

## Northland Pioneer College

## Instructional Council (IC)

09-25-09

Voting Members: Mark Vest (Chair), Bill Bohn, Eric Henderson, Lynn Browne-Wagner, Ruth Zimmerman,  
Debra McGinty, Doug Seely, Kenny Keith, Shannon Newman, Cynthia Hutton, Sandy Johnson

Non-Voting Members: Cindy Hildebrand, Jake Hinton, Russell Dickerson (recorder)

I. Approval of 05-08-09 Instructional Council minutes

- a. Ruth noted that under the Professional Development report heading that *Professional Developmental* be changed to read *Professional Development*.
- b. Lynn moved to approve the 05-08-09 Instructional Council minutes as amended; second by Eric.
  - i. The 05-08-09 minutes were approved unanimously, as amended.

II. Subcommittee Reports

a. Assessment of Student Knowledge (ASK)

- i. Eric presented the ASK subcommittee report of yearly activity and asked IC to take action on the materials presented so that they could be sent to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Resource Room to show that another yearly cycle of assessment has been completed.
- ii. Eric explained that ASK will continue to publish yearly reports, which are a compilation of notes that describe ASK activities. These reports are being handled separately from Assessment Academy materials but at some point in the future, may be more closely tied together.
- iii. Bill moved to accept the ASK subcommittee report and appendices as presented; second by Shannon.
  1. The motion to accept the report was approved unanimously.

b. Faculty Association appointments to IC subcommittees

- i. Sandy distributed the *Faculty Association Committee Members List for 2009-2010* to IC members. Sandy noted that there are a couple of positions yet to be filled and that calls have been made to the potentials.
- ii. Mark asked if there were any IC questions or concerns about the 2009-2010 committee appointments.
  1. Eric asked if the Faculty Association has decided that it is no longer important that faculty members serve on only one committee. Ryan Jones and Gary Mack serve on multiple committees. Mark suggested that Ryan Jones, who is based out of Springerville/Eagar, should be scheduled to report on the second Friday IC meeting.
  2. Shannon noticed that the Assessment of Student Knowledge was not listed on the committee member list. Sandy will add the ASK subcommittee to the list and include all members from last year.
  3. Eric wanted IC members to think about the fact that the Procedure 2125 is no longer accurate as the college division structure has changed.
  4. Eric suggested that for the future, IC subcommittees should have one voting member of IC as a member to improve continuity and responsiveness to IC. Sandy agreed that Eric's suggestion is a good idea but is subject to faculty member willingness to serve on multiple committee groups. Mark suggested that a future shared governance structure

could include language so that the possibility of multiple committee service is known to faculty members. Mark added that College Council currently has a member on its subcommittees and that it seems to work.

c. Subcommittee Reporting Schedule

- i. Mark suggested that all of the subcommittee chairs attend the next IC meeting and receive a charge, from IC, to the subcommittees. A rotating, staggered subcommittee schedule will be discussed with chairs and set for the year.
- ii. Russell to contact subcommittee chairs and invite to next meeting.
- iii. Bill thought, and other IC members agreed, that the subcommittee reporting schedule to be determined is not set in stone and that important reports or items from subcommittees can be placed on the agenda as required by IC.
- iv. IC members agreed that subcommittee reports submitted after the Wednesday 8:00 a.m. deadline would be bypassed for the meeting and placed on the agenda for the following meeting. IC members did reserve the right to have a late subcommittee report placed on the agenda should timely IC action be required.
- v. Mark informed IC members that the two standing subcommittees, Career and Technical Education and Dual Enrollment, have met and decided to merge into a single Dual Enrollment standing committee. The Dual Enrollment standing committee is required by statute to report to the President, through IC, at least two times per year.
  1. Proposed meeting schedule for the Dual Enrollment group includes an organizational meeting at the beginning of the fall semester, a mid-year meeting and report on accomplishments to date, and an end of the spring semester meeting and report on accomplishments.
  2. The proposed meeting schedule would meet the terms of state statute. If the proposed schedule is implemented, it would have to be incorporated into the IC subcommittee reporting schedule so that the Dual Enrollment group reports to IC following their meetings.

III. Curriculum

a. ACRES

- i. Discussion of ACRES in general
  1. Last year, Eric Henderson served as the ACRES System Administrator during his tenure as Dean of Academic Development. Eric, as Dean of Arts and Sciences will not continue to be the ACRES System Administrator.
  2. IC members agreed that the college should utilize ACRES to process curriculum.
  3. Two questions: who will be the system administrator and when will the ACRES “training wheels be taken off?”
    - a. Ideally, ACRES would not be addressed at IC meetings unless there are curricular issues that need to be resolved.
    - b. Mark is reluctant to accept a volunteer to become the ACRES system administrator because it will become part of a person’s job responsibilities.
    - c. Eric reported that ACRES administration is not normally very time-consuming requiring about 3 hours per week. An increase in the volume of courses and the resultant increase in reporting done through the ASSETS system can add approximately another hour per week.

- d. Three people share responsibilities that would normally fall under the purview of a Curriculum Coordinator: Cindy, Jake, and yet to be filled Faculty in Education Technology.
    - e. Mark will decide who is to be the ACRES Systems Administrator by the next IC meeting on October 9, 2009.
  - ii. SPT 250, new course
    - 1. Course was offered last summer as SPT 199 and works in conjunction with the annual Children's Theatre Project. Requesting course be given a permanent course number.
    - 2. IC members recommended that the course number be changed to SPT 251 to avoid a previously used course number.
    - 3. Ruth moved to approve SPT 251 as amended; second by Doug.
    - 4. Motion to approve SPT 251, as amended, approved unanimously.
  - iii. WLD 130, new course
    - 1. Mark noted that the recommendations made by IC in the spring semester, when this course was first brought to IC, have been followed with regard to load.
    - 2. IC members noticed a discrepancy between the ACRES form which calls for a maximum enrollment of 15 and the attached 3035 form which says 12. As 15 is the new minimum number of students for a full teaching load, IC members recommended amending the course maximum to 15.
    - 3. Eric moved to approve WLD 130 as amended; second by Ruth.
    - 4. The motion to approve WLD 130, as amended, passed unanimously.
  - iv. WLD 131, new course
    - 1. IC members reviewed the course and recommended the following:
      - a. Implementation date must be, at a minimum, spring 2010.
      - b. Prerequisite must be changed to WLD 130 or Instructor Permission.
      - c. The proposer indicate which course description to use as there was a discrepancy between the ACRES new course form and the 3035 form.
    - 2. After discussion, IC members recommended that WLD 131 be sent back for revision.
    - 3. Eric asked IC members if they thought that the course titles for WLD 130 and WLD 131 accurately reflect course content. Question to be conveyed to proposer as part of revision items to address.
    - 4. Bill moved to send WLD 131 back to the proposer for revision; second by Lynn.
    - 5. The motion to return WLD 131 for revision passed unanimously.
  - v. Review of curriculum submission deadlines for 09-10
    - 1. IC members agreed to keep the curriculum submission of 10 days prior to an IC meeting.
    - 2. IC members will only discuss controversial ACRES curriculum and ACRES program changes at a meeting if it was submitted by the 10 working day submission deadline.

#### IV. Old business not related to curriculum

- a. Discussion and approval of Midterm Status Report Letter
  - i. Jake reported that over the summer, Sandy and other faculty members worked on the student notification letter. Jake also met with the faculty association. Jake review faculty comments and faculty concerns were centered on improving student services provided (tutoring, Writing Center, etc) or getting faculty input on retention. Jake noted that more faculty input can occur through the Enrollment Management Committee of College Council as new initiatives as they go forward.

- ii. Jake reported that there is now faculty tutoring. Mark reported that there is currently Math, Biology and Chemistry tutoring on the video system at all locations and the response has been very good.
  - 1. Jake will follow up with department chairs to make sure faculty members are aware of tutoring services available to students.
- iii. Jake requested approval of sections F and G of the Midterm Status Proposal. Jake reported that testing has been completed and that faculty can report on student midterm status in the Jenzabar system. An email regarding the new reporting process was sent to faculty and a list of training dates will be sent out today, 09-25-09, so that faculty can go through the process with Records and Registration staff. Multiple training dates will be available and Jake will send out the instructions this week.
- iv. IC members reviewed items F and G of the Student Midterm Reporting Proposal.
- v. Jake added that Mira White reported to him that there are still a number of adjunct faculty members without NPC email addresses.
  - 1. Debra suggested that Jake could send the information to the Deans and that they would distribute it to their respective adjunct faculty members since they have good email contacts for adjuncts.
- vi. Kenny moved to approve Midterm Status Proposal items F and G as presented; Ruth seconded.
  - 1. The motion to approve items F and G of the Proposal for Reporting of Midterm Status, as presented, was approved unanimously.
- b. Request to approve sustainability marker inclusion on the 3035 form
  - i. Trudy submitted her request but was not present at the meeting. Kenny indicated that he would like her to be present for an explanation of the request.
  - ii. What does it mean for a course to be sustainable? Does that mean equipment, paperless course, e-books or an assignment within a class that deals with sustainability?
  - iii. Lynn moved to table the request for approval of a sustainability marker on the 3035 form; second by Doug.
    - 1. The motion to table passed unanimously.
  - iv. What does IC want Trudy to provide for future consideration?
  - v. What is the intended point of putting a sustainability marker on the 3035 form? Is the marker saying that the course physically helps the college meet the President's Climate Commitment? Is it a matter of addressing sustainability within coursework?
  - vi. Eric's scenario: a course brought before IC will not use a textbook, thereby meeting a sustainability requirement. Then, at some point in the future, a great textbook becomes available. Does a faculty member have to bring the course back to IC for a change to the 3035 sustainability marker?
  - vii. How much detail do we want in the course outlines within an academic institution?
  - viii. Sustainability marker language: these are all the items that fit within the Climate Commitment. You (faculty member) are agreeing, by checking the sustainability marker that, to the best of your ability, you (and everyone who will teach the course in the future) will take these into account.
  - ix. Is sustainability to be embedded into the curriculum like the general education curriculum that embeds critical thinking, diversity, etc? Question: what does the college want to infuse into the curriculum with regard to sustainability? Eric suggested that if sustainability is to be infused into curriculum that faculty need to decide how that will be done.

- x. Is IC being asked to change how courses are taught or is IC being asked to change the course content?
- xi. Bill moved that a specific recommendation from the Sustainability Committee be forwarded to the President for approval. Once approved, the recommendation will be forwarded to IC to then be forwarded to the Faculty Association for review and comment. A recommendation from the Faculty Association will be returned to IC for further discussion and action; second by Lynn.
  - 1. Motion to implement the above process approved unanimously.

V. New business not related to curriculum

- a. Establish 09-10 IC meeting schedule (time/location)
  - i. The second Friday monthly will take place in the Audio classroom. The fourth Friday monthly meeting will take place at SCC.
- b. Discuss IC goals for 09-10
  - i. Jake would like IC to address streamlining prerequisites (Math for example) to decrease number of Petitions. Eric explained that this is primarily an AAS issue that stems from the historical approach of requiring a student to take a math course appropriate for a certain degree. Eric would also like to see prerequisite streamlining. A review of Math classes must happen by February 2010 so changes could go to the Board in March and then be included in the fall 2010 catalog.
  - ii. Sandy reminded IC members that last year, the Placement Subcommittee called for departments to review, and if necessary, adjust their cut scores. Does IC want to keep a one size fits all approach for Gen Ed courses or is IC comfortable with departments adjusting cut scores to meet their departmental needs? Information will need to come out of Institutional Research but there may be some difficulty in getting large enough sample sizes for some departments.
  - iii. Look at General Education co-enrollment in TLC depending on placement scores. Eric sees this as a Placement Subcommittee issue as co-enrollment is based upon placement scores. Mark suggested that the Placement Subcommittee look at this issue and perhaps develop new recommendations.
  - iv. Eric suggested taking a look at General Education throughout the curriculum and see how various disciplines are doing with Gen Ed and what is the overall view of Gen Ed by IC and how should it be delivered to the college. How broadly do we want to diffuse out, to the other courses, these Gen Ed principles? The ASK to lead this discussion.
  - v. Full implementation of ACRES this year.
  - vi. Reconstitute Business Plan Task Force to better assess cost effectiveness of programs. At the 10-09-09 meeting, IC will ask for a volunteer to chair the reconstituted group and create marching orders and timeline for work.
  - vii. Eric suggested that IC consider whether NPC should be a comprehensive college. Identify areas of curriculum/programs that should be expanded? What will happen to weak programs (no recent enrollment, no full-time faculty member)? Does the bottom line drive the budget or does instruction drive the budget—which approach will NPC take given the current budget climate?
  - viii. Placement: should NPC follow the Maricopa/Pima model and allow high schools install COMPASS testing at their locations without direct supervision by college employees? Placement Subcommittee to review the issue, especially academic integrity aspects and submit a clear

recommendation to IC for action. The Dual Enrollment Committee also needs to look at this issue.

- ix. Professional Development: very little money, about \$18,000, compared to previous years. Currently, a Presidential mandate barring out of state travel is in place. Mark would like to see the Professional Development Subcommittee make a recommendation to IC for a Professional Development procedure/policy to be adopted. Perhaps the recommendation would use a mileage radius, level of involvement, or total cost as means of determining professional development funding.
  - x. Learning Technologies: Dr. Swarthout accepted the Internet Course Guidelines that came out of the LT Subcommittee last year and at the same time, indicated that subcommittee use the approve guidelines as the basis for producing much broader guidelines that include programs and distance education in general. Russell to post the Presidential acceptance letter on MyNPC for IC member review.
  - xi. Mark wants to talk to the Faculty Association about a review of all aspects of being a department chair. Mark wanted to know if IC members feel like this is within the purview of IC. If not, Mark will work with the deans and faculty. Can we come up with an agreed up set of chair responsibilities, compensation, process for chair selection, and how a chair can be removed? IC members acknowledged that IC is involved with department chairs, as far as the curriculum approval process is concerned, but that all other questions raised should be dealt with as an administrative issue.
  - xii. Current model of faculty compensation: initial salary placement and all the add-ons: overload, online courses, teaching on A/V with high enrollments. As enrollment has spiked, some faculty have seen changes in compensation, while others have not seen increased compensation despite higher student enrollment. Debra told members that this had been addressed in the Employee Relation Subcommittee of College Council. The issue became incredibly complex and the subcommittee ended up recommending that a consultant be hired to tackle the issue. Some IC members were of the opinion that compensation models are outside the scope of IC. Eric offered that the various types of compensation, particularly for Internet and A/V courses implicitly incentivizes certain methods of teaching and that the college should have a clear direction for instruction and compensate accordingly. Mark added that compensation should reflect the institutional priorities of the college. Do we like the current compensation model and does it fit the mission and direction of the college? If not, how can instructional funds be distributed differently? Bill and Debra suggested that compensation models should be simplified. A simplified compensation scheme must meet the instructional needs of the college as well as budget requirements.
- c. Other?
- i. Lynn reported that work has continued on the Plagiarism issue and that she will present information and a recommendation to IC at the October 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.
  - ii. Next meeting: 10-09-09, Audio classroom, 9:00 to 11:30 a.m.
  - iii. Bill moved to adjourn; second by Doug.
    1. Motion to adjourn approved unanimously.