

Northland Pioneer College
Instructional Council (IC)
09/25/20
Meeting Minutes

Voting Members Present:

Pat Lopez, Gary Santillanes, Ruth Creek-Rhoades, Susan Jamison as proxy for Brian Gardner, Rickey Jackson, Dawn Johnson, Wes King, Eric Bishop, Mike Solomonson, Renee Freese, Wei Ma

Non-Voting Members Present:

Jessica Clark, Jeremy Raisor, Josh Rogers, Scott Estes, Donna Krieser, Rebekah Wilson, Michael Broyles, LaTonya Motley, Stephanie Stancil, Cassie Dows

Guests:

Susan Hoffman, Amelinda Webb, Shannon Motter, April Horne, Debbie Myers, Elizabeth Oliphant, Judy Yip-Reyes, Lia Keenan

- I. Call to Order – Pat Lopez
- II. Approval of meeting minutes for 09/11/20-Pat Lopez
 - a. Minor change made to wording of section VIII.> b.> i.
 - b. **MOVED** by Eric Bishop to approve
 - c. **SECOND** by Wes King
 - d. **ABSTAIN** by Rickey Jackson
 - e. **APPROVED** by majority vote
- III. LMS gatekeeper role – Pat Lopez – (action)
 - a. Pat-Three or four years ago the IC decided to require all faculty to have a Moodle page that would have, at a minimum, course syllabus and link to the course survey. After this decision, IC members started to notice non-academic items appearing in Moodle. IC made a recommendation (which consisted of two points) to the president in 2019, which was revised and then presented in November of 2019. President Vest asked that recommendations be joint recommendations between IC and the VPLSS even if they are not in agreement. VP Clark agreed on the second point but dissented on the first point, some of that dissent was tied with the planned reorganization of division of Instructional Innovation which has now occurred. As a result, President Vest has asked that we revisit and see if there can be a resolution to this issue
 - b. VP Clark – I am still in support of the #2 point. My dissent with #1 was in hopes that with the restructure, we would get an Instructional Designer and more support for distance education, that oversight of the LMS fall in a distance education department, Instructional Technology and Curriculum Support (ITCS) made up of

LaTonya Motley, Dr. Michael Broyles, and Dr. Stephanie Stancil. While they would collaborate and set up expectations with IC, ITCS would be tasked with support and monitoring.

- c. Eric B. – still supports original recommendation, glad there is a dept for support, but that is should only be support, the directing and leading should come from the faculty through IC.
- d. Amelinda W. – faculty are the ones that are face to face with the students practicing education and we know what the students are facing. Even though ITCS has some interaction as faculty, it is not to the same level. It should stay with IC.
- e. Rickey J. – we had an Instructional Designer/Educational Technologist that had a very different philosophical view of pedagogy and what needs to be inside that Moodle shell. If we had someone in this role again, would they infringe on the academic freedom of that particular faculty member? That is where this came from and that is where I see the need for IC be in charge of this. It is good to have balances. I don't like the term "gatekeeper."
- f. Eric B. – this actually started with Tutor.com. It just showed up one day, it should have come to IC for discussion before just being implanted in the Moodle shell as it was. Discussion should take place in a shared governance model before these changes are made. Faculty believe that Moodle is a classroom, and it should not be used by administration.
- g. Shannon M. – Dr. Ma's dept will be able to bring in research, best practices, and wonderful things that they could find. They should have shared role.
- h. Eric B. – this is not about cutting them out, this is just saying that they can't just make decisions, they absolutely should have a role and bring those things to us.
- i. Pat L. – the changes in the last year have resulted in the Dean of Instructional Innovation being a voting member of Instructional Council so there is a nexus between the two depts.
- j. Gary S. – it is not that we don't want this input, but how it has worked in the past, I still have the Tutor.com. Students assume that I put the Tutor.com there. It has nothing for Philosophy students to use. Students get frustrated that their grade is poor when they used what they thought I put there. It didn't play nice with the grades, because it crashed my gradebooks for an entire semester. These decisions weren't being made in a shared governance. The way the suggestions are phrased doesn't address those issues in the future. I also don't like "gatekeeper."
- k. Jess C. – If IC could change the "gatekeeper" language, I might be more comfortable in a joint support of this, because I don't like the language "gatekeeper" either.
- l. Pat L. – I don't care for it either and so what suggestions are there? If we start from scratch and say that the recommendation is that the Moodle environment be a blank slate as a learning environment and any additions or changes be brought to Instructional Council.

