

Northland Pioneer College

Instructional Council (IC)

09-22-17

Voting Members Present: Amber Gentry, Amy Grey (proxy for Dawn Johnson), Eric Henderson, Tom Hodgkins (proxy for Deb McGinty), Rickey Jackson, Ryan Jones, Kenny Keith (proxy for Eric Bishop), Pat Lopez, Wei Ma (proxy for Ruth Creek-Rhoades), Ken Wilk and Ruth Zimmerman

Non-Voting Members Present: Lisa Jayne, Stan Pirog, Jeremy Raisor, Mark Vest and Hallie Lucas (recorder)

Guests: Everett Robinson, Jeanne Swarthout and P.J. Way

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

- I. Roll Call
- II. Approval of 09-08-17 IC Minutes – Ken Wilk
 - a. Pat **MOVED** to approve the IC Minutes of 09-08-17; **SECOND** by Ruth.
 - i. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
- III. IC Subcommittees/Task Forces - none
- IV. Curriculum
 - a. ACRES – reminder to vote – Ken Wilk
 - i. ECD 250 – in the last catalog, the prerequisite was satisfactory placement – this course form does not include satisfactory placement, but there is no mention of a prerequisite change
 - b. New Programs - none
 - c. Program Modifications
 - i. IMO/MET Combined – Request to Proceed/Request for New Prefix Number of EIT (Energy and Industrial Technician) – Kenny Keith
 1. Kenny gave an overview of his proposal and noted that he would like to combine IMO and MET into one program, while utilizing the equipment that we already have. He would basically incorporate the same courses/topics/outcomes under a different prefix, selecting the best courses from each area. He would also like to be able to offer the program at more locations, particularly at the south end of the county. Discussion followed, especially as it relates to whether or not this should be considered a new program or a program modification. Since the course prefixes will change, a cross-walk appears to be the best approach (for instance, this IMO 208 course is the same as the EIT _____ course)
 2. Pat **MOVED** that we allow Kenny to proceed with combining IMO/MET into one new program and that we create a new Energy and Industrial Technician (EIT) prefix; **SECOND** by Amber.
 - a. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.

- ii. **Task:** Kenny will get with Hallie regarding the Feasibility Study template and the Teach-out Plan template.
 - d. Program Deletions - none
 - e. Program Suspensions - none
 - f. Misc. Curriculum - none
- V. Old Business Not Related to Curriculum
 - a. Moodle LMS – Specifics – Ken Wilk
 - i. Since IC adopted Moodle as our college-wide LMS platform, we need to establish a minimum threshold of what would be required from every Faculty member, including Dual Enrollment Faculty and Adjunct Faculty. Discussion points included: 1) is the LMS capable of handling the additional testing needs that would be generated, as we become more dependent upon distance education? 2) syllabus; 3) course evaluations; 4) SafeColleges™ link (for trainings) – handled on administrative side (home page); 5) Moodle super shell to encompass multiple courses; 6) copy function could be beneficial – example, if you are teaching ENL 101 during five separate days/times, Moodle would treat them as five separate classes; 7) grades will only need to be entered into Moodle – if they are entered into Jenzabar, they will not automatically show in Moodle; 8) multiple ways to do group communications.
 - ii. Eric **MOVED** that we require the syllabus to be posted in Moodle (as a Moodle minimum threshold); **SECOND** by Tom.
 - 1. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
 - iii. It was noted that the vote did not include course evaluations, which seemed to be the consensus of the group during the discussion. More discussion followed, especially as it relates to accessing the course shells (at an administrative level) to insert the course evaluations. Amy described the process, which took place this past SU, as it related to course evaluations being inserted into her Moodle shell (by adding a questionnaire Module, etc.).
 - iv. Pat **MOVED** to allow the administration to place a link to student surveys into the Moodle course shells, as long as it is visible to the instructor; **SECOND** by Ryan J.
 - 1. **DISCUSSION** – there seemed to be agreement that the instructor should be able to see what percentage of students who took the survey (but should not see who took it).
 - 2. Motion **APPROVED** by majority vote.
 - 3. Eric **ABSTAINED**.
 - v. **Task:** Wei will check with Mindy Neff regarding a (Moodle) super shell that combines multiple sections and ask her to check with the vendors.
 - b. Academic Calendar 2019-2020 (Rev. 09-18-17) - Rickey Jackson
 - i. Rickey reported that he relabeled the weeks (on the calendar) to fix that issue. He also noted that 9-month Faculty have a contract of 195 days and 10-month Faculty have a contract of 215 days; he adjusted the 10-month Faculty dates accordingly.
 - ii. If NAVIT needed two extra days in May, 10-month Faculty would need to be paid extra for those days.
 - iii. Ryan J. **MOVED** that we approve the 2019-2020 Academic Calendar (Rev. 09-18-17); **SECOND** by Kenny.
 - 1. Motion **APPROVED** by majority vote.

2. Rickey **ABSTAINED**.
- iv. **Task:** Mark will contact Matt Weber to see if a SP20 semester end date of 05-27-17 will work with the NAVIT schedule.
 - v. **Task:** Mark will take the 2019-2020 calendar to SPASC for review.
- VI. New Business Not Related to Curriculum
- a. IS Update – System Hardware Strategy – P.J. Way and Ken Wilk
 - i. Ken noted that the group would like an update regarding potential options if we were to move toward a single system; we would also like to know what the plan is if the Video bridge fails.
 - ii. P.J. reported: 1) recently the Deans, Executive Team, P.J. and some IS Staff members met to discuss what the future potentially holds for the classrooms and what priorities we should set; 2) over the past year P.J. received input from Faculty and he investigated Support tickets, etc. – he recognizes that folks want the Audio fixed (or replaced); however, if the Video bridge fails, it would have the most impact on the institution (\$300,000-\$400,000 to replace it – for the same dollar amount, we could replace V1 and V2 with CISCO); 3) IS is currently working on the CISCO interactivity – there are tools available today that would address this; however, they are cost prohibitive (P.J. is working with CISCO to get the educational model pricing for this tool) – if we had to pay the higher cost for this tool, it would cost \$100,00 per year – our current systems run about \$90,000 annually for licensing and keeping them up and running; 4) the cost structure (taken to the District Governing Board) was generic to allow us to choose the best technology available to us – however, P.J. designed it for a CISCO, because he knows that it is a cost effective model that will meet our needs.
 - iii. Discussion included: 1) the idea of building a fourth system has drawbacks – we would have to develop new classrooms that do not exist – no rooms even available at some of the Centers; 2) end-of-life means you cannot get parts or anyone to work on the system – end-of-service means that the company will support whatever they can, warranties will not be extended and a premium will be paid to get it fixed (this is where we are with the Video system); 3) connectivity challenges; 4) tower update; 5) P.J. described timeline needed by IS if we move forward with replacing the Video system with CISCO – and they really need a decision by 11-01-17, including a recommendation for the learning space redesign; 6) as the college moves forward with increasing reliance on distance education, the need for testing services becomes a stronger consideration – what do Faculty have to have to feel comfortable monitoring their own tests over a system? – will CISCO (or any other system) meet the needs? – at some point we may need increased face-to-face testing possibilities; 7) budget requested outlines \$400,00 over next three years – start with Video 1 and Video 2, audio and then the model/CCP classrooms; 8) we can develop contingency plans if classrooms have to be down for a period of time during installation or system failure; 9) consider only having interactivity in three out of the five classrooms – then it becomes a scheduling need; 10) priority to get survey to Faculty underway within the next week (will discuss at Faculty Association Meeting on 10-06-17); 11) in working with the classroom redesign, Faculty need to take into consideration the room sizes, especially at the Centers.

- iv. **Task:** Hallie will add an action item to the 10-27-17 IC Agenda for the System Hardware Strategy.
- b. AGEC Policy Change Request (draft 09-14-17) – Rickey Jackson
 - i. Rickey stated that there is a statewide general education meeting next month; and, he would like to have direction from the Faculty regarding the proposed changes to the AGEC policy. He gave an overview of AGEC Policy Change Request document. Discussion followed; and, the group agreed that they are not in favor of the proposed change, especially on the general education side.
- c. Internship Manual (Draft 09-18-17) – Jeremy Raisor
 - i. Jeremy went over the proposed changes to add two points of clarification (as requested by the Veterans Administration) which would allow funding for internships through the GI Bill.
 - ii. Suggested additional changes to the document included: 1) 1st page – change “an assigned instructor” to “a Faculty coordinator”; 2) 5th page at top – replace “Instructor Flexibility” with “Faculty Coordinator Flexibility”; 3) Pat sent Jeremy a few editorial comments.
 - iii. There was a brief discussion regarding the restrictions of the grading scale; however, nothing definite was decided.
 - iv. Eric **MOVED** to table the Internship Manual; **SECOND** by Pat.
 - 1. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
 - v. **Task:** Jeremy will make the recommended changes to Internship Manual and will bring it back to IC as an action item.

VII. Other - none
 VIII. Adjournment

- a. Eric **MOVED** the meeting be adjourned; **SECOND** by Tom.
 - i. Motion **APPROVED** unanimous vote.