

Northland Pioneer College
Instructional Council (IC)
10-23-09

Voting members present: Mark Vest (Chair), Carol Stewart (proxy for Lynn Browne-Wagner), Orina Hodgson (proxy for Debra McGinty), Marianne Richardson, Kenny Keith, Eric Henderson, Doug Seely, Cynthia Hutton, Shannon Newman, Sandra Johnson, Ruth Zimmerman

Non-voting members present: Cindy Hildebrand, Trudy Bender, Russell Dickerson (recorder)

Guest: Don Richie

- I. Approval of 10/09/09 IC minutes
 - a. Doug moved to approve the 10/09/09 minutes as presented; second by Kenny.
 - b. The 10/09/09 IC minutes were approved unanimously.
- II. Subcommittee reports
 - a. Placement
 - i. No report. The subcommittee has not yet met.
 - ii. IC members reviewed messages from the subcommittee chair and agreed to keep the established 2009-2010 subcommittee reporting schedule with the Placement subcommittee to report at the live monthly meeting at SCC.
 - iii. Russell is to notify Placement subcommittee chair Brenda Manthei of the group's decision.
 - b. Assessment of Student Knowledge
 - i. Sandy moved to accept the 10/23/09 assessment planning day report as presented; second by Doug.
 - ii. IC members voted unanimously to accept the planning day report as presented.
 - c. Business Plan Task Force Update
 - i. IC members reviewed materials submitted by Debra. Orina was present to receive IC member input and report back to Debra.
 - ii. IC members directed the task force chair to recruit appropriate, knowledgeable faculty and staff at large for the task force and to begin work. IC members, as well as the CTE Dean agreed that materials submitted by Debra indicate an appropriate approach for development of program business plans.
 - d. Dual Enrollment Standing Subcommittee
 - i. Mark reported that the Deans met last week and discussed issues that clearly fall under the purview of the Dual Enrollment Standing Subcommittee. The subcommittee is made up of 5 CTE and 3 general education faculty members appointed by the President.
 - ii. IC members reviewed a draft charge to the Dual Enrollment Standing Committee that was prepared by Eric.
 - iii. Sandra commented that the evaluation of dual enrollment faculty members has been difficult to accomplish. Mark agreed and suggested that the group work to form a recommendation on how to effectively accomplish evaluations as there is an associated cost, either in dollars or staff time.
 - iv. Mark informed IC members that there is a standing offer by NAVIT to contribute money to help cover the cost of performing evaluations of CTE dual enrollment faculty.

- v. Questions: should the college adopt a more narrow approach to dual enrollment offerings knowing full well that some enrollment will be lost? Should dual enrollment more closely mirror what is being done at campuses and centers, or should it be different? Should a class be available for dual enrollment delivery just because the college offers it?
- vi. Mark estimated that the college will lose approximately \$168,000 when the 50% reduction of State funding for dual enrollment goes into effect.
- vii. More questions: what can the college do ensure that what happens at the high schools is up to college standards? Are dual enrollment faculty members considered adjunct faculty?
- viii. Goal: establish an effective dual enrollment process and introduce similar concepts, standards and requirements to college adjunct faculty.
- ix. Even more questions: how can the college hold high schools responsible, in the current economic environment, for providing computer software and textbooks that are in use by the college? Don commented that NAVIT has given money to the high schools for current textbooks but the funds are not being spent on books.
- x. Background: in the mid to late 1990's, the college had declining enrollment and dual enrollment was seen as a way to increase enrollment and to recruit students. Students benefitted by not having to pay tuition and the college received more State funding when aid was determined using a FTSE based model.
- xi. Currently, the college receives increased recruitment yield. Students who participated in the dual enrollment program are more likely to be degree seeking and will finish faster due to credits accumulated while in high school.
- xii. IC members agreed to charge the dual enrollment subcommittee with the draft charge and Mark will contact the subcommittee to inform members of the charge.

III. Curriculum

- a. Deletion of the Construction Technology program from the college catalog, effective at the end of the spring 2010 semester. The program will remain in the course bank so that BOC curriculum can be evaluated by the advisory committee and at some point in the future be revised and reintroduced. Don cited low enrollment and economic issues and low completion rates (nearly zero) as justification for program deletion.
- b. ACRES not being effectively utilized by IC members
 - i. Mark reminded IC members that they agreed, as a committee, to use ACRES to process routine curriculum changes. IC meeting time is being devoted to ACRES curriculum because IC members are not reviewing and submitting their votes (comments) in ACRES in numbers that constitute a voting majority.
 - ii. For the benefit of new IC members, Mark reviewed the ACRES process.
 - 1. New courses, existing course modifications and deletions, without problems or IC member concerns, are to be handled in ACRES. IC members are to submit their votes (comments) so that the curricular process can be done outside of the meeting. IC members should submit their comments at least two days prior to meetings.
 - 2. Problematic ACRES submissions will be identified and addressed during IC meetings.
 - iii. Cindy asked if mass deletions can be performed as a block. Eric noted that as a committee, IC can choose to deal with courses in blocks. However, submission of courses individually serves to create a lasting paper trail.
- c. ACRES curriculum
 - i. Problems:
 - 1. BOC 160: course deletion was listed twice. Eric will remove one instance of BOC 160.

2. BOC 123: The reference to BOC 126 in BOC 123 was never updated when BOC 126 became BOC 156. BOC 123 is not to be deleted from the course bank.
- ii. Having resolved problems with BOC 160 and BOC 123, IC members chose to address all BOC deletions as a block.
 1. Doug moved to delete BOC 160, 123, 260, 201, 200, 180, 173, 172, 171, 170, 230, 201, 205, 202, 240, 261, 159, 158, 157, 156, 153, 152, 149, 147, 146, 148, 140, 139, 138, 137, 136, 130, 120, 117, 115, 108, 107, 106 and 102 from the college catalog with an effective date of fall 2010; second by Ruth.
 2. The motion to approve deletion of all BOC courses, as listed, was approved unanimously.
 3. Related concern: Cindy noted that there are four BOC classes in the catalog that were not slated for deletion. Cindy will work with Don to identify the four classes to be deleted and Don will submit the deletions through ACRES.
- iii. DRF 120
 1. Questions: is the course title Technical Drafting I or Technical Drafting? What about DRF 220, Technical Drafting II (remains unchanged in the catalog)? Is there a plan to change or delete DRF 220?
 2. Correction: revise 3035 course title to read Technical Drafting I.
 3. Question: What does individualized instruction mean? Don explained that it indicates that the division/department is willing to offer the course using a learning contract.
 - a. Eric asked: are there are courses that the college is not willing to offer using a learning contract? Is it really necessary to have this information on the 3035 form?
 - b. Homework assignment for next meeting: talk to deans and department chairs to figure out exactly what individualized instruction is.
 4. Eric moved to approve DRF 120 with a revision to the 3035 form to reflect Technical Drafting I as the course title; second by Ruth.
 5. The motion to approve DRF 120, as amended, was approved unanimously.
- iv. WLD 131
 1. Mark reported that he had a conversation with Curtis Casey to explain IC member concern over the very specific course description and title, as well as a course title discrepancy.
 2. Issues: the 3035 form has a course title of Intermediate Metal Art; the ACRES form lists a prerequisite of WLD 130 or Instructor permission; specific catalog course description—too specific?
 3. Corrections: course title is Metal Armour Fabrication; the prerequisite is WLD 130 or Instructor permission; course description listed is correct; demonstration of skill should be listed as a method of assessment of learning.
 4. Shannon moved to approve WLD 131 as amended; second by Kenny.
 5. WLD 131, as amended, was approved unanimously.
- v. DRF 140
 1. Issues: implementation date; prerequisite. Don informed IC members that lecture/lab figures have been revised.
 2. Corrections: 2 lecture/2 lab; prerequisite to read DRF 120 or Instructor permission.
 3. Ruth moved to approve DRF 140 as amended; second by Shannon.
 4. DRF 140, as amended, was approved unanimously.

- vi. DRF 251
 1. Issues: the 3035 course title and implementation date do not match the ACRES form.
 2. Corrections: implementation date is fall 2010; correct course title is AutoCAD 3D; correct prerequisite is DRF 130 or Instructor permission.
 3. Shannon moved to approve DRF 251 as amended; second by Ruth.
 4. DRF 251, as amended, was approved unanimously.
 5. Warning: Law Enforcement Academy curriculum will show up at the next meeting.
- vii. Should ACRES be used for 199 forms?
 1. Use of ACRES would create a database of 199 courses.
 2. Eric suggested creation of a 199 course form in ACRES with approval routing that stops at the Dean level, skips IC, and then goes to VPL for final approval. IC members liked the idea of a separate 199 form—Eric to set up the ACRES 199 form.

IV. Old business not related to curriculum

a. Update on ACRES Administration

1. Eric will continue to serve as ACRES Administrator until the Faculty in Educational Technology position is filled. The new faculty member will be able to look at curriculum to check for technology issues and ACRES will provide a quick introduction to the IC process.

V. New business not related to curriculum

a. Discuss possible revision of 3035 form

- i. Discussion tabled until next meeting pending a definition of individualized instruction.
- ii. Things to consider: ACRES forms can be made to mirror the paper 3035 form; 3035 forms must be attached to ACRES curriculum for inclusion in the course binders; would it be possible to use an addendum for lengthy course outcomes? What would such an addendum focus on and what would it look like? Trudy suggested that an addendum must accompany the associated course in the course binders—would cut down on duplication of information. Move away from creating paper 3035s? What about the sustainability marker? Do we need to review textbook information listed on the 3035?

VI. Back to BOC program deletion

- a. The BOC program has been suspended for a period of 18 months. The program is to be removed from the catalog, effective the end of spring 2010 semester. Course will remain in the course bank so students can complete the program. The program will be reviewed, revamped and brought back after the suspension period. The program suspension is supported by the advisory committee and CTE Dean. The program suspension will not affect BOC programs offered to Department of Corrections or the White Mountain Apache Tribe.
- b. The initial plan is to remove DRF certificates and the Drafting Technician AAS degree from the BOC program. Where does that leave a current student working on a Drafting Technician AAS degree? The student will be able to continue work on the degree as the BOC program is only deleted from the catalog and will remain in the course bank. There will be no new students because it will not be in the catalog beginning fall 2010.
- c. Kenny moved to approve deletion of the BOC program from the catalog; second by Ruth.
- d. The motion to delete passed unanimously.

Ruth moved to adjourn; second by Doug. Motion to adjourn approved unanimously.

Next meeting: November 13th, 9:00-11:30 a.m., Audio classroom.