- m. Eric B. – it needs to be a requirement. We don't want to control every single change. There is administration and there is oversight. Administration should be by ITCS but the oversight should be done by IC.
- n. Pat L. – is there agreement on the word "oversight," I am seeing "change management" from Dr. Stancil
- o. Stephanie S. – I am not aware if TAS already has a change management philosophy or process but if they do I would recommend following that process
- p. Mike S. – would the word "facilitator" be a more preferred word choice
- q. LaTonya M. – there does need to be more consultation, should be consultation with IC as well as TAS on the LMS, but my problem is the part B where IC wants to be administrator of positions, user roles, permissions. I have questions about that in my role now, so when I get requests to manage these, do we need to bring that before IC.
- r. Gary S. – the "we" there means the instructor in the course and not IC. There were issues where people were given permissions over the course shells where the faculty member running the course was unaware.
- s. LaTonya M. – I absolutely believe that faculty should have full control but that needs to be systematic layout as how people can be added to a course, but I don't think IC can do that so it can be done right away. We need to have that ability.
- t. Gary S. – we could change that language to just "faculty." The original intention wasn't that every time that something changed it would need to come to a committee meeting.
- u. Eric B. – I think there was concern that people were getting rights in the system that they really shouldn't have had. This wasn't aimed at people who need to administer the system, but more at being monitored, or having people entering without permission. Consultation leaves it open for interpretation and not left for IC to have final say.
- v. Michael B. – Looking at this, one thing to consider would be whatever term you decide on, it will be key to have it clearly defined
- w. Mike S. – Doing probationary faculty visits, there will be times where faculty may need to have to have permissions to do "classroom visits" for those probationary faculty members.
- x. Rickey J. – I agree, and I give notification about reviewing Moodle shells in that way, but there is nothing in writing for that to be the case.
- y. Eric B. – There might be something, not directly related to Moodle, but as far as who could request course work. There was an issue with that, there may be documentation.
- z. Stephanie S. – It could put the Instructional Designer in an awkward place if there is no documentation. I think what you are asking for is documented processes that IC approves the protocol and ITCS follows it.
- aa. Eric B. – I agree 100% with that, I am just saying that there is probably precedent for that already.

bb. Dawn J. – I am coteaching a particular class with Ruth C. and needed added into the Moodle shell, agree that there needs to be a protocol but there needs to be instructor voice in who has access. Let's get this down in black and white so that we can do this efficiently and effectively.

cc. Eric B. – That could be pretty simple as far of the process of requesting someone be added

i. **TASK** – Pat to rewrite the LMS proposal and bring back to the committee

ii. **MOVED** by Dawn Johnson to approve

iii. **SECOND** by Eric Bishop

iv. **DISCUSSION** by Wei Ma – Another question is that we not only have instructional Moodle, but we also want to mention the other uses for Moodle and how that would that affect those

i. Pat L. – I would say that one is instructional and the other is not.

ii. Eric B. – Those that are assigned to those pages should have control over them.

v. **APPROVED** by unanimous vote

IV. Dual Enrollment Subcommittee – Wei Ma – (discussion)

a. Wei M. – Over the summer there were lots of discussions about how Early College could support HS programs. April and her team have been working really hard to streamline the process and consolidate the resources. One discussion we had with DE committee members was how we can align the DE subcommittee's role with Early College. We looked at Yavapai College's model, which has DE committee chaired by Early College Director and members include faculty dual liaisons from all disciplines with DE courses being offered. Not only members from each division, but from each discipline which has DE offered and the committee has both advisory and administrative duties, such as DE instructor training, HS classroom visit, course syllabi review. This model seems to allow them to better serve their HS and meet the NACEP and HLC requirements.

b. April H. – Wei and I worked on a proposal to realign DE committee to report to both IC and the Early College program. If you look at the whole AZ state statute, it is equally split between the administrative roles of working with our HS partners, identifying course and program needs, submitting intergovernmental agreements, making sure those are filled out, in addition to the more curriculum-based requirements, ensuring that the course is rigorous, it meets the expectations of normal college classes, and ensuring that our faculty is also high quality. What I have found is that we have a lot of HS onboarding, new instructors, new interest and one of the biggest downfalls with the current structure is that I wasn't able to work with anyone on the DE committee or on IC to make sure that these new instructors or these new courses are being appropriately approved. That means that we would have to wait another year before those get approved and into the right venues. That was the biggest issue shared from faculty members on the committee: the lengthy timeframe for course approval. In my job description, it

says that I am operating under the AZ state statute, HLC requirements for DE and the NACEP Accreditation standards and all three endorse that curriculum should be routed through the regular process. We aren't suggesting that this wouldn't happen, but we want to make sure that the administrative duties that I have to support as well are provided some oversight roles within the committee.

- c. Eric B. – I just want to talk about process. I am more concerned about what took place over the summer as opposed to what happened at the Sept 10th meeting. It seems like this proposal was made with a chair that had already vacated their position and it seems like a lot of this has been done without IC input. I am concerned that things are being done too much before a discussion is had. If there is a subcommittee that reports to a much larger group in shared procedure, that is where the conversation should really start.
 - d. Pat L. – I agree with Eric, and I would ask that if there are any subcommittee members present I would invite you to share your thoughts on this. It is the process that concerns me as well. This was highly developed without input from the voting membership, and the proposal didn't get the benefit of the diversity on that committee. The role that the DE subcommittee plays is more strategic and the Early College is more operational. April was needing assistance with the operational aspect of the process. I think that the proposal needs more scrutiny by the members of the DE subcommittee and it needs to be brought to IC.
 - e. Eric B. – If this is something we want the subcommittee to look at restructuring, then they need a charge to do so. It isn't in their current list of charges and that is where IC should have been consulted with first because they are a subcommittee of this council.
 - f. Wei M. – In the spring, Dr. Grey reached out to Dr. Clark regarding some ideas of realigning the DE committee with Early College/HS programs back then. During the summer we were charged with exploring those ideas. Back then faculty were off contract, so we were not able to consult IC and we just continued to explore the proposal and kept working on it so that when faculty returned we were able to sit down with the DE committee members to discuss this proposal.
- Gary S. – whether it was intentional or not, it comes off as deceptive because the chair of DE came to IC and suggested that we dissolve the committee. We suggested that maybe the DE members should have been informed. Shortly after, the chair resigned. Later in the spring, we had to go back and change the charges for DE in the next year. We were talking about how to get ahead of these concerns. There was a lot of silence from the people who went on to make this proposal. We approve these charges and go off for the summer and then we come back to this proposal that has this perception of being deceptive that we remove IC and change it to an administrative governance. I am not saying it was intentional, but it has the perception. We need to be careful when making recommendation of removing the authority of shared governance groups.

- g. Wei M. – we did consult April who is a DE subcommittee member. It wasn't that we wanted to omit anyone, we were just trying to come up with something to support the college. As soon as faculty returned, we met with them.
 - h. Eric B. – so what you are saying is that you were meeting with parts of the committee during a time when we were off contract and shouldn't have been meeting and weren't even charged with looking at this.
 - i. April H. – I wasn't part of this in the spring but I know that this was developed as a skeletal shell that will need to be filled in. My responsibility is to ensure that all of the aspects of the statute are being met, half of that is my responsibility and the other half is not, but coming in to this position I am seeing a lot of discrepancies and this is just trying to correct this. I just want to say that none of this was done to be deceptive, it is just that I was here, and I am seeing a lot of discrepancies with the operations. I don't have a DE committee chair currently that I can consult with. And that is something that is missing right now as I am trying to move my program further.
 - j. Pat L. – Looking back there was an impropriety, specifically with the outgoing chair, of making a recommendation without consultation with the rest of the committee. We know we have issues with the structure, we are down one member and no chair. We are supposed to have seven voting members, we currently have six. We are also without a chair. First thing we need to do is reconstitute this group to acquire a member from both NAH and EDU/CCP. And turn over to them to work on discussion of the strategic vs operational needs of this subcommittee. Dean of II and ECC are both non-voting members.
 - k. Eric B. – I think that is a good start to reconstitute the committee, but I think it needs to come to IC for us to amend the charges to DE and make sure that they are within the desire of IC.
 - l. Dawn J. – I agree that we need to restructure the committee and getting running as it should, so that they have a more successful end to what is being worked on right now.
 - m. Rickey J. – The structure is there, we are just absent members. I would think it needs to go through the DE committee as it exists but it doesn't have a chair, so it would need to go through the President's office as I believe it exists.
 - n. Eric B. – We thought it best to wait until fall to appoint that new member and chair.
 - o. **TASK – Pat to work with FA to identify new members for DE subcommittee.**
- V. Mission, Vision, Values statement – Judy Yip-Reyes – (discussion)
- a. Two venues for feedback
 - i. Qualtrics survey
 - ii. Padlet
 - b. Looking for any questions
 - c. Mission Review
 - i. Pat L. – My thoughts were that we just discuss and then decide on our response at our next meeting.

- ii. Eric B. – If we decide on these, how are we going to hold to them? Has there been any talk about this? There was an initial discussion, but not in-depth. How do we uphold that value?
- iii. Judy Y. – Bullet points are some of the examples of how we can demonstrate the values. But it is still up for discussion. It could be part of performance reviews or it could be a process that goes out to the college as a whole. There are some ideas floating around, but hasn't been any decision. If IC has any suggestions, that would be great to put together something for LC.
- iv. Pat L. – I have questions about the structure, why do we have values with three bullet points, why not one?
- v. Judy Y. – We struggled with this a little bit, and in the end, we used these as more of behavioral examples of how we may live these out. Perhaps we do something for two weeks that we revisit and live this value out.
- vi. Pat L. – Why did the group decide to start with “Centered in Navajo County”?
- vii. Judy Y. – It was probably in response to the HLC comment on what community we were serving. Other depts had the same question as to where is Apache County, but it is based in Navajo and that is where we collect tax payer money.
- viii. Pat L. – I like that we have it county based.
- ix. Eric B. – I disagree. We have done things to hide that we are in Navajo County. I don't think it serves the mission more to state our location more so than what we do.
- x. Rickey J. – We have to look at this politically as well. We were voted in by this community. Their taxes support us, but stating it in our mission allows us not to lose focus on who we are serving, who supports us.
- xi. Jeremy R. – Shared the HLC requirements in chat:
 - i. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services that the institution provides.
 - ii. His interpretation is that it isn't specific that it has to be in the Mission statement but could be in the mission documents.
- xii. Amelinda W. – I am concerned/confused why this is excluding Apache county, are we doing this because most of our monetary support comes from Navajo.
- xiii. Rickey J. – We do support people in New Mexico, Apache County, most of the Navajo Nation, but do we alienate those that support us financially? Maybe we omit it from Mission Statement and put it in the mission documents, but I am afraid that if we take that out of the mission, we will lose focus of who we are here to serve.

- xiv. Pat L. – We are also maybe serving kids that chose to stay home rather than go off to college. One option may be to leave out the location portion of this mission statement, but the danger there is that we lose focus of why this college was started to begin with. Second option is to keep as suggested identifying Navajo County but it excludes folks.
 - xv. Wei Ma-Centered in northeastern Arizona, located in northeastern Arizona
 - xvi. Elizabeth O. – I agree that we are getting away from who we historically started to serve.
 - xvii. Eric B. - We are established by county lines, but if we do this in the mission we are pinning ourselves down and possibly sending the wrong message. If we say Navajo county then perhaps we need to say “and beyond” too.
 - xviii. Rickey J. – My biggest concern is that we lose focus of serving the people in our area. I like Dr. Ma’s suggestion.
 - xix. Amelinda W. – Instead of changing the first part, Centered in Navajo County, Northland Pioneer College makes lifelong learning accessible and affordable for our communities in Northeast Arizona and beyond.
 - xx. Gary S. – I worry about us being forced online, for the folks that are already boosting that we move in that direction. I don’t want us to get away from our physical classrooms, and being focused on our community doesn’t mean we can’t do online.
 - xxi. Eric B. – I get what everyone is saying I teach online, and I would prefer to teach face to face. But for some classes, we have to have these online classes for some. We do want to serve our students outside the WMC. WE NEED to find balance
 - xxii. Mike S. – We need the Mission to be concise, and I think we need to make it simple and put the location in another location.
- d. Vision review
- i. Pat L. – Why are we using future tense in this? Also ...fearless is a useless word and should be stricken as it does not add to the meaning.
 - ii. Judy Y. – Encourage the shared governance groups to remove fluff words because if we can make this concise and precise, then we have a clear direction and it allows us to identify those things that will impede us in our mission. We may have already addressed things, if it is redundant, overlapping, etc, please do let LC know.
 - iii. Eric B. – I don’t like the term passion, I prefer purpose and I don’t like goals, I like systems. I think Vision Statements are used to set goals, but I think we need to focus more on our day to day steps to achieve our mission.
 - iv. Ruