

Northland Pioneer College

Instructional Council (IC)

03-25-16

Voting Members Present: John Chapin, Ruth Creek-Rhoades (proxy for Rickey Jackson), Amber Gentry, Amy Grey (proxy for Janice Cortina), Eric Henderson, Ryan Jones, Pat Lopez, Ryan Rademacher, Carol Stewart and Ken Wilk

Non-Voting Members Present: Karen Hall, Cindy Hildebrand, Wei Ma, Jeremy Raisor, Josh Rogers, Mark Vest and Hallie Lucas (recorder)

Guests: Peggy Belknap and Everett Robinson

(NOTE: Some items were taken out of order from original agenda.)

I. Roll Call

II. Approval of 03-11-16 IC Minutes

a. Ken **MOVED** to approve the IC Minutes of 03-11-16; **SECOND** by Ryan J.

i. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.

III. IC Subcommittees/Task Forces

a. Academic Standards - will report at the next IC Meeting

b. Dual Enrollment – no report

c. PASS Demo to IC – Josh Rogers

i. Josh gave a Starfish demonstration of the capabilities, from a Faculty point of view, including: 1) set office hours; 2) see concerns up front (such as low GPA); 3) see raised (or closed) flags and the reason and course involved with each flag; 4) success plans; 5) displays all courses student is taking; 6) can raise concerns or give kudos; 7) classified, general or private notes; 8) network includes everyone connected with student (instructors, advisers, etc.); 9) referrals – tutoring or Writing Center; 10) messages; 11) appointments, which connect directly with Outlook.

ii. Discussion followed and Josh answered questions. He also indicated that we hope to go live (for the pilot) in a couple of weeks, after IS works out all security concerns.

d. Professional Development – no report

e. Subcommittee Charges for 2016-2017 – Ryan Rademacher – see below for suggested changes:

i. Academic Standards

1. a. - Work with PASS and Department Heads in ~~evaluating~~ **reviewing and re-evaluating the new placement mechanism** and making a **recommendations as needed** for long-term. ~~deadline of December 2015 for this charge~~

2. b. keep as is

ii. Assessment of Student Knowledge

1. a., b., and c. – keep as is, but somehow c. needs to be emphasized

- iii. Catalog Review
  - 1. There was discussion regarding whether or not to continue with the Catalog Review Subcommittee. For the most part, their charges have already been met. In the future, if sweeping catalog changes are needed, an ad hoc task force could be formed.
  - 2. Pat **MOVED** to eliminate Catalog Review Subcommittee; **SECOND** by Ken.
    - a. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
      - i. As a result of this decision, Procedure 2125 (Shared Governance) will likely need to be slightly revised.
- iv. Dual Enrollment
  - 1. Add a charge - Assist Title III Project Director and Deans in coordination.
  - 2. Add a charge – Determine if continued membership in National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) is needed.
  - 3. Charges a., b., c., d. and e. are ongoing.
- v. Learning Technology (LT)
  - 1. Depending on LT's upcoming recommendation regarding hybrid course evaluation, some type of language may need to be included in their charge.
  - 2. Charges a., b., c., d., e. and f. are ongoing.
- vi. Professional Development
  - 1. Mark brought up a potential issue. He sees a differential between how Faculty members are placed on the pay scale initially, as opposed to Professional Development that they do during their time at NPC. Discussion followed.
  - 2. **Task:** Ryan R. will speak with Mark Vest and Bill Fee regarding the faculty step/grade issue.

#### IV. Curriculum

- a. ACRES - none
- b. New Programs - none
- c. Program Modifications - none
- d. Program Deletions - none
- e. Program Suspensions – none
- f. Misc. Curriculum
  - i. Credit Hour Calculations When it Doesn't Equate to a Whole Number – Ryan Rademacher
    - 1. Pat gave a little background regarding this topic and gave a recent example of a course that came forward that had 1 lecture, 1 lab and 1 credit hour. When the lecture/lab hours do not equate to a whole number for credit hours, should we have some type of directions or best practices for our Guidelines (Instructions) for Course Forms in ACRES? Is there ever a situation where you would want to have only 1 lab hour?
    - 2. Discussion followed, and the main outcomes of the conversation included: 1) credit hours, in general, should equate to a whole number; 2) bottom line – the course needs enough time to meet objectives; 3) course should never go below minimum standards of 2-1, 3-1 or 4-1 (lab to credit hour ratio) (standards vary - depending upon the discipline); 4) the example given was probably more the exception than the rule –

therefore, it probably does not need to be included in the Guidelines (Instructions) for Course Forms in ACRES.

V. Old Business Not Related to Curriculum

a. Placement Testing – Mark Vest

- i. After a recent meeting with College Success (the company identified for our NPC commercial placement test), several potential issues were identified: 1) for students who would need diagnostic testing, the cost would increase from approximately \$5.10 to \$13.50 (would likely need an raise testing fees from \$10.00 to \$30.00-\$35.00 to absorb cost); 2) several years ago, IC made the decision not to allow computer-based testing at the high schools – in the past, personnel from some high schools were very positive about being allowed to administer computer-based tests and some were very negative about the potential; 3) College Success is developing a pencil/paper test – they want to score them, which would cause a delay in results of approximately 1½ weeks (currently, we can (at times) give immediate results); 4) because of State testing, it is difficult to have access to the students to conduct testing.
- ii. Potential solutions include: 1) change acceptable high school GPA to 2 years (as opposed to the final GPA); 2) give College Success commercial test and refer students to CCP for a “home-grown” test, if diagnostic testing is needed; 3) take into consideration the grade a student receives in an Algebra class.
- iii. Ken **MOVED** that we give Mark the directive to purchase the needed ASSET tests (so that we can give this pencil/paper test to students after the COMPASS test expires 12-01-16) and ask the Academic Standards (AS) Subcommittee to re-evaluate their placement recommendation for NPC; **SECOND** by Ryan J.
  1. **DISCUSSION** – what considerations would IC like AS to consider?
  2. Eric suggested that the **MOTION BE DIVIDED** into the ASSET portion and the AS portion – Ken and Ryan J. were fine with this suggestion.
    - a. The **FIRST PART** of the Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
    - b. **DISCUSSION** – questions for AS to consider include: 1) what do we do about students who do not place into college level math and English? – do we spend the additional money needed to use the College Success platform? – do we refer students to CCP? – is there another option that AS identifies? 2) as Vice President for Learning and Student Services, Mark recommends that we do not use the pencil/paper testing system, as described to us by College Success – give a different recommendation regarding the placement of high school students; 3) look at global GPA issue – in addition, how should college-bound courses fit into the equation? 4) some high schools offer Algebra I in 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> grade; 5) should the math department be involved in decision-making? 6) would AZ Merit measure what we are looking for?
    - c. The **SECOND PART** of the Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.

VI. New Business Not Related to Curriculum

a. IC Membership – Ryan Rademacher

- i. Amber agreed to a second term of IC membership. Janice sent word that she will finish out her 3<sup>rd</sup> term, which will end May 2017. All other voting Faculty members of IC agreed to continued service on IC for next year.

- b. IC Curriculum Review Calendar (Partial) Draft 03-16-16 – Ryan Rademacher
  - i. Discussion followed and IC decided upon:
    - 1. We will have a meeting on 11-04-16, 8:30-11:30 a.m., SCC, LC #111
    - 2. 11-18-16 meeting will be 8:30-11:30, SCC, LC #111
    - 3. We will have an IC meeting 01-13-17, 8:00-10:45 a.m., Video 2
  - c. Request to Enroll a Child Under 14 (RECU14) – Mark Vest
    - i. Mark explained the proposed changes to the RECU14, which would formalize that the adviser and instructor must approve. It also would clarify the reason(s) why the instructor disapproves. Discussion followed. .
    - ii. Ken **MOVED** to approve the proposed changes to the Request to Enroll a Child Under 14 Draft 03-16-16 and add a small check box, which will be inserted by the Adviser’s name. Checking that box would indicate that the adviser believes the course would be appropriate for the child; **SECOND** by John.
      - 1. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
- VII. Other
  - a. Course Delivery Methods (approved by IC 10-09-15)
    - i. Dr. Swarthout signed the course delivery recommendation and now Mark needs to submit it to the Change Advisory Board. Ruth indicated that there may be a slight change to the verbiage.
- VIII. Adjournment
  - a. Ken **MOVED** the meeting be adjourned; **SECOND** by Ryan J.
    - i. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.

Approved by IC 04-08-16