voted unanimously against dividing the faculty. We had no input into this decision. This is yet another issue of shared governance. The Math Department was told that it would have to reorganize because it was required of the English Department. At Convocation the Developmental English Faculty were told to move behind Dr. Beckles who was representing the Promise Academy; but no one in the Math Department was asked to do so. Developmental English faculty could not stay with the English department. There have been numerous meetings with the Developmental English faculty and Dr. Sophia Ward; but, no meeting with the Developmental Math faculty. There is no clear direction for Promise Academy. These concerns were discussed with Dr. Lyman who drafted a resolution on behalf of the SEC regarding the Promise Academy that Professor Webb read aloud to the group (see attachment of SEC President statement regarding the Promise Academy). The resolution addressed two separate issues:

- Faculty are discontent with being required to teaching only developmental courses; and

- There is confusion with the organizational chart in terms of who is reporting to whom.

The SEC is not disagreeing that there should be a developmental education department. The issue is how it’s being managed. The faculty list provided to the SEC by the Academic Affairs office does not include Promise Academy/Developmental Education as a separate department, so there is still a question regarding SEC representation for the Promise Academy. This is October and report lines are still confusing.

Dr. Hall modified the resolution statement with input from the SEC.

**Action:** Professor Webb moved to approve the resolution with accepted amendments by Dr. Hall that will become part of the proposal. Dr. Ritter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

*Overload Contracts and Under Loads*
VIII. Announcements – Dr. Lyman

| Professor McNair asked about the process for overload contracts. We should not be working without a contract, yet she is teaching 15 TAUs in overload and still waiting for her contract. Professor Fakinlede stated that there are forms for regular TAUs and overloads. Professor McNair stated that she has not had her regular TAU form signed either. Overloads cannot be approved until a regular TAU form is signed. VPAA does not have to sign off on everything. There also may have been an issue with the transfer of funds to pay the overloads. Dr. Lyman asked Dr. Ritter as chair of the Working Condition Committee to follow up on the issue of overload contracts. The functioning of the systems needs to be addressed.

Professor Paraskevoudakis brought up the issue of faculty who are not teaching their full 15 TAUs. Apparently there are four faculty who have less than 15 TAUs this semester.

SEC will address systemic issues that are affecting faculty and students. Dr. Lyman asked Professor Webb to hear individual issues and funnel systemic issues to the SEC. Dr. Lyman also requested the names of faculty who are teaching fewer than 15 TAUs this semester. Professor Webb reminded everyone that SEC reps. need to bring issues affecting their areas to the SEC. Let’s consolidate issues and concerns to see if there is a bigger problem that needs to be addressed. Professor Webb stated that lack of communication between administration and faculty is still a problem and needs to be worked on.

The next Board of Trustees meeting will be on October 23, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. at BCED, Harbor Campus.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:30pm

**Action:** Dr. Hall moved to adjourn the SEC meeting at 4:30 p.m. Dr. Ritter seconded and the motion passed unanimously.
Addendum

Baltimore City Community College

The Faculty Senate

October 5, 2012

We, the faculty of Baltimore City Community College, are committed to serve our student population and meet their educational needs. We further understand and support the development and existence of a program that facilitates the needs of our academically underdeveloped students, as they prepare for credit level coursework. We do not, however, agree with the process used to establish the Promise Academy and Developmental Education Department.

The Senate Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate heard testimony on October 5, 2012 regarding problems with the organization of the Academic Affairs Division. The testimony centered on the ambiguity of the Promise Academy and the centralization of developmental studies. Additional discussion included:

1. The Faculty Senate Constitution calls for Senate Executive Committee representation based on academic departments. The SEC received a fall 2012 faculty roster that does not identify a Promise Academy or a Department of Developmental Studies. All faculty listed as developmental are listed under the Mathematics and Engineering Department or the English, Humanities, Visual and Performing Arts Department. No Associate Dean for the Promise Academy or Developmental Studies is listed.
2. A number of English faculty reported that they are currently being supervised by personnel outside of an academic department.
3. A number of English faculty report a confused chain of command.
4. A number of English faculty are concerned about the academic credentials and experience of those assigned to supervise them.
5. The Math faculty voted unanimously on October 3, 2012 to remain as a single department.

The Senate Executive Committee asserts that every faculty member is entitled to an assignment to an Academic Department with a properly credentialed Associate Dean. Every faculty member should be afforded all the rights and respect of a faculty member of BCCC.

Be It Therefore Resolved on this 5th Day of October, 2012 that the Faculty Senate of Baltimore City Community College recognizes the Faculty List provided by the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs dated August 27, 2012 as the legitimate organization of the Division of Academic Affairs. The SEC must constitutionally organize itself based on this roster. The position of the Senate Executive Committee is that faculty are assigned to the Academic Departments as listed on the August 27, 2012 roster.

Approved unanimously by the Senate Executive Committee on October 5, 2012.
Baltimore City Community College
Senate Executive Committee Meeting

Addendum

Baltimore City Community College
The Faculty Senate
President’s Update to the Senate Executive Committee
October 5, 2012

September 25, 2012 – The Board of Trustees met on Liberty Campus. On August 28, I submitted my written report which included items on: 1. The enrollment decline of 27% 2. Discussions with the VPAA regarding qualifications to teach 3. The Middle States Monitoring Report. 4. Excerpts from my July 19 memo to the President listing 18 concerns we are addressing below the Board level. (Report to the Board is attached)

Additionally I reported orally to the Board of Trustees that the SEC had approved a Faculty Development proposal which was submitted to the President. I communicated the SEC request for a faculty delegation to meet with the Board regarding the vote of no confidence. The Chair of the Board asked me to explain the AAUP Censure issue. I explained that the College was censured 20 years ago and I had communicated with the AAUP liaison officer regarding changes required for removal from censure. The AAUP takes such actions only in June, so we have time to work on the issue. The Chair of the Board also asked me about the phrase in my report “obligation to defend the academic integrity of the College”. I explained that in 2009 the faculty has presented a list of concerns to the administration but 14 months later there was little response so the faculty voted no confidence and then faculty testified in Annapolis.

September 26, 2012 – VP Webb and I met with VPAA Bradford regarding the SLOA process and the monitoring report. The VPAA reported that Dr. Winrow had been contracted to write the report. The discipline liaisons were working on collecting data and Penny Wiedman would be entering into a database. A draft of the monitoring report is to be supplied to me on October 5, 2012. VPAA Bradford agreed to assign a dean to work our proposals on credential audits, academic coordination and academic master planning.

In a follow-up email, Dr. Bradford assigned Dr. Iweha and Dean Olden to work with VP Webb and Working conditions chair Dr. Ritter on Academic Coordination/Release. She assigned Dean Weeks to work with Dr. Ritter on credential auditing. Dr. Bradford and Dr. Charles will work with Professor Paraskevoudaki on Academic Master Planning.
September 27, 2012 – VP Webb and I attended a focus group for Academic Affairs on the Climate Survey. Dr. Pace was the facilitator and reported that she had conducted focus groups for all the divisions. I requested there be one for faculty since the Academic Affairs focus group was all administrators except for VP Webb and me. The focus group discussed the three lowest items for our division on the climate survey.

September 27, 2012 I proposed two meetings with VPAA Bradford, VPSS Harvey-Smith to discuss:

1. Student advisement, academic intervention systems, financial aid systems, etc. toward the goal of leveraging student success.

2. Academic responsibilities that inadvertently migrated to Student Affairs. (Pre 100, Grade Grievance, Academic Calendar, Honors programs, etc.)

September 28, 2012 – I attended a teleconference with VPAA Bradford and her staff on a computer program to administer the student course survey through Blackboard. The survey would be the same as before simply administered electronically rather than paper. Professors Hall and Leshan (Faculty Evaluation) will liaison with Diana Zilberman and Charles Wilson.

September 28th, 2012 – VPAA Bradford communicated the membership of the College-wide Assessment Council (CWAC) to Professor Quine, who will co-chair with VP Soileau. The purpose of the CWAC is to monitor the outcomes assessment process of all College divisions. The membership is: Linda Benjamin,(Peggy Bradford),Melvin Brooks, Carolyn Dabirsiaghi, Beatriz Del Castillo, Terry Doty, James Dyett, Ann Frazier, Enyinnaya Iweha, Michael Kaye, Shawn Lane, Betsy Mackey, Emmanuel Okereke,(Carole Quine),Annette Russell, Dwight Smith, Amrita Madabushi, Cynthia Webb, Brad Lyman, Sue Niehoff, Cedric Grant, Tony Warner, Miles Woodhouse, Tony Herrera, Mara Cazabon, Alicia Harvey-Smith, Ron Smith, Kathy Styles, Wayne Beckles, Dennis Weeks, Scott Olden.

October 4, 2012 There was a meeting on the Professional Development Policy for Faculty with President Williams and VPAA Bradford. Professors Lyman, Webb, Hall and Leshan were in attendance. We reached agreement on a proposal to eliminate the 40 hour requirement in favor of evaluation of professional development in the Faculty Evaluation Process. The procedure and policy will be presented to SEC on October 5, 2012.

October 4, 2011 – VPAA Bradford notified me that Dr. Charles Abasa-Nyarko has been hired in a contractual position to assist her in project development. Additionally Dr. Hsin-Yuan Chen has been hired as the new Director of Assessment. She also provided a new schedule for the completion of the Middle States monitoring report.
Baltimore City Community College
Senate Executive Committee Meeting

October 19, 2012 @ 2:07 p.m.
Main Building, Rm. 114

Draft Minutes for SEC Approval

President: Brad Lyman “x”
Vice President: Cynthia Webb “x”
Secretary: Edward Ennels “x”
Membership (“X” indicates meeting attendance)
Meeting began at 2:07 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEC Members</th>
<th>Standing Committee Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| x delCastillo, Beatriz ME  
   Alternate: Gieger, Marianna | Chapple, Fred, ME  
   Alternate: Mohammad Salajegheh | Dr. Shawn Lane  
   Curriculum & Instruction |
| Laditan, Adewale NPS  
   Alternate: Okereke, Emmanuel | x Paraskevoudakis, Fred NPS  
   Alternate: Radhakrishnan, Malathi | Prof. Albert Phillips  
   Program Review & Evaluation |
| x Fakirlede, Solomon BMT  
   Alternate: Osztecher, Tibor | x Webb, Cynthia BMT  
   Alternate: Walker, Cortez | x Prof. Jacqueline McNair  
   Faculty Affairs |
| x McNair, Jacqueline NAH  
   Alternate: Tomy, Terry | x Arvin, Sheree NAH  
   Alternate: Beaty, Tonya | Prof Beverly Constantine-Fraser  
   Grievance |
| x Shallenberger, Karen ESBS  
   Alternate: | x Servioe-Mariano, Boyd ESBS  
   Alternate: | Dr. Katana Hall  
   Prof. Tracy Leshan  
   Faculty Evaluation |
| Coleman, Theron EHVPA | Hall, Katana EHVPA  
   Alternate: Moss, Latonia | Dr. Ann Ritter  
   Working Conditions |
Dr. Lyman called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

Dr. Lyman asked for a motion to accept the October 5, 2012 SEC minutes.

Dr. Lyman praised Dr. Brad Lyman for the wonderful work he is doing as SEC President. He is doing a superb job in meetings with administration and providing summary information to the faculty.

The SEC Secretary, Professor Edward Ennels, reported that the following names were submitted as nominations for the Academic Rank and Promotions Committee as of Friday, October 12: Professor George Andrews, Professor Brian Lazarus, Professor Lorrain Brown, Professor Amrita Madabushi, Professor Kathy Berlyn, and Professor Naesea Price. All of these individuals were self-nominated. The names were confirmed by Professor Fred.
III. Report on Academic Advisement Committee
– Dr. Karen Shallenberger

Paraskevoudakis and placed on a ballot created by Professor Edward Ennels. All members of the SEC received a copy of the ballot and were asked to comment on its content. It was decided to include the rank of the nominees on the ballot and to ask each nominee to email the faculty a brief professional biography along with their reasons for wanting to serve on the committee. Professor Cynthia Webb also suggested that along with the ballot the SEC Secretary should include in the email the names of the faculty who would be continuing on the committee. Professor Edward Ennels reported that he would be creating two ballot boxes over the weekend that will be placed in LSB 212 and MNB 253. Faculty will have until Friday, October 26, 2012 by 12noon to vote.

Dr. Karen Shallenberger reported that the Academic Advising Council met for the first time this semester on Tuesday, October 16. There were four faculty members in attendance among others from the College (approximately 15 in attendance). There were three faculty members from the Natural and Physical Sciences Department and one from the Education, Social and Behavioral Sciences Department. Key notes from the meeting included the following:

1. The new Advising Model was considered to be implemented in Spring 2012 with a focus on intrusive advising.

2. It was suggested that a presentation, focusing on the advising model, be made to the faculty within their individual departments. The training model is being developed with the core elements of the training module developed by a group of faculty and staff during the NACADA Summer Institute this past summer (National Academic Advising Association).

3. A constituency relationship management system called Hobson is being purchased and it is hoped that training will occur in December and the system fully implemented in January.

4. Future meetings will address new policies and procedures regarding mandatory advising.
5. The 2013 NACADA Region 2 Conference will be held in New Brunswick, NJ on March 14-16, 2013. Faculty and staff are encouraged to attend.

6. The next meeting of the Academic Advising Council will be October 30, 2012 from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

**Feedback on Report:** Professor Jacqueline McNair reported to the SEC that she got a call last week from an academic advisor asking for information about her program. Professor McNair stated that program advising should come from the program coordinators who are more knowledgeable about their programs than academic advisors. Professor Cynthia Webb stated that coordinators are better able to guide the students. Program coordinator should be advising students in their programs. Currently, faculty see all students regardless of their majors. Dr. Karen Shallenberger commented that the assignment of advisors is difficult. Advisees are assigned by the computer system. The software is not well designed but the college is working on improvements to the system. Professor Solomon Fakinlede said changes to the system are needed in order to make it operate more efficiently. One of the major concerns is that we get appropriate assignment of advisees.

What’s the difference between intrusive advising and mandatory advising? Dr. Brad Lyman noted that the intrusive advising requires that students see advisors before registering for classes when they have reached the 15, 30, and 60 credit milestones. There needs to be a policy that states that students are required to see advisor because right now such a policy does not exist. Dr. Karen Shallenberger stated that the Academic Advising Council is working on a mandatory policy for the advisement model. Students seem to prefer being advised by students in their program.

Dr. Rose Monroe asked what is the purpose of gapping a non-declared major or non-degree seeking students? This seems like a waste of time. Dr. Karen Shallenberger stated in order for a student to register online they must be gapped, which includes non-declared major and non-degree seeking students. Dr. Shallenberger said she would bring the issue to the Council. Professor Solomon Fakinlede commented that gapping students is important to ensure that they are not floating along. It gives advisors a chance to encourage such students to pick a
IV. College wide Committee Reports – Dr. Brad Lyman

specific major. It is important for students to be making progress toward their degree.

Any other thoughts and ideas about advising should be emailed to Dr. Karen Shallenberger.

Dr. Brad Lyman would like a lead faculty member on each college-wide committee. He has selected a faculty member on each college-wide committee and asked them to submit to the SEC Secretary, Professor Ed Ennels, by the 2nd Friday of each month a brief summary of their committee’s monthly activities. Professor Ennels will compile all reports into one document to be shared on the 3rd Friday of each month during the SEC Meeting. Dr. Brad Lyman stated that the SEC still needs a faculty liaison on the ERP Working Committee, Social Committee, and Tuition and Fees Committee, and Professional Development Committee (PDC). Dr. Lyman nominated Dr. Rose Monroe to be the SEC liaison on the PDC and will follow up with Ms. Sheryl Nelson. He also appointed Professor Maria Robinson for the Social Committee and Professor Solomon Fakinlede for the ERP Working Committee. The ERP Working Committee and Registration Committee need more faculty participation.

Dr. Lyman concluded by saying the Academic Calendar Committee needs to come back to Academic Affairs side.

V. Un-enrollment of Students – Dr. Brad Lyman

The Senate Executive Committee discussed the practice of un-enrolling students during the course of the semester. This technique to collect unpaid obligations has a detrimental effect on students’ academic progress. The SEC understands the necessity of collecting student obligations and has no objection to withholding registration, transcripts, diplomas, etc. However, we consider the exclusion of students from classes, denial of access to Blackboard, etc. during the course of instruction an unwarranted intrusion on the academic process.

It is not fair to take money from students and not allow students to re-enroll in their courses. Professor Cynthia Webb stated that an international student was arrested and served 19 days in jail because he was dropped from his courses for non-payment. If the college was able to offer an extension to the 64 students this semester who were dropped for non-payment and reinstated why not with the 90 students last semester who were dropped for non-payment? Professor Jacqueline McNair commented that it takes too long for student to re-enroll in class after they are dropped, which results in students falling further behind in their work.
Even if students pay the bill they may be so far behind that they still end up dropping the course. Dr. Rose Monroe informed us that the Maryland Business Round Table participants speak at different high schools and share information regarding credit enrollment at different colleges. There data shows that BCCC has the lowest enrollment than any other college in Maryland. Cecil Community College has more credit bearing students than BCCC. It’s very embarrassing for the college that we are at the bottom of all colleges in terms of enrollment. Mechanism need to be put in place so we do not lose our students. Professor Solomon Fakinlede said that the SEC should take hold of this problem.

Dr. Lyman read his statement to administration on “Un-enrolling Students” and asked the SEC if they all were comfortable with the language. See addendum for statement.

Dr. Lyman called for a motion to approve the statement.

**Action:** Professor Beatriz del Castillo moved to approve the “Statement on Un-enrolling Students.” Professor Fred Parakevoudakis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Lyman will bring the issue to Board’s attention during the Board meeting on Tuesday, October 16, 2012.

### VI. Faculty Concerns – SEC Representatives

**AAUP Chapter at Baltimore City Community College**

Dr. Rose Monroe stated that we are still short of the 10 faculty needed to start an AAUP chapter at BCCC. Currently, 7 BCCC faculty are signed up. She thinks the issue might be the membership dues which are based on salary.

### VII. Faculty Concerns – SEC Representatives

**Faculty Credentials**

Dr. Monroe shared with the group that she had a meeting with Dr. Peggy Bradford about Dr. Monroe’s credentials. Apparently there was an oversight in reviewing her credential. She
stated that administration did not look at additional courses beyond her masters. Dr. Monroe had to ask the administration to look at the entire transcript so all courses could be counted. She was told she had to get course descriptions but some courses on her transcript are no longer offered. The Associate Dean of Arts and Social Sciences, Dr. Dennis Weeks, asked Dr. Monroe to look up archives or go to college to get course description. If the course description does not exist for the courses being challenged, then she will have to go to the Dean of Graduate Studies for an approval letter.

Pro-rated TAU's

Professor Beatriz del Castillo voiced concerns about pro-rating TAU's based on course enrollment. Deans are doing different things because there is no policy on TAU's. TAU's were changed after the first week of enrollment when it should be based on the first week. Dr. Ann Ritter’s Working Condition Committee met this week to discuss the issue. Any faculty who are not getting 15 TAU's need to email Dr. Brad Lyman. If the college has to take a financial hit due to enrollment the cost should not fall totally on the faculty.

Re-assigning Faculty to teach either Developmental or College level Math or English

Professor Beatriz del Castillo shared with the SEC that the administration plans to re-assign math faculty to teach either developmental math courses or college level math courses. The Math Department voted unanimously against such a move and have a meeting scheduled with Dr. Peggy Bradford on Wednesday, October 24th to share issues of concern. Dr. Brad Lyman will be meeting with Dr. Bradford to discuss the “Resolution on the Re-organization of the Promise Academy.”

Dr. Rose Monroe stated that the English Department was not in favor of faculty being re-assigned to teach either developmental English or college English courses but were forced to do so. The faculty were never afforded the opportunity to discuss and vote on the new structure.

The SEC was informed that the deans would now be completing course schedules. Professor Cynthia Webb said this responsibility should remain with the associate deans and program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. Announcements – Dr. Lyman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coordinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Program Cancellation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brad Lyman asked the group if there were any academic programs placed on probation. If there are programs that are being cancelled by the administration, the SEC should know about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The next Board of Trustees meeting will be on Tuesday, October 23, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. at BCED, Harbor Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The next SEC Meeting will be on Friday, November 2, 2012 at 2:00 p.m., in MNB 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfully submitted,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Ennels, SEC Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Adjourned: 4: 23pm**

**Action:** Professor Jacqueline McNair moved to adjourn the SEC meeting at 4:23 p.m. Dr. Karen Shallenberger seconded and the motion passed unanimously.
Addendum

The Faculty Senate

Baltimore City Community College

October 19, 2012

Senate Executive Committee

Statement on Un-enrolling Students

Over the past several semesters faculty have become increasingly concerned with the College practice of un-enrolling students from course rosters and denying them access to Blackboard during the course of the semester. We also object to the practice of removing faculty access to their submitted work and course records on Blackboard. The Faculty Senate recognizes the moral and legal responsibility of students to properly settle their financial obligations. Many colleges prevent future registration; withhold transcripts and/or graduation until financial obligations are met. The mission of the College is the delivery of instruction to our students and we respectfully request that the College seek bill collection methodologies that do not disrupt the instructional process.

Approved Unanimously by the Senate Executive Committee, October 19, 2012
October 8, 2012 - I submitted the Faculty Senate Report to the Board of Trustees.

On October 10, 2012 President Williams informed me that she would not be taking the policy change on professional development (the remove the mandatory 40 hours) to the Board of Trustees at the October meeting. She noted that the year had begun under the old policy, that academic administrators and faculty would need training on the new system. She also indicated she wishes to consult the rest of the College and present an integrated professional development policy for implementation next year.

The SEC resolution on the Academic Organization was submitted to the VPAA Bradford. Professor Webb and I tried in vain to meet with her this week. I explained faculty were upset about the assignment to teach only developmental courses as well as the lack of transparency in the credential evaluation process. Additionally I expressed our concern that the confusion regarding the placement of faculty imperiled the CIC approval of developmental courses as well as the constitutional representation on the SEC. We have a meeting scheduled for Monday, October 22, 2012.

The College-wide Assessment Council (CWAC) was proposed by the Faculty Senate in December 2010 and instituted in Spring 2012 in time for the monitoring report to the Middle States Visiting Team. As its title implies, the College-wide Assessment Council is charged with monitoring the outcomes assessment of all divisions of the College. Professor Carole Quine and VP Soileau have been designated as Co-Chairs, members have been appointed and it will meet October 24, 2012.

Dr. Chen is working on the Middle States Monitoring Report. We expect to receive the draft on October 25 in time for SEC discussion at our November 2nd meeting.

Professor Lynn Kerr reported from the Faculty Advisory Committee of MHEC that no BCCC faculty has been nominated to serve on any of the working groups for the Maryland State Plan for Post-Secondary Education. (Revised every 4 years and last completed in 2009). There are five workgroups:
1. Quality and Effectiveness

2. Access, Affordability and Completion

3. Diversity

4. Innovation in Educational Delivery

5. Economic Growth and Vitality

6. Data Transparency and Accountability

The completed plan will be submitted in April and approved by May 2013

College Council, scheduled for October 10, 2012 was cancelled.

Academic Council, on October 17, 2012 included the introduction of Dr. Chen, Director of Curriculum and Assessment, as well as Dr. Harris, Associate Dean of Education, Social and Behavioral Science. Dr. Bradford announced the monitoring report must be submitted on November 30, 2012. There was a report from the Committee discussing Pre-100 with Dean Smith. They reported progress in establishing procedures for computer blocking of students to ensure they take Pre100 early. The issue of bringing the course under an academic department will be taken up with Dr. Harvey-Smith. Professor Webb raised the issue of students who have been un-enrolled in courses for failure to make installment payments. It was decided to determine the extent of the problem and address it at the next meeting. Dr. Lyman noted that the ERP Committee does not have Academic Affairs representation. There was a lack of concern that AA was not being represented. Professor Phillips, Chair of Program Review and Evaluation, asked all coordinators present to work with him on proposed schedule of program evaluations.

Dr. Williams emailed the College on October 18 extending the deadline for un-enrolled students to pay their bills. Dr. Lyman replied as follows:

Thank you for getting our students back into our classrooms and restoring our Blackboard records for these students. Still this does not address the underlying issue of how our financial aid and/or financial policies and procedures impact student success. Nor does it address the more specific issue of interrupting the instructional process to collect bills.

As you will recall, we had a lengthy discussion at the Board of Trustees Retreat on the need to use our financial resources and policies to leverage student success. In this case there is a clear value conflict between the necessity of students meeting financial obligations and the provision of quality instruction. It is
understandable that the finance department sees dis-enrollment as an easy tool to wield as they try to balance the budget. The faculty, however, take the view that continuity of instruction is the greater value. If we live by our core values, and adhere to our mission, I believe the College should embrace instructional continuity over bill collection. This is especially true when there are other bill collection methodologies that do not disrupt the instructional process, for example, denying future enrollment, withholding transcripts, etc. I have taught at several other institutions and I have never had a student dis-enrolled during the course of instruction. I now seem to have at least one each semester. It occurs to me that this bill collection technique is most effective against our motivated students and least effective against the indifferent student. I will discuss this issue with the SEC this afternoon, but I expect they will concur that this practice unnecessarily violates the continuity of instruction and is counterproductive to student success. In a time of economic recession and declining enrollments this practice is doubly troubling. Thank for listening to my thoughts. I urge you to seriously consider discontinuing the dis-enrollment practice.

Ms. Nelson informed me by email that a focus group of faculty would be convened regarding the Climate Survey. I recommended that a random sample of faculty be selected for the focus group.

I have asked Ms. Nelson to work with me to offer a one hour workshop regarding shared governance and the Faculty Senate. We will cover the both the reasons why colleges and universities have shared governance as well as the particulars of the Faculty Senate at BCCC, its constitution, committees, procedures, etc. She has responded in the affirmative.

Professor Leshan met with Ms. Zilberman and Mr. Wilson to facilitate the insertion of the student survey into the Blackboard client (Evaluation Kit). The student assessments will run for 2 weeks from November 26 through December 9, 2012.

Mr. Warner informed me that HR is working on a survey to provide feedback to the Academic Administration. I referred him to the Faculty Evaluation Committee for consultation.

I submitted the names of Professor Linda Benjamin and Ms. Nicole Cameron-Beckett to President Williams as nominations for the Co-Chairs of the upcoming Middle States Self Study.

I requested one faculty member from each of the College-wide Committees to provide a single paragraph report for the second SEC meeting each month. Professor Ennels will coordinate the compilation of these reports for the second SEC meeting of each month.

On October 26-28, 2012 the American Association of University Professors holds their annual conference in Washington D.C. I will be attending. Please promote membership among the faculty so we can start our own local chapter.
AFSCME Local 1870 Presentation
to the Board of Trustees
Tuesday, November 27, 2012

1. LMC and Human Resources Meetings- Under discussion/in progress
   - 40 hour Professional Development procedure
   - Memorandum of Understanding Negotiations
   - Wage Reopener
   - Classification Structure and Series
   - Union Office

2. Other – Under discussion/in progress
   - Other
TAB 9
PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE BCCC FOUNDATION BOARD
TAB 10
IN THE NEWS

BCCC’s Dental Hygiene Program Holds Annual Senior’s Week

Each fall Baltimore City Community College’s Dental Hygiene Program holds its annual Senior Week where area seniors have the opportunity to visit the Liberty Campus Dental Hygiene Clinic for a free cleaning, oral cancer exam and dental x-rays. The effort fulfills an important public health function as evidence of more serious diseases is sometimes discovered in patients who visit the clinic. Even if neighbors and residents cannot make an appointment during Senior Week, dental services are provided all year in the clinic for only $20. This year’s event took place October 15-October 19, 2012.


Changing Lives...Building Communities

BCCC partnered with Payne Memorial AME Church to host a well-attended and well publicized “Employment Opportunity Day” job fair, Thursday, Nov. 1. During the morning kickoff, two employment-related workshops, 1) How to Find and Keep a Job; and, 2) Resume Writing, were conducted. Key area employers including Johns Hopkins University, the State of Maryland, MTA, the Baltimore Police Department, the U.S. Secret Service, Elizabeth Cooney Care Network, Crispy Bagel, and many others, reported brisk interest at their tables. According to event co-sponsor Sarah Matthews of Payne A.M.E., this year’s event served approximately 300 people.
**IN THE NEWS (CONT.)...**

**Faculty/Staff Author Lecture Series**

Dr. Katana Hall-Banks, professor of English, Humanities, Visual and Performing Arts, and Mr. Jim Clemmer, curator of the African Tribal Art Collection at Sankofa African & World Bazaar in Baltimore, MD, recently participated in the Bard Library Lecturer Series. Dr. Hall, an award-winning playwright, actress, and director-producer for stage and television, drew from her extensive body of original literary works. They include a series of open letters and the upcoming documentary, *Stories My Sisters Tell.* Mr. Clemmer discussed and displayed his impressive collection of African artifacts. Both events were very successful with more than 100 students, faculty and staff attending the presentations.

**Presidential Contacts...**
(from Oct. 22-Nov. 16)

**Del. Talmadge Branch**

**Dr. Lillian Lowery,** Superintendent, Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

**Ms. Eloise Foster,** Secretary, Department of Budget and Management

**Mr. Kirby Fowler,** President, Downtown Partnership

**Mr. Andy Frank,** Special Assistant to the President, Johns Hopkins University

**Mr. Michael Gaines,** Assistant Secretary, Department of General Services

**Sen. Nathanial McFadden**

**National Council on Black American Affairs (NCBAA)**

**Leadership Development Institute for African American Midlevel Leaders**

**Ms. Lisa Rusyniak,** President and CEO, Goodwill Industries

**Mr. Kurt Sommer**
Director, Baltimore Integration Partnership (BIP)

**Ms. Karen Sitnick,** Director, Mayor’s Office of Employment Development

**Ms. Linda Westgate,** Manager, Hilton Baltimore

The Offices of Student Affairs, Judicial Affairs and Veterans Affairs hosted the Mental Health Symposium on October 16, 2012. The Mental Health Symposium is designed to provide a wealth of information and resources addressing current mental health challenges. The symposium is one of many student led initiatives strategically planned during mid-terms, so that students, faculty, and staff can discover healthy ways of dealing with stress and its related challenges.

A separate symposium was held on October 16, 2012, to address mental health challenges as they relate to veterans and their families. The symposium was expertly facilitated by Mr. Gregory M. Hunter, LCSW-C and director of Upward Bound; Ms. Tope Aje, M.Ed, MS, NCC, LGPC and director of the TRIO/SSS-STAIRS Program; and Mr. Jon Dansicker, Veteran’s Outreach Specialist, Department of Veterans Affairs. In addition, Ms. Angela Donn, LCSW-C, mental health therapist, Office of Student Support and Wellness Services and Mr. Stefan Charles Pierre, coordinator, Disability Support Services, discussed the services that each provide to the student body. There were 92 students in attendance at this event.
BCCC Receives Grant Funding for Math and Science Programs

Baltimore City Community College is the recipient of a $1.25 million five-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education to fund an Upward Bound Math and Science Program serving 60 eligible students at five target high schools in Baltimore City. The program is vital to the needs of the community, targeted students and families in our region. The overall goal of the program is to help students recognize and develop their potential to excel in math and science; to encourage them to pursue postsecondary degrees; and to ultimately obtain careers in the math and science profession.

The division of Student Affairs hosted the SEED School of Maryland’s presentation by Dr. Khalek Kirkland, Head of School and Ms. Nedra Davis, Director of Admissions, on October 24, in the Gaare Auditorium. The SEED School provides an innovative learning model that integrates a rigorous academic program with a nurturing boarding program. The school teaches life skills and provides students with a safe and secure environment. The model includes academic, residential, mental health, physical health, and social and enrichment programs. This special presentation was for students, faculty or staff who may have or know students in grades 6 through 12 that would benefit from a quality academic and boarding school experience.

BCCC IN THE MEDIA

BCCC students and recent graduates were featured on a Baltimore public radio segment examining Janks Morton’s latest documentary film, “Hoodwinked,” which challenges many of the statistics and reports released over the years about African Americans, especially black men. The film was recently shown the College. In the segment, BCCC students Jamil Shabazz, Rasheed Bonner, Shantwan Smith and Pierce Perkins share their reactions to the film with WYPR reporter Gwendolyn Glenn.

As part of an effort to promote new scholarships funded by the National Science Foundation, Professor Yun Liu participated in a special Comcast Cable interview which airs on all stations served by the cable network.

The Baltimore Business Journal mentioned BCCC’s Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA) Program in a broad survey of regional continuing education programs, in its Friday, Oct. 12 edition.

The BCCT Dental Hygiene Program’s annual Senior Week was profiled in an excellent story and photo essay by Institutional Advancement, Marketing and Research (IAMR) staffer Bill Fleming in the Friday, Oct. 26 edition of the Baltimore Times.

THE BIG GIVE

BCCC, in conjunction with the Baltimore City Community College Foundation, Inc., participated with 15 other Maryland community colleges Nov. 14 in a daylong effort to raise funds online for scholarships, student support services, faculty development, instructional programs and campus improvements. The “BIG GIVE,” a Maryland Association of Community Colleges initiative, spurs the state’s community colleges and their foundations to compete against each other to raise money and donors. For a BCCC student, resources provided by this campaign could fund:

♦ Scholarships for students interested in pursuing careers in high-demand fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM);
♦ Needs-based and emergency scholarships for students who have few, if any, alternatives for meeting the expenses of starting or staying in college;
♦ New and upgraded campus facilities or state-of-the-art equipment;
♦ Enhanced athletics and performing and visual arts programs;
♦ Experiential learning and STEM internship opportunities

CAREER FAIR AT BCED

On October 12, 2012, the Business and Continuing and Education Division (BCED) hosted an English as a Second Language (ESL) Career Fair to inform and prepare ESL students for post-secondary education and training opportunities with BCCC. This event was organized by Ms. Carolyn Rash, transition specialist for the BELS Program along with Ms. Ida Sass, associate director of Workforce Development for BCCC. Over fifty students from both on and off-campus ESL classes attended either the morning or afternoon session. Students were treated to an array of speakers who spoke on workforce development, weatherization, healthcare and the English Language Instruction program. Participating students were also able to tour the Harbor Campus and see first-hand the Fiber Optics Lab as well as a Healthcare training classroom.
Listed below are follow up items from the last Open Session Board meeting, Finance Committee meeting and Budget Workshop:

**Deferment Process**
- Business and Finance, Student Affairs and the College attorney are still exploring how to continue the deferment process without jeopardizing the College’s legislative and financial audits. A report will be included in the next Board packet.

**Professional Development Policy**
- President Williams has not received feedback and agreement from all constituency groups yet on the Professional Development policy. The policy will be included in the next Board packet

**Book Rentals**
- Staff have attended a webinar on bookstore rentals and a vendor is ready to implement rentals at BCCC (although titles that are available for rentals are limited). The biggest hurdle for us is that students must have a major credit card to rent books (this ensures a mechanism for charging them if the books are not returned or returned in unusable condition). Once we work out the details with the vendor, we will pilot a book rental program for fall 2013.

**Follow up from the Budget Workshop:**
- What is the annual indirect cost amount and what do we do with it?
  Our average indirect cost allowance is approximately 8%. We collected $302,380 last year and it is listed as “Other Revenues” (Unrestricted) on the financial reports and used to fund our general operating costs.

- What is the mark-up on books/supplies, etc. for the bookstore? Are these industry standard mark-ups? Who decided these mark-ups?
  - Textbooks-25%
  - Customs textbooks-30%
  - Trade Books-40%-50%
  - Electronics-20%-25%
  - Clothing/Supplies/Gifts/Sundries-27%-50%

  The College follows the National Association of College Stores retail guideline for all books. For other items, we follow the College’s business plan for the bookstore (written in 2002) and the National Association’s retail guidelines. Each college has the ability to set slightly different mark-ups based on volume discounts, etc. Some of the merchandise mark-ups are also dictated to some degree by the supplier (for example, Microsoft mandates a mark-up of no more than 25%).

- Why is the financial aid, scholarship, and tuition waiver expenditure line only 12.5% for unrestricted and 3.3% for restricted when we are 25% way through the school year already?
  The percentages on the first quarter report for financial aid/scholarships/tuition waivers are low due to timing. Although school begins in late August, the majority of financial aid payments do not occur until October when the money is actually received. The College received $10 million in October for Pell on the restricted side, so the December quarterly report will be more reflective of the aid and scholarships expenditures.

- Why the variance on the utilities for WBJC?
  As part of the tower project a new “pre-fab” building was erected and new power lines were added to the building. When BGE dropped the new line, they opened a new account and closed the old one. WBJC Station General Manager, Joe Hutchins, contacted DGS (Mr. Lionel Hill) in September as they have oversight of the negotiated utility rates for all state facilities. A follow-up message was left on November 15, 2012, to inquire about the status of the utility rates. At this point, the rates are being renegotiated by DSG which will likely result in a higher utility cost to the radio station.
Year Up Baltimore reports that, over the course of its work at BCCC, all 37 students who began the program are still progressing successfully in their studies and toward their internships. This is the first time this has ever happened in the history of the program, anywhere.

Dr. Alicia B. Harvey-Smith, vice president of Student Affairs, graduated from the 2012 Greater Baltimore Committee (GBC) Leadership year-long program on Thursday, October 25, 2012, at the Federal Reserve Bank.

The Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE) concluded at its fall 2012 meeting that the PTA Program at BCCC is a **Fully Accredited Program** and **NO Progress Report will be Required!**

Special word of thanks to **Mrs. Debra Parson**, PTA Program Faculty; **Mrs. Sonya Johnson-Branch**, PTA Adjunct Faculty; **Ms. Penny Weidner**, coordinator for the Office of Assessment; to **Ms. Nijole Kaltreider**, PTA Adjunct Faculty; **Ms. Dorothy Holley**, interim associate dean of Allied Health, Nursing, and Health & Life Fitness; and **Mr. Scott Olden**, interim dean of Allied Health, Nursing, Health & Life Fitness.

Professor **Linda Benjamin**, department of Business Management and Technology, and **Ms. Nicole Cameron Becketts**, director of the Student Success Center, will co-chair the Middle States Self Study slated to begin in January 2013.
POV: Leaders Who Disturb the Universe
Monday, October 01, 2012 - Terry O’Banion, President Emeritus, League for Innovation in the Community College

In our 110-year history, the community college has evolved through many stages, and each stage has required a different kind of leader — leaders who build, leaders who consolidate, leaders who negotiate, leaders who partner. At this stage in the continuing evolution of the community college, national leaders from the White House to the State House and from major foundations are calling on the community college to play a key role in doubling the number of students in the next decade who complete a certificate, associate degree or transfer to the university. The Completion Agenda has become the overarching mission of the community college, and if we are to achieve even a modicum of success in reaching the goals of the Completion Agenda we need leaders who will, in the words of poet T. S. Eliot, “disturb the universe.”

As we gear up to transform our colleges to meet this overarching goal doing more of the same will just get us more of the same. Simply tweaking a program or grafting on a prosthetic technology is trimming the branches of a dying tree. Margaret Wheatley has advised that “we need the courage to let go of the old world, to relinquish most of what we have cherished, to abandon our interpretations of what does and doesn’t work.” We need leaders who will “disturb the universe.”

There are indications the transformation is under way. One example of the change is reflected in the assertive language we are beginning to use to address the challenges of the Completion Agenda: “intrusive” advising, “mandatory” placement, “disruptive” innovations, “accelerated” instruction, early “alert,” data “driven,” “deeper” engagement, scalable “interventions,” etc. The old passivity associated with change is giving way to something more robust and energetic; colleges are picking up momentum because the charge is clear and the timeline short. Never in our history have so many stakeholders galvanized behind a common goal. Never in our history have so many foundations provided so many funds to support our efforts. It is our Andy Warhol 15-minutes-of-fame on the national stage, and failure is not an option. We cannot succeed without leaders who are willing to “disturb the universe.”

We have always been champions of the student success agenda, which is the same as the completion agenda, with a more targeted goal. But in this stage of our history we have many more resources and many more challenges than in previous decades. Whereas 50 years ago the only research we had included a few studies by Medsker and Knoell on transfer success, today we have a rapidly growing body of research on what works to help students succeed. The Community College Research Center at Teachers College, Columbia University alone has produced over 300 research reports in the last decade. Fifty years ago, our technology consisted of rolling tub files, color-coded folders, the McBee Sort System and eventually IBM punched cards. Today, through the application of data analytics, we can mine data to predict student behavior and to intervene in the first week of class to help get students back on track. And we can manage and orchestrate huge systems of data related to learning outcomes, educational plans, course schedules, and assessments. Fifty years ago most foundations did not fund community colleges, or purposely excluded them from their agenda; Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy did not call on the community college to play a major role in the nation’s work. Today we are the darlings of the foundations and of the White House.
We have more resources than we have ever had to make good on our promise of student success. And we have more challenges than ever before: declining financial resources, retiring faculty and leaders, reliance on adjunct faculty, crumbling facilities, complex accountability metrics from accrediting agencies and state and federal agencies, internal conflicts among faculty and other groups, cumbersome educational codes and regulations, and a hostile national political climate. We are caught in a Dickensian nightmare of the best of times and the worst of times. If we are to navigate our way through this jungle we will require leaders who will not settle for business as usual but who will “disturb the universe.”

If we are to transform the community college to meet the goals of the completion agenda we must heed the advice of the 21st Century Commission on the Future of the Community College: “The American dream is at risk. Because a highly educated population is fundamental to economic growth and a vibrant democracy, community colleges can help reclaim that dream. But stepping up to this challenge will require dramatic redesign of these institutions, their mission, and, most critically, their students’ educational experiences.”

The commission report concluded that “Change cannot be achieved without committed and courageous leaders….Community colleges have been developing leaders to maintain the inherited design. They need now to develop leaders to transform the design.” That is to say, we now need leaders who will “disturb the universe.”

Many of the new leaders needed to “transform the design” and “disturb the universe” will come from community college leadership programs, including one now under development at National American University. John Roueche, who has been “disturbing the universe” of community colleges for five decades as the most gifted leader in the history of the community college, is working with NAU to create a substantive leadership program. His vision and experience will provide the foundation for the new program which he is developing in collaboration with a vast network of community college colleagues, including me. The program is in early stages of development and is expected to welcome its charter class in the fall of 2013.

Terry O’Banion is a senior advisor to National American University and chair of its Community College Advisory Board. National American University is a private, proprietary, regionally-accredited institution. This article is the first in a series to be authored by principals involved in NAU’s Roueche Graduate Center and other national experts identified by the center. John E. Roueche and Margareta B. Mathis will serve as editors of the monthly column, a partnership between the Roueche Graduate Center and Community College Week editorial staff. Send comments to mbmathis@national.edu, and Paul Bradley, editor@ccweek.com.

It’s YOUR TURN CCW wants to hear from you!
Q: Can “disturbing the universe” advance the community college completion agenda?
Share your Comments: ccweekblog
SHELLEY F. PAYNE-COOKE is a conquered woman of God. Shelley is currently employed with the City of Baltimore, Department of Public Works Environmental Services Division, where her Lead Data Entry Operator II position affords her the opportunity to do quality control through analyzing data and maintaining records for Back River Laboratories in Essex, MD. Shelley has been with the City of Baltimore for eleven years and she is an active member with The City Union of Baltimore, where she served as union steward for her area and remains a contact person for her area location.

Shelley has been a member of Empowerment Temple, AME church since August, 2001 under the leadership of Dr. Rev. Jamal Harrison Bryant, founder and Pastor and has been active on several ministries: Media, WAR, Beyond the Walls Ministry: Prison, Addiction, Street Evangelism and Homeless and Altar Care. Shelley received her Ministers in Training Certificate in 2005 for completion of studies through the MIT Program at Empowerment Temple, AME Church in Baltimore, MD. Shelley is now co-chairing HIV TOUCH MINISTRY at Empowerment Temple where she works tirelessly to bring information to the community at large about this disease which has affected the United States and International Communities.

Shelley is currently a student at Baltimore City Community College where she is seeking an Associates of Arts Degree in Arts & Science Transfer-Public Policy. Shelley received her leadership award through the Passport Leadership Program in May, 2010. Shelley was inducted into the Phi Theta Kappa International Honor Society, Theta Alpha Chapter at Baltimore City Community College on May 3, 2011 for her outstanding academic achievements. On May 19, 2011, Shelley received a Phi Theta Award and the National Dean’s List Award for continued outstanding academic achievement. On November 14, 2011, Shelley was inducted as President of Phi Theta Kappa International Honor Society, Theta Alpha Chapter at Baltimore City Community College. On May 16, 2012, Shelley received the National Dean’s List Award for continued outstanding academic achievement. Shelley was extended the invitation to attend this unique and historic event exclusively as a member of Phi Theta Kappa International Honor Society to take part in the Collegiate Presidential Inaugural Conference in Washington, D.C. on January 19-23, 2013. Shelley will receive a “Black Capital Award” from Bmorenews.com 10th Anniversary Celebration Awards Dinner and Shelley will be in the 95th Anniversary Publication of Phi Theta Kappa in the year of 2013.
Board of Trustees

My desire for knowledge and education is at the forefront of my life. A college education empowers the student to make choices that would enrich their life; and impact their community. I returned to college in 2003 at the tender age of 38 years old and I was scared. I doubted if I belonged after 20 years of being out of school. However, my desire to achieve a higher goal outweighed my fear and I stayed.

It is of great privilege and honor to be considered for such a position. To be able to make changes that will affect the forward movement of this college is of a great reward as a student representative.

I understand that the role of student Trustee is one of great responsibility, which will give me the opportunity to improve the student experience at Baltimore City Community College. I will gain great experience contributing to meetings and acquire great knowledge as it pertains to student life. I have a keen desire for the positive development of the College as well as the students. I understand the level of commitment needed in this position. My willingness to devote the necessary time and effort will be proven. I am able to think creatively, and speak clearly as to the vision to move the college forward. I am a team player and I understand the necessities of this public position, which includes but is not limited to: selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership. Since being a student at Baltimore City Community College I have been prepared emotionally and academically, and I am excited to serve as student representative to Board of Trustees to ensure the same experience for others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Div</th>
<th>PIN #</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date(s) posted</th>
<th>Advertised</th>
<th>Current Status/Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>66725 Dean, Allied Health &amp; Nursing</td>
<td>1/27/2012; 5/2012;</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHE, HERC, Chron (2/10), Mdjobs, Advance (2/27), Hispanic Outlook (4/18/12), MD Nurse (5/14), Minority Nurse</td>
<td>1st interviews 10/29/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>66904 Assoc Dean Nursing &amp; Allied Health &amp; Fitness</td>
<td>9/19/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, HERC, Chron 10/12, Nurse Com 11/5</td>
<td>Search reopen 10/24/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>66815 Asst Prof Public Speaking</td>
<td>5/11/2012; 6/8/12; 8/20/12</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHE, HERC</td>
<td>2nd interviews 11/8/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>76584 Assoc Dean, Bus &amp; Technology</td>
<td>7/25/2012, 8/31/12</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, HERC, Chron (8/3), 8/31</td>
<td>2nd interviews TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>73962 Assoc Dean, EHVPA</td>
<td>7/25/2012, 8/31/12</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, HERC, Chron (8/3), 8/31</td>
<td>1st interviews 10/29/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>66780 Asst Professor Developmental Math</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEJ, HERC, ISHEJ</td>
<td>PAR Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>66793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>66734 Asst Prof Developmental English</td>
<td>8/28/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, HERC</td>
<td>Search reopen 10/26/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>76824 Manager, Prescriptive Tutor</td>
<td>10/4/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, HERC</td>
<td>1st interviews 10/25/12 and 11/5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>TBD Asst Professor, Fashion Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>B&amp;F</td>
<td>66871 Director of Facilities</td>
<td>9/11/2012</td>
<td>ISHEJ, HEJ, HERC, Balto Sun, CB</td>
<td>1st interviews 11/8 &amp; 11/9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B&amp;F</td>
<td>66984 Lead Payroll Specialist</td>
<td>8/31/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, CB</td>
<td>PAR Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B&amp;F</td>
<td>66668 Controller</td>
<td>10/9/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, CB</td>
<td>search committee reviewing; resumes sent to search chair 11/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>66652 Dean of Enrollment Mgmt</td>
<td>8/28/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, HERC, Chronicle 10/12</td>
<td>search committee reviewing; resumes sent to chair 10/25/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>66968 Career Development Service Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAR Pending approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PO-CITS</td>
<td>66738 Lead Systems Administrator</td>
<td>9/11/2012; 10/12/12</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, CB, DICE, Chronicle</td>
<td>Search reopen 10/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PO-CITS</td>
<td>66987 Systems Administrator</td>
<td>9/11/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, CB, DICE, Chronicle</td>
<td>Search reopen 10/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PO-CITS</td>
<td>TBD Director, Enterprise Resource Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAR Pending approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>PO-CITS</td>
<td>TBD Manager, Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAR Pending approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>82345 Assoc Director of Human Resources</td>
<td>10/5/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, ISHEJ, CB, CHRA</td>
<td>Search open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>BCED</td>
<td>66847 Community Education Specialist</td>
<td>8/6/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, HERC, ISHEJ</td>
<td>2nd interviews TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>BCED</td>
<td>81691R Refugee Program Manager</td>
<td>8/6/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, HERC, ISHEJ</td>
<td>PAR Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>BCED</td>
<td>84364 Manager, Non Credit Healthcare</td>
<td>10/8/2012</td>
<td>HEJ, HERC, ISHEJ, Nurse Spectrum and Nurse.com 11/5</td>
<td>Search Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>BCED</td>
<td>78498R Volunteer Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAR Pending approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>B&amp;F</td>
<td>81591 Administrative Asst III-Public Safety</td>
<td>10/24/2012</td>
<td>BCCC website</td>
<td>Search committee reviewing; resumes sent to search chair 11/5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>B&amp;F</td>
<td>66870 Police Officer II</td>
<td>10/22/2012</td>
<td>BCCC website</td>
<td>Search open 10/22/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>B&amp;F</td>
<td>TBD Administrative Asst III</td>
<td>10/25/2012</td>
<td>BCCC website</td>
<td>Search open internal only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATUS KEY**

- 1st interviews scheduled
- 2nd interviews scheduled/TBD
- Search committee reviewing
- SAR Pending
- PAR Pending
Draft Strategic Plan

2013-2015

Mission

The Baltimore City Community College Foundation advances the mission of the Baltimore City Community College by strengthening philanthropic giving to the College. The Foundation supports students with scholarships so they can build their careers, strengthening families and communities; the Foundation works to advance the College as a vital part of Baltimore City’s economy and community.

Vision

Baltimore City Community College Foundation enables the College to be a trend-setting institution that benefits from strong partnerships with the business and philanthropic community of Baltimore who contribute to the successes of the College’s remarkable students and programs.

Goals

I. Increase funds for scholarships to ensure that all students are able to get the resources they need to advance their education at BCCC.

II. Partner with BCCC to advance its vision and priorities by making connections to people and institutions who can contribute to its success.

III. Involve the entire BCCC community in opportunities to contribute to the Foundation.

IV. Strengthen the BCCC Foundation organizationally, to ensure a high performing board and staff to achieve Foundation goals.
Monitoring Report to the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
from
Baltimore City Community College
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

Dr. Carolane Williams, President
Dr. Peggy F. J. Bradford, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Accreditation Liaison Officer

December 1, 2012

Subject of the Follow-Up Report:
At its session on June 28, 2012, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted:

To accept the monitoring report and note the visit by the Commission’s representatives. To remove the probation because the institution is now in compliance with Standard 4, 6, and 14 and to reaffirm accreditation. To request a monitoring report by December 1, 2012, demonstrating continued compliance with Standard 14 including but not limited to (1) evidence of the full implementation of the new student learning assessment process; (2) evidence of the use of assessment processes to influence academic decisions; (3) evidence of course learning outcomes with program goals; (4) documentation of the use of student learning assessment data to inform institutional assessment (Standard 14). A small team visit may follow submission of the monitoring report. The next evaluation visit is now scheduled for 2013-2014.
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INTRODUCTION

Baltimore City Community College (BCCC) recognizes the essential role that College-wide outcomes assessment plays in institutional effectiveness. BCCC is committed to ongoing evidence-based outcomes assessment as a collaborative tool to inform decision making at every level and in every division of the College. BCCC also acknowledges the importance of assessment in increasing student learning. While this monitoring report addresses the need of the Academic Affairs Division to develop honest and effective assessment systems, the College recognizes that creating a College-wide culture of outcomes assessment is crucial to building a vibrant and effective community college for all who take advantage of BCCC's offerings. Through the establishment of a College Wide Assessment Council (CWAC), the College is developing the institutional capacity for ongoing and effective outcomes assessment leading to improved institutional coordination and decision making. This emerging culture of assessment is now an integral component of BCCC's commitment to excellence.

College Vision

Baltimore City Community College strives to be the leader in providing quality education that responds to and meets the needs of a diverse population of learners, adding value to lives and the community.

College Mission

Baltimore City Community College provides outstanding educational, cultural, and social experiences to the citizens of Baltimore, the State of Maryland, and surrounding areas. The College’s accessible, affordable, comprehensive programs include college transfer and career preparation, technical training, and life skills training. The College provides a variety of student services that meet and support the learning needs of an increasingly diverse student population. BCCC is a dynamic higher education institution that is responsive to the changing needs of its stakeholders: individuals, businesses, government, and educational institutions of the community at large.

College Background and History

BCCC is a state-sponsored, urban, comprehensive, degree-granting community college with one campus and a number of instructional sites in the city of Baltimore. The College currently offers 27 degree programs and 14 certificates as well as a range of noncredit offerings including General Educational Diploma (GED), English as a Second Language (ESL), and Adult Basic Education (ABE). The College also partners with local business and industry to offer non-credit workforce training, customized training, and a number of other educational programs and services.
BCCC is both an old and a young institution. The College was founded in 1947, as Baltimore Junior College (BJC), a department of the Baltimore City Public Schools. Its mission was to provide post high school education for returning World War II veterans. In 1967, the College was renamed the Community College of Baltimore (CCB). In the early 1990s, ownership of the College was transferred to the State of Maryland and renamed again: the New Community College of Baltimore (NCCB). In 1992, the College name was changed to its current name: Baltimore City Community College (BCCC).

In 2003, the College successfully completed its last comprehensive self-study with reaffirmation of accreditation by the Middle States Commission. At that time, the Middle State Commission was undergoing a transition to new outcomes assessment standards. The 2003 self-study was completed under the earlier Middle States standards, and the College would transition to those new standards. In 2008, the College completed its Periodic Review Report and the Middle States Commission reaffirmed accreditation with the caveat that the College document progress on several of the new outcomes assessment-based standards. Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning) proved to be the most problematic for BCCC.

The Middle States Commission subsequently requested a progress letter in 2009, a monitoring report, a Commission liaison visit and small team visit in 2010, a monitoring report and a small team visit in 2011. The 2011 monitoring team found the College in non-compliance with Standard 14. At its regular meeting in June 2011, the Commission placed the College on probation, ordered an immediate liaison guidance visit to discuss expectations and a monitoring report to address Middle States standards 4, 6, and 14, to be followed by a small team visit.

Consequently, a SLOA Task Force was created to develop a more comprehensive Student Learning Outcomes Assessment process. Working throughout the summer, the Task Force created a process along with a document titled Comprehensive Learning Outcomes Assessment: A Practical Guide. (Hereafter referred to as the Practical Guide).

The assessment process detailed in the Practical Guide was implemented during the 2011-12 academic year, and a small team visit followed in spring 2012. In June 2012, the Middle States Commission found BCCC in compliance with Standards 4, 6, and 14 and removed the College from probation but requested a monitoring report by December 1, 2012.

Baltimore City Community College wishes to acknowledge the contributions of the Middle States Commission and the role of regional accreditation in stimulating and guiding the College toward more effective assessment and improvement of student learning. The College is committed to sustained College-wide outcomes assessment, and looks forward to the start of our comprehensive decennial self-study.
Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this monitoring report is to assure the Middle States Commission of BCCC’s continuing compliance with Standard 14 and to document our progress and momentum toward a culture of assessment. In the Academic Affairs Division, we are continuing to assess student learning in courses and programs and to use the results to inform institutional outcomes. Additionally, the College has established the College Wide Assessment Council, co-chaired by a Vice President and a faculty member, for the purpose of assessing and improving every instructional division of the College.

Specifically, this report will update the Commission on BCCC’s capacity to

.....sustain on-going compliance with Standard 14, including, but not limited to, (1) evidence of the full implementation of the new student learning assessment process; (2) evidence of using assessment processes to influence academic decisions; (3) evidence of course learning outcomes with program goals; (4) documentation of the use of student learning assessment data to inform institutional assessment (Standard 14).

Organization of Report

The College’s responses to the four items are organized into four sections. Each section includes recent accomplishments. Section 1 focuses on evidence of the implementation of the new student learning assessment process; section 2 examines the use of the assessment processes to influence academic decisions; section 3 addresses the integration of course learning outcomes with program goals; and section 4 illustrates the current implementation of student learning assessment data to inform institutional assessment.

The intended outcome of this report is to demonstrate continued compliance with Standard 14 and to reaffirm BCCC’s accreditation. These are actions taken since the team visit of spring 2012. Clearly outcomes assessment is a continuing process, and BCCC’s full implementation of the process is ongoing.
SECTION 1: EVIDENCE OF THE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Recent Accomplishments

All of BCCC’s 41 programs, 27 degree programs and 14 certificate programs, have implemented the assessment process since spring 2012. Since outcomes assessment is an iterative process, all of the programs are currently somewhere within the four-step process of Planning, Implementation, Analysis, or Reporting Phase (See Table 1A and 1B). Every phase requires documents to be submitted to the Office of Assessment and Curriculum for review and evaluation (See Table 2A and 2B).

Table 1A: Five-Year Program Outcomes Assessment Cycle Status: 27-Degree Program Majors and Options Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Analysis &amp; Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration Transfer</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Allied Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Management/Marketing)</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences Transfer*</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Aided Drafting &amp; Design</td>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Supervision</td>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Physical Therapist Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem Educ/Generic Spec Educ PreK-12 (AAT)</td>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>Respiratory Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Design</td>
<td>Engineering Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Design Retailing</td>
<td>Health Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies Transfer</td>
<td>Law Enforcement and Correctional Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistant</td>
<td>Office Administration (Admin Assistant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td>Robotics Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical Technologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program Options: Arts & Sciences Transfer: Art, Music, Theater, Math, Science, Psychology*
Table 1B:
Five-Year Program Outcomes Assessment Cycle Status: 14 Certificate Options Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Analysis &amp; Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Design</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Addiction Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Aided Drafting and Design</td>
<td>Allied Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Supervision</td>
<td>Biotechnology Lab Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>Coding Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lab Animal Science</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education Assistant</td>
<td>Substitute Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Practical Nursing is not running at this time – to be deleted*

The evidence in Tables 1A and 1B further explains that BCCC is in the full implementation of the student learning assessment process. This process is ongoing; thus, programs have different positions in this five-year program outcomes assessment cycle. Each program cycles back and forward for adjustments and then proceeds to summative assessments to ensure better performance evaluation and improvement. Through periodical reviews, systematic data collections and the use of the assessment information, this process improves all BCCC’s students’ learning, performance, and development.
Table 2A: Five-Year Program Outcomes Assessment Cycle: 27 Degree Programs’ Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM LEVEL</th>
<th>COURSE LEVEL Year 1 (Fall 2012 - Spring 2013)</th>
<th>SLOARs</th>
<th>SLOAPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-SLOR</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Design Retailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Human Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement-and Correctional Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem Edu/Generic Spec Ed Pre K-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education Transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Management)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Marketing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Administration (Admin Asst)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Aided Drafting &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robotics Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapist Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical Technologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In higher education institutions, it is important to develop an assessment system to document and record all of the assessment evidence and data. This process responds to institutional effectiveness, accountability demands, and student learning outcomes (Ohia, 2011). BCCC has developed an assessment system and designed several documents to explain each program’s activities, academic decisions, adjustments, and future plans. In addition, these documents record the alignment of programs goals with measurable student learning outcomes (SLO). Each document has its own purpose to record the programs’ assessment activities, and the details of each document are shown in the Table 3.
Table 3:  
**Required Documents in BCCC’s Assessment Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-SLOR – Program Learning Outcomes Report (Five Year)</th>
<th>Matrix (Appendix A)</th>
<th>P-SLOR (Appendix B)</th>
<th>SLOAR(s) (Appendix C)</th>
<th>SLOAPs (Appendix D)</th>
<th>PLOW (Appendix E)</th>
<th>Curriculum Map (Appendix F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLOAR – Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report</td>
<td>Five-year Overview</td>
<td>Five-year Overview</td>
<td>SLOAR indicates the semester being assessed (i.e., Spring 2012, Fall 2012)</td>
<td>Outlines assessment changes at the SLO, Course, or Program Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A SLOAR records a course was not taught. Indicate reasons (low enrollment; not offered that semester, etc.)</td>
<td>Quick View Worksheet</td>
<td>Identifies the Assessment Instrument and Measurement Criteria</td>
<td>Landscaped Doc</td>
<td>SLOARs</td>
<td>PLOY - Program Learning Outcomes Matrix (Appendix A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOAP – Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan</td>
<td>Program-level Documents</td>
<td>Course-level Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A SLOAP records Program-level Changes</td>
<td>Five-year Overview</td>
<td>– SLOAR - Documents student performance per Student Learning Outcome (SLO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOW – Program Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Information Extracted from the Program Learning Outcomes Worksheet and Curriculum Map</td>
<td>– SLOAP – If an assessment change is made, the SLOAP records the change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking toward future</td>
<td></td>
<td>– SLOs must map back to the PG &amp; MPLO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Student Learning Assessment Database**

All of the documents of the assessment process in Table 3 are accessed from an online system. The first use of this system began in fall 2011. All of BCCC courses are currently in some phase of the process. The Assessment Office is working to input the data supplied by the faculty and academic departments into a database called Xitracs Accreditation and Assessment Reporting System that tracks every course.

The Coordinator of Assessment inputted the fall 2012 course and sections offerings and full-time faculty names and contact information into the Xitracs system. The database framework aligns with the College’s Academic Affairs structure featuring three academic schools (Arts and Social Sciences; Allied Health and Nursing; and Business, Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics). A fourth section in the database is dedicated to the Academic Services area.

An annual licensing fee provides unlimited, but controlled, access to information by full-time faculty members, deans, associate deans, and Academic Affairs administration. For accuracy, information can only be edited by the Credentials Administrator (CA). However, faculty may see their personal records using the secure Xitracs User Portal. The portal provides tools for faculty to report any changes and provide evidential documents such as certificates or publications to the CA who, after following appropriate checks, updates the record. Xitracs provides a variety of reports with content and format required by accrediting agencies along with generic examples. Output can be provided in Excel spreadsheet format for numeric analysis and instant custom reporting.
Training occurred on December 16, 2012, for the Discipline Liaisons (DL), Program Coordinators, Assistant Deans, and Assessment Office personnel. The interactive training required participants to load their respective content, provide feedback on the initial framework, and determine the spring 2013 training schedule. Conceptually, DLs partnered with Program Coordinators are to repeat the training with their respective faculty.

Annually, the Assessment Office produces a report documenting the outcomes of assessment for the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC). This report also to be reviewed by the College Wide Assessment Council (CWAC).

**Evidence of Implementation of Student Learning Assessment Process**

Seven programs are presented in this report. These seven programs are in different phases of the five-year Program Outcomes Assessment Cycle (See Table 1A), and they further align in this student learning assessment process. In addition to these documents, the appendices include all documents as evidence of the full implementation of this student learning assessment process. These documents include a Program Learning Outcomes Report (P-SLOR), Matrix Five-Year View, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports (SLOARs) with Learning Improvement Plans (LIP), Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan (SLOAP), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOW), and Curriculum Maps. An abstract of assessment activities from each program appears below:

**Allied Human Services (AHS)**

In the AHS program, every course met the criteria associated with the program’s capstone course. Also, the AHS program is moving toward alignment with national accreditation to allow students to qualify for national certification. Toward this end, accreditation preparation and course adjustments have started. Adjustments include four courses being deleted in fall 2012, and field placement being deleted from another four courses in spring 2013. Overall, in fall 2012, there is one course in the Planning Phase, and two courses in the Implementation Phase. In spring 2013, there are two courses in the Planning Phase and one course in the Implementation Phase. Table 2 and Appendix A, Matrix Five-Year View, illustrates the assessment cycle for all five academic years.

**Biotechnology (BTC)**

In the BTC program, courses from such different subjects as biotechnology, biology, and chemistry align their measurable student learning outcomes with the general program goals (See Appendix A: Matrix Five-Year View). In spring and fall 2012, assessment findings indicated that CHE 101 and 102’s SLOs needed further alignment with the BTC program goals. Also, these two courses needed to adjust the measurement tools or methods to fit tightly into the program goals. For example, four
student learning outcomes (SLOs; two from each master syllabus) have a direct correlation with necessary BTC student performance, but not all SLOs met this requirement.

Generally speaking, all courses are within the five-year assessment plan. The Matrix Five-Year View (See Appendix A) shows that for fall 2012, there are four courses in the Reporting Phase and one course in the Planning Phase.

**Early Childhood Education (ECE)**

In the ECE program, all courses taught in fall 2012 aligned assessment instruments and measurement criteria with program goals and measurable program learning outcomes (See Appendix F: Curriculum Map, Appendix B: P-SLOR, and Appendix E: PLOW). There are four courses in the Implementation Phase and nine courses in the Reporting Phase. In addition, ECE made adjustments based on the alignment of program goals. The ECE faculty assessment team recommended that seven courses be deleted from the ECE program. Three of the seven courses (ECE 110, 115 and 116) were presented and approved at the departmental level. The remaining four courses will be presented upon future revision of both the certificate and degree programs. In addition, ECE 201 is offered once a year in fall 2012; field placement requirements are to be removed from four courses in spring 2013. Two documents, the Matrix Five-Year View and Program Assessment Cycle Summary, illustrate this five-year plan and layout. (See Appendix A: Matrix Five-Year View).

**Engineering – Transfer (EGN)**

The Engineering Transfer Program is in the Implementation Phase. The program generated a five-year assessment cycle plan to assess all program goals / outcomes between fall 2012 and spring 2017. Currently, SLOAPs have been developed for the first set of courses to be assessed in the program. Assessment of the courses will begin in spring 2013.

All courses syllabi are updated every semester. These adjustments include measurement criteria, assessment tools, instructional strategies, learning strategies, and appropriate adaptations or modifications. Also, faculty members follow the program goals and ensure the benchmark criteria are appropriate so that all students make regular progress. For example, several courses, MAT 140, 141, 211, are now monitoring student progress and will be in the assessment cycle starting in fall 2014.

Besides these monitoring courses, there are two courses in the Planning Phase in fall 2012; one course is in the Planning Phase and two courses are in the Implementation Phase in spring 2013. Overall, all courses follow the assessment cycle and the guidelines of the required assessment process to ensure every course meets the program goals and measurable learning outcomes.
Nursing (NUR)

All courses in the NUR program are in the assessment cycle (See Appendix A: Matrix Five-Year View). When specific outcomes are not met, SLOARs and LIPs are expected. In fall 2012, four LIPs were implemented, and the academic results are expected to be generated in SLOARs after fall 2012.

All Reporting Phase courses in the NUR program listed student performance findings in the SLOARs (See Appendix C). The SLOARs showed that most of the students met the benchmark criteria of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) in these courses, so no academic actions needed to be taken. When some of the SLOs were not met, LIPs were attached and modifications were made to adjust the curriculum, instruction, and measurement. For example, in NURS 111, modifications included a self-test administration before the exam, prescriptive math tutoring, and review sessions. These academic actions helped to improve student success in the courses and encourage students to integrate knowledge, skills, dispositions, and methods of inquiry when they graduate from BCCC.

Physical Therapist Assistant (PTA)

Due to this assessment process and resulting data, the PTA program initiated an admission policy beginning in fall 2011. An Admission Strategies and Sustainability Plan with program-level initiatives were developed that addressed the Program’s three-year graduation rate and compliance associated with their national accreditation agency.

In addition, extensive planning was conducted during this assessment process. In fall 2013, every course will construct weekly student seminars and overall course reviews. These academic actions will benefit students’ learning experiences and increase the retention rate in the PTA program. (See Appendix C: SLOARs and Section 2).

Respiratory Care (RC)

All courses in the RC program are set up in appropriate phases in the assessment process (See Appendix A: Matrix Five-Year View). When the courses’ benchmark criteria were not met in spring 2012, LIPs were implemented in fall 2012. For example, in RC 113, the instructor adjusted the instructional strategies including supplemental materials and such measurement modifications as corrections and explanations. In RC 115, multiple assessments were given to make sure student performances were assessed appropriately and validly.

Similarly to other programs, RC aligns program goals with its national accreditation agency. All courses align SLO with program goals to ensure students are progressing. In addition, due to the assessment data, retention rates have improved. The program coordinator and faculty members are drafting two plans for two courses, RC 121 and 213, to ensure that students are assessed with appropriate assessment tools.
SECTION 2: EVIDENCE OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT PROCESSES TO INFLUENCE ACADEMIC DECISIONS

Recent Accomplishments

The newly implemented program assessment process is beginning to show results. A number of programs are sufficiently advanced in their outcomes assessments and are prepared to make informed decisions, including specific course revisions, additions, and deletions. Below are the examples of the evidence from the seven programs. (See Appendix G: Academic Decisions Summary).

Allied Human Services (AHS)

In implementing this new student learning assessment process, the AHS program made several academic decisions. Those decisions include effective changes to shift from the course level to program level and also to benefit faculty and student learning. For example, the Learning Improvement Plans (LIP) from two courses, ASH 100 AND 101, listed such changes as using a written paper focusing on identifying, analyzing, and comparing the various major theories.

By aligning their program goals with the national accreditation standards, students will qualify for national certification qualifications. Beginning fall 2012, AHS faculty members have begun to re-evaluate student learning outcomes for the program and from each course as well as to revise assessment instruments and measurement criteria. These actions frame the AHS program for accreditation status, including scheduled fall 2012 course deletions; field placement eliminations that are scheduled for spring 2013; and, developing a capstone course and requirements in spring 2013. (See Appendix D: SLOAP).

Biotechnology (BTC)

Different SLOs were assessed every semester in the BTC program. The SLOARs showed that four courses, BTC 102 and 105; BIO 207 and 212, in the BTC program, have met the benchmark criteria of a 70% pass rate of SLOs in the previous semesters, spring 2012 or fall 2011. BTC 101 submitted LIPs for a plan to be implemented in spring 2013 since not all benchmark criteria were met for BIO 101. This plan includes weekly quizzes and two semester vocabulary exams so that students can master the skills and knowledge when periodically reviewing terminology, terms, and professional vocabularies.

Early Childhood Education (ECE)

Similar to the AHS program, this new assessment process helps ECE align program goals with national, NAYCE, accreditation standards for courses. Restructuring this five-year assessment plan also includes adjusting program goals, program student learning outcomes (See Appendix E: PLOW), course sequencing, measurements, and curriculum map. (See Appendix F: Curriculum Map).
Due to this alignment, one of the decisions is to propose the deletion of seven courses in the ECE program. These courses do not meet national accreditation standards and no longer align with program goals. The other academic change includes course revisions for three courses, including eliminating the field placement component and increasing student preparation time for a clinical experience.

**Engineering – Transfer (EGN)**

Several academic decisions were made due to the implementation of this assessment process. First, if courses did not meet program student learning outcomes, the measurement reassessment needed to take place. For example, in EGN 102, since the benchmark criteria were not entirely met, the SLO will be reassessed again in the next cycle. More examples and homework will be assigned and explained to the students. Second, if the benchmark criteria are not met, measurement adjustment and teaching strategies are implemented in the planning courses (for example, EGN 101, 201). Third, LIPs need to be generated to modify the curriculum or adjust the instruction in the following semester or academic year. (See Appendix D: SLOAP).

**Nursing (NUR)**

When program student learning outcomes from program goals are not met, academic decision and changes need to be made to improve course content and student learning. For example, in NUR 120, a series of adjustments were implemented, including shifted lecture time, additional exam review, measurement modifications based on content analysis, and assistance from the College’s retention specialist staff. In NUR 122, the instructor needs to improve the measurement to achieve benchmark criteria. For example, students are divided into two groups with different assessment conditions and measurement tools. These adjustments are listed on the SLOAR and LIP and are a result of the assessment process.

**Physical Therapist Assistant (PTA)**

The PTA program aligns program goals with its national accreditation standards. Academic changes in this program resulted from a review of the withdrawal rate and failing-grade pattern. PTT 112 and 120 are two critical courses relative to retention and program completion (See Appendix C: SLOARs). These courses are now expected to change assessment tools and measurement criteria to meet outcome expectations.

PPT 150’s academic decision was to submit a LIP based on student performance on four exams. However, one exam’s results did not meet the benchmark criteria, so one of the student learning outcomes was not met. In the LIP, students are now required to draft Plan Care notes referencing the Patient Care plan, and the instructor is required to provide sample notes for student reference and application. This approach improves student learning and academic grades to meet the setup criteria and program student learning outcomes.

Besides assessment changes and teaching strategies, other courses also focus on the change of delivery methods. For example, in PTT 210, guest speakers and lab sessions were implemented; for PTT 214, case studies, practice examples, and review sessions before the exams were also added; in PTT 215, course manual, developmental videos,
and pre-course assignments were issued before the course started in spring 2011. These actions increased the course and program completion rate. (See Appendix C: SLOARs).

In conclusion, courses in the PTA program made academic decisions to adjust course content areas, delivery methods, instructional strategies, assessment tools, and learning environments. These changes resulted in higher completion rates, better learning outcomes, and successful experiences in the PTA program. (See Appendix C: SLOARs and Appendix B: P-SLOR).

**Respiratory Care (RC)**

Some course benchmark criteria in student learning outcomes were not met in the RC program; therefore, the LIPs must be submitted and implemented in the next cycle. For example, in RC 111, the instructor holds more office hours for students; in RC 113, the instructor designed an action plan. This plan includes video instruction, group meetings in addition to regular instructor office hours, study groups, test strategies, review sessions, assessment adjustments including more analysis and critical thinking instead of rote memorization, learning strategies, and collaboration with the Program Faculty Advisory Board to improve student learning and grades.

Overall, the courses in the RC program made decisions about the change of instruction and assessment delivery methods. Now, students can put into practice the knowledge and skills they learn in class and will take with them when they graduate.

**Academic Integrity**

When faculty members make academic decisions and changes to a program, such modifications are processed through the Faculty Senate’s Curriculum and Instruction Committee, reviewed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and approved by the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC). This process ensures the academic integrity of BCCC’s courses and programs.

As of fall 2012, all courses are undergoing systematic assessment, and all College programs have been placed at some point in an assessment cycle. The next stage in the institutionalization of the process will come to fruition in spring 2013, when the outcomes assessment process will be used in conjunction with the Faculty Senate for institutional decision making.

The Faculty Senate at BCCC operates three standing committees related to Student Learning Outcomes Assessment. These three committees are the Curriculum and Instruction Committee that reviews and approves the creation, deletion and modification of academic courses and programs; the Program Review and Evaluation Committee that systematically reviews existing academic programs; and the Academic Master
Planning Committee that develops the future direction of the academic offerings and programs. These committees provide the necessary faculty expertise and review that safeguard the academic integrity of the College and its courseware. Now that Student Learning Outcomes Assessment is well underway, the next step is to integrate outcomes assessment with these functions.

The Director of Curriculum and Assessment in conjunction with the Vice President for Academic Affairs determine a cycle for academic program outcomes assessment. Typically, programs will go through the assessment cycle every five years, unless such mitigating circumstances as low enrollment, changes in articulation, and program accreditation cause the Vice President for Academic Affairs to advance a program in the review cycle. This academic outcomes assessment cycle is aligned with the Faculty Senate’s Program Review and Evaluation cycle. In fall 2012, programs with weak enrollments were advanced in the Program Review and Evaluation Committee cycle. The completed Academic Program SLOA reports, along with enrollment data, external scans, changes in employer demand, and so forth, will allow the Program Review and Evaluation Committee to make recommendations on program deletion, suspension, continuance, or enhancement.

Simultaneously, the Academic Master Planning Committee is charged to prepare an annual review of the Academic Master Plan. The committee reviews the institutional outcomes like graduation rates, retention rates, among others, as well as external sources that inform the College on employment trends, transfer opportunities, state and federal mandates, grants, and initiatives. Each year the Academic Master Planning Committee will recommend new program development opportunities.

The Academic Master Planning Committee and the Program Review and Evaluation Committees report annually in March. The Director of Curriculum and Assessment and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Committee Chairs and the President of the Faculty Senate, will develop an academic action plan. The action plan will include the creation of new programs, enhancement of existing programs, revisions of existing programs, and so forth. The action plan will include estimates of the fiscal and human resources necessary to ensure success. The action plan, which shall support the College Strategic Plan, will be reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee and approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will include the necessary resources for academic program development in the January budget development cycle.

We believe that collaboration between the academic administration and the Faculty Senate is an essential ingredient in developing an integrated academic decision-making process. Outcomes assessment is a central feature of our integrated assessment model.
SECTION 3: EVIDENCE OF COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES ALIGNED WITH PROGRAM GOALS

Section 3 addresses the evidence of course learning outcomes aligned with program goals. This section has two parts: academic goals at the program level and measurable student learning outcomes at each individual course level.

Recent Accomplishments

There are three major accomplishments since the last monitoring report was submitted on February 29, 2012:

1. All courses in 41 programs now align the measurable student learning outcomes with the program goals.
2. When scoring benchmarks were not met in spring 2012, a Learning Improvement Plan (LIP, See Appendix C) was submitted by summer 2012, and the plan was implemented in fall 2012 or spring 2013 depending in which semester a class may be taught.
3. Programs were adjusted based on the alignment of program goals. These adjustments included the deletion of courses or the identification of courses as an independent study.

Program Level Outcomes

A process for the development of program outcomes was developed by the faculty-led Student Learning Outcome Curriculum Assessment (SLOCA) Task Force in the summer and fall of 2011. After the SLOCA Task Force completed the creation of the process, the 41 programs began the new program mapping process. Program Coordinators worked to develop program learning outcomes in conjunction with faculty assessment teams and advisory boards. As a result of that work, there are now measurable student learning outcomes for all 41 programs. Since spring 2012, every course aligns the measurable student learning outcomes with the program learning outcomes. This ensures the assessment process integrates course level assessment with program level assessment. In addition, all courses are now in the five-year assessment plan to meet individual program goals (See Appendix F: Curriculum Map).

Four documents: Curriculum Maps (See Appendix F); P-SLOAR (See Appendix B); PLOW (See Appendix E); and the Matrix Five-Year View (See Appendix A) are designed to help faculty align program goals and measurable program learning outcomes when they develop courses. These documents both provide evidence of established measurable learning outcomes at the program level and integrate course learning outcomes with program goals. For example, in the Early Childhood Education (ECE) program, ECE 102 met the Program Goal II-A (See Table 5 and 6); for Program
Goal I, five courses, ECE 100, 101, 109, 200, and 202, have aligned this program goal in their course objectives (See Table 6).

Table 3:  
Matrix - Faculty Five-Year View: Early Childhood Education (Example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SASS - ESBS</th>
<th>Assessment Year 1</th>
<th>Assessment Year 2</th>
<th>Assessment Year 3</th>
<th>Assessment Year 4</th>
<th>Assessment Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Faculty Five-Year View</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 100</td>
<td>III-B</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Imple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 110</td>
<td>Delete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: (Continued)  
Program Learning Outcomes Worksheet (PLOW)

Program Name: Early Childhood Education (MHEC #5550301)
School: Arts &Social Sciences
Department: Education Social Behavioral Sciences
Program Coordinator: Professor Darlene Godwin
Coordinator Extension 410-462-XXXX | Date Submitted: 9/21/2012

I. The early childhood candidate will describe a developmentally appropriate educational program for children from birth to eight years old.

Course Goals:  
A. Articulate the NAEYC standards of developmentally appropriate programs.
B. Create and explain a developmentally appropriate floor plan for children from birth to eight years of age.
C. Observe and analyze the physical environment, teaching practice and how children lean an Observation Change list.

Courses:  
ECE 100, 101, 109, 200, and 202

II. The early childhood candidate will be able to explain the major research

Course Goals:  
A. Identify the purpose, value, and use of formal and informal observation and assessment.
Course Level Outcomes

Measurable outcomes are established for all BCCC’s courses. Some courses are in the process of the deletion or were identified as an independent study for which outcomes are established in accordance with the topic of study. For example, the ECE program made adjustments based on the alignment of measurable outcomes with the program goals. The ECE faculty assessment team recommended that seven courses be deleted from the ECE program; field placement requirements are to be removed from four courses in spring 2013 (See section 1 and Appendix G: Academic Decision Summary).

The College took the following actions to ensure measurable learning goals:

- Since fall 2011, faculty were trained in writing measurable student learning outcomes, developing appropriate assessment tools, and using the results of assessment to improve teaching and learning.
- Discipline Liaisons (DL) positions were created and the nomination of DLs was approved in fall 2011. These individuals are full-time faculty members in various departments who are provided release time to work with their faculty colleagues in writing measurable learning outcomes.
- Since fall 2011, more specifically, DLs work with faculty to review and, if necessary, revise outcomes; determine if measurements of assessment are appropriate for the outcomes; determine criterion levels for satisfactory student performance; develop recommendations for modifying the assessment process when criteria are not met; or develop the next step for assessment if criteria are met.
- Since spring 2012, course syllabi were revised to reflect revised Student Learning Outcomes.
- Since fall 2011, the assessment team reviewed the status of courses based upon submitted documentation and logged the results into the Course Assessment Tracker.
Integrating Course Level Assessment with Program Level Assessment

BCCC recognizes that course level assessment is only one component in using outcomes assessment to improve instruction and student success. Therefore, the College is now emphasizing the integration of course-level assessment with program-level assessment. Program goals and outcomes have been established and course goals and outcomes are derived from the program level. All 27 degree programs and 14 certificate programs are currently in the process of either submitting or completing program outcomes (See Table 7 in the Section 3). Since outcomes assessment is a dynamic, iterative process, it is impossible to specify when each course or program will complete its assessment cycle. In reality, the completion of a cycle simply begins the next. The Office of Assessment and Curriculum tracks the progress of every program to ensure it moves expeditiously through the process of review and revision. (See Appendix A: Matrix Five-Year View).

Program assessment involves not only the participation of the faculty and the academic department but two important standing committees of the Faculty Senate. The Curriculum and Instruction Committee (CIC) reviews and approves both course and program proposals from academic departments. Thus, when the faculty and departments determine the need to add or delete a course as a result of the program assessment process, these changes will be approved by the Curriculum and Instruction Committee and the Faculty SEC. Additionally, the Faculty Program Review and Evaluation Committee (PREC) reviews the status of every program on a five-year rotating basis. This review is broader than the student learning outcomes assessment discussed in this report. In addition to the program assessment reports that are an integral part of the Program Review and Evaluation process, the PREC also considers enrollment trends, graduation rates, employment demands, and employer satisfaction, among other criteria. The SEC has directed the CIC to phase in a reaffirmation policy for courses and programs in which no course or program will be allowed to continue without periodic review.
SECTION 4: DOCUMENTATION OF THE USE OF STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT DATA TO INFORM INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT (STANDARD 14)

The Practical Guide, the assessment handbook, outlines the process for the on-going assessment, monitoring, and use of student learning outcomes at the institutional, program, and course level.

The Practical Guide provides the model for collaboration of faculty, academic departments, Deans, the Director of Curriculum and Assessment, relevant committees of the Faculty Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The College has committed both human and financial resources to ensure the sustainability of the assessment process.

Recent Accomplishments

Two accomplishments stand out since the last monitoring report was submitted in spring 2012:

1. The implementation of the assessment model for general education courses aligned with the eight core institutional competencies. The Information and Computer Literacy core competency was chosen for the first assessment cycle.
2. The Faculty Assessment Team has implemented the use of the new assessment rubric to collect data this fall 2012.

Since the spring 2012 Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) team visit on February 29, 2012, general education courses have been aligned with the eight core institutional competencies. Faculty from general education courses contribute to the general education core competency of Informational and Computer Literacy and completed the outcomes assessment plan forms. This group of faculty formed the Faculty Assessment Team. They have worked to develop, pilot, and evaluate a rubric for the collection of data to assess the achievement of the year 1 competency, Information and Computer Literacy. The team is comprised of faculty members who teach the general education classes being assessed on each of the eight competencies. A new faculty assessment team is formed annually. The scoring rubric for the Information and Computer Literacy competency was piloted in spring 2012. In fall 2012, the Faculty Assessment Team approved the use of the rubric to gather data that assesses student abilities to complete specific tasks and goals related to this competency identified in the general education classes undergoing assessment. The rubric is being used to collect institutional level student assessment data from students taking general education classes where significant information and computer literacy skills are being taught, in keeping with the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Schedule. Current data from the pilot of the rubric is available from Psychology and English. Additional general education courses are being assessed using this rubric in fall 2012. The new Faculty Assessment Team will develop, pilot, and
evaluate a rubric to assess the second year, 2012-2013, on the competency of Personal Development and Social Responsibility. The cycle will continue until all the eight general education competencies have been assessed. The data from the assessment of general education courses are submitted to the Office of Assessment and Curriculum for review and evaluation.

**Sustained Assessment Process at the Institutional Level**

BCCC has adopted the following eight competencies from the general education curriculum. These competencies align with the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) requirements (See Table 1). All BCCC graduates must demonstrate these competencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5:</th>
<th>Institutional General Education Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Timeline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Computer Literacy</td>
<td>Personal Development and Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Aesthetic Awareness</td>
<td>Deductive and Inferential Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the oversight of the College Wide Assessment Council (CWAC), the Institutional Student Learning Outcome (ISLO) committee convened to create an assessment schedule for institutional student learning outcomes. Based on the ISLO core competency assessment schedule, the committee selected the institutional core competency: Information and Computer Technology to assess for fall 2011 planning and as a spring 2012 implementation pilot. Instructors of those identified courses met to commence outcomes assessment planning which included the selection of courses for the pilot, development of a common scoring rubric for the core competency, and completion of the outcomes assessment plan form (See Table 2). The implementation of this institutional assessment began in spring 2012 and continues to follow the established procedural guidelines outlined in the *Practical Guide*. 
Table 6: General Education Learning Outcomes Course and Assessment Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goals (Year 1)</th>
<th>Measurable Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide students with information technology skills for competence in the digital world</td>
<td>1. Demonstrate these computer skills: use basic software programs, search the web, use proper etiquette and security safeguards when communicating through e-mail.</td>
<td>ETS standardized iSkills Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identify, locate, and effectively use information from various print and electronic resources.</td>
<td>Research Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Combine aspects of information literacy and consider the ethical, legal, and economic implications of information use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO)**

Students in general education classes across the College are being assessed for Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO) for the Year 1 core competency: *Information and Computer Literacy*. The data below is from the pilot of the rubric devised to collect data on student achievement of the core competency being assessed fall and spring 2012-2013. The data collection was done to test the validity of the rubric developed for that purpose, and it proves that the rubric is valid for its intended purpose.

Current assessment data from the piloting of the rubric is available from Psychology 120 and English 101 and 102. Students were assessed in Psychology 120: Introduction to Scientific Psychology using the *Information and Computer Literacy* competency rubric to pilot the rubric. The students are identifying appropriate research methods and sources and using the information ethically at this point in their work, which satisfactorily meets the benchmark set out in the general education *Information and Computer Literacy* rubric for the assessment of the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. Students in ENG 101: English Writing were assessed in spring 2012 in the pilot of the *Information and Computer Literacy* competency rubric. The benchmarks set out in the rubric, including accessing relevant information through the use of library resources, electronic resources and / or field resources, were satisfactorily met. Additional documentation from BIO 102 and BIO 103 was collected (See Appendix H). The Faculty Assessment Team evaluated the rubric’s data and determined that the rubric is acceptable for its intended use. Some members on the Faculty Assessment Team determined that there are items in the rubric that are not covered in the initial general education classes being
assessed. Those items will yield responses of “Not Applicable.” Several general education classes in Sociology and Political Science will be assessed in year two on the Personal Development and Social Responsibility competency.

In addition to these general education courses, programs across BCCC are assessing student skills in the Information and Computer Literacy competency, within individual classes, and particularly in the seven programs highlighted in this report. The seven programs are in different phases of the five-year program outcomes assessment cycle and in the student learning assessment process.

Appendix D (SLOAP and Syllabi) and appendix H (General Education Year 1 Summary) capture the evidence of the various ways that students are acquiring these skills. For example, the Information and Computer Literacy competency is integral to the Biotechnology (BTC) program. BUAD 112, as part of its required curriculum, substitutes for the computer literacy course, CLT 100. This competency is evaluated as part of student presentations. Students are required to perform computer searches for scientific journal articles from which they use to develop PowerPoint presentations, thus demonstrating oral communication skills. The presentations must contain graphic representations of the research article data and analysis (i.e., understanding of p values along with mean and standard deviations reflected). Students must also demonstrate oral communication skills by presenting and answering questions throughout their presentations. A standardized rubric is used to assess student performance. The students met the benchmark of the rubric for the assessment of the Institutional Student Learning in spring 2012 (See Appendix D: SLOAP and Syllabus).

**Sustained Assessment Process at the Program Level**

The process for on-going development, monitoring, and use of student learning outcomes at the program level is outlined in the assessment handbook. The program outcomes assessment process takes place over a five-year cycle. The assessment model is a design backward planning process that involves mapping program outcomes to the course level (See Table 3). This new model was developed in the summer and fall of 2011, and all programs are currently participating in the five-year cycle (See Section 1). It is anticipated that the five-year plan and curriculum map will result in some minor adjustment to course level outcomes while programs seeking national accreditation organizations may require more extensive modifications.
### Table 7:
*Five-Year Program Outcomes Assessment Cycle*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>DOCUMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong>&lt;br&gt;Year 1&lt;br&gt;2012-2013</td>
<td>• Development of a program plan with the support of the Director of Curriculum and Assessment that includes the program mission and vision, program goals, program assessment measures and criteria for success, and a curriculum map and program student learning outcome assessment plan.&lt;br&gt;• The plan will include relevant recommendations and revisions from the previous Analysis &amp; Reporting Phase.&lt;br&gt;• Alignment of course syllabi with the Faculty Assessment Team.&lt;br&gt;• Development of a data collection process with the Office of Institutional Research.</td>
<td>Program Curriculum Map and Program Outcome Assessment Plan submitted by the Program Coordinator and Faculty Assessment Team to the Dean/Associate Dean, CWAC, Director of Curriculum and Assessment, and VPAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Year 2-4&lt;br&gt;2012-2016</td>
<td>• Implementation of student learning outcomes assessment across all courses in the program.&lt;br&gt;• Faculty members gather data at the course level.&lt;br&gt;• Results are provided to the Program Coordinator for on-going analysis.</td>
<td>Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Report submitted by the Program Coordinator and the Faculty Assessment Team to the Dean/Associate Dean, Director of Curriculum and Assessment, and VPAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis and Reporting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Year 5&lt;br&gt;2016-2017</td>
<td>• Revisions and modifications to program mission, vision, goals, and outcomes are suggested based upon assessment data. (Revisions are incorporated into the year 1 planning cycle as the cycle repeats.)&lt;br&gt;• Results are presented to the Program Review and Evaluation Committee for evaluation.</td>
<td>Program Review and Evaluation Report submitted by the Program Coordinator and Department Dean/Associate Dean to PRE Committee, Vice President of Academic Affairs, President, Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Matrix Five-Year View in Appendix A provides evidence of the implementation of the sustained assessment process at the Program level. The five-year program learning outcomes assessment cycle aligns with the Program Review and Evaluation Cycle. During the fifth year of the cycle, programs will report student learning outcomes assessment results to the Faculty Senate Program Review and Evaluation Committee (See Table 4). By doing so, greater sustainability and accountability will be ensured.

For those programs participating in the Program Review and Evaluation phase in the next several years, the implementation of the program student learning outcomes assessment plan will be required; however, the process will be adapted for shorter periods of implementation. For example, Allied Human Services, Early Childhood Education, Physical Therapist Assistant, Nursing, and Respiratory Care programs are in the Analysis and Reporting Phase, while other programs are in the Planning or Implementation Phase. (See Section 1).

### Table 8:

**Faculty Senate Program Review and Evaluation Schedule: 2012 - 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 2013</td>
<td>Nursing, Respiratory Care, Physical Therapist Assistant, Health Information Technology, Dental Hygiene, Surgical Technologist, Teacher Education Transfer, and Legal Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - 2014</td>
<td>Engineering Transfer, Arts &amp; Science Transfer (Science and Math Options), Robotics Technology, Biotechnology, and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 - 2015</td>
<td>Accounting, Computer Information Systems, Business Administration Transfer, Computer Aided Drafting and Design, Office Administration, Construction Supervision, and Business (Management and Marketing Options)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 - 2016</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences Transfer (Art, Music, Theatre Transfer, and Psychology), Fashion Design, Law Enforcement and Correctional Administration, Elem Ed / Generic Spec Ed Pre K-12, and General Studies Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 2017</td>
<td>Mental Health Services, Allied Human Services, Allied Human Services (Addiction Counseling), and Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustained Assessment Process at the Course Level

A Practical Guide outlines the process for course-level assessment and mirrors the process for the assessment process of program and institutional student learning outcomes.

The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Template, referred to as the "Old SLOA Template," captured documentation of assessment for many courses between 2008 and spring 2011. This template included all assessment phases in one document. A transition to new outcomes assessment forms occurred in fall 2011. Since fall 2011, each faculty member completing an outcomes assessment must submit SLOAP (See Appendix D: SLOAP) and SLOARs with LIP (See Appendix C).

Currently, all faculty members at BCCC use the new Sustained Assessment Process. It follows four assessment phases for student outcomes assessment: Planning, Pilot, Implementation, and Analysis and Reporting. Each phase includes specific assessment activities and documents to be completed.

In this process, a course may move directly through the assessment cycle, or it may loop back depending on the satisfactory completion of each phase. The course assessment process is documented with the Office of Assessment and Curriculum, but academic decisions reside with the faculty and the respective academic department. The Sustained Course Level Assessment Process illustrates the assessment process. (See Diagram 1).

Diagram 1. Assessment Process Activities

Since spring 2012, faculty members have collected data and assessed it each semester. For benchmarks that were not met in spring 2012, a Learning Improvement Plan (LIP) is developed to address the specific Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) that did not meet the benchmark (See Appendix C: SLOARs and LIP). This effort shifted the
course assessment segment back to the Implementation Phase for fall 2012. For the courses whose benchmarks were met, faculty members continue the assessment plan for the following semesters according to their five-year assessment cycle. Also, the assessment cycle moves into the Analysis and Reporting Phase, and a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports (See Appendix C, SLOARs) is completed and submitted to the Office of Assessment and Curriculum. This means that when benchmarks have been met and the SLOAR is completed and filed with the Assessment Office, the course assessment loop is completed. That course would then go back into the Planning Phase for its next iteration of the SLOA process. For example, Student Learning Objectives (SLO) in EGN 101 were met for spring 2012, so all SLOs were scheduled for reassessment in fall 2012 to see if the successful results are repeated (See Section 2).

**Student Learning Assessment Data and Institutional Assessment**

**Improving Teaching and Learning**

BCCC's ongoing student learning outcomes assessment process will continue to improve teaching and learning. While the improvements begin at the individual course level, academic programs have been integrated into the process. As faculty determine what actions to take at the course and program levels, these actions will be documented through the Analysis and Reporting Phases to both the academic department and the Office of Assessment and Curriculum. Additionally, course and programmatic changes continue to be reviewed by the Faculty Senate committee on Curriculum and Instruction. The broader review of academic programs is conducted by the Senate’s Program Review and Evaluation Committee. Presently there are 41 programs in some phase of student learning outcomes assessment review. Moreover, the entire Academic Affairs assessment process is reviewed at the College Wide Assessment Council (CWAC).

Assessment is an on-going process to evaluate student learning outcomes and to monitor student progress in a timely manner. Course, program, and institutional goals will be aligned to ensure students have acquired the necessary competencies upon graduation. Ongoing assessment will result in the timely revisions of courses and programs to improve student learning and success and to ensure academic integrity at the course, program and institutional levels.
CONCLUSION

The BCCC Board of Trustees, faculty, administration, and staff of BCCC are intensely committed to the improvement of student learning through outcomes assessment. And, although the College has persisted through challenges in order to fully implement an outcomes assessment process, it continues to make strides forward. The “tough love” issued by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education has been an essential ingredient in the substantial progress we have made since our first report on Standard 14 in 2009. Palomba and Banta (1999) describe assessment as a dynamic process with systematic collection, review, and implementation in order to improve student learning and academic development. Since student learning outcomes assessment is an important factor in higher education (Duque & Weeks, 2010; Peterson and Einarson, 2001; Terenzini, 1989), BCCC has established such a process. We have come to understand the dynamic nature of outcomes assessment, not only for academic courses and programs, but in assessing our assessment processes. Fortunately the College is preparing to embark on our comprehensive self-study next year. One major area of inquiry will be an assessment of the Practical Guide and its ancillary processes.

Next Steps

Clearly outcomes assessment is a continuing process, and BCCC’s full implementation of the process is ongoing even as different elements necessarily proceed at different rates, cycle back for adjustments, and arrive at a summative assessment. There are several steps BCCC will continue to take action on and to implement. First, the assessment model for general education courses continues to be implemented. Additional general education courses are scheduled for assessment in the year 2 on the competency of Personal Development and Social Responsibility, and the cycle will continue until all eight general education competencies have been assessed. Second, the five-year program learning outcomes assessment cycle continues to align with the Program Review and Evaluation Cycle. Every year, selected programs will report student learning outcomes assessment results to the Faculty Senate Program Review and Evaluation Committee. The academic semester of spring 2013 includes Program Coordinators and faculty scheduled for the Senate Executive Committee’s Program Review and Evaluation. By doing so, greater sustainability and accountability will be assured.

BCCC has established measurable learning outcomes for programs and courses. We have worked together to develop an assessment process to monitor student learning outcomes at the institutional, program, and course level. We have created sustainable infrastructures that support training, faculty, and staff as well as a constant review of our processes. We have established a College Wide Assessment Council to oversee outcomes assessment across all divisions of the College. BCCC looks forward to a future built on the intersection of the Middle States foundational Characteristics of Excellence and our core values of Integrity, Honesty, Respect, Quality, Diversity, Learning and Leadership. As we refine our assessment practices and focus on
continuous improvement, BCCC aspires to become a leader in providing students with quality learning experiences that change lives and build communities.
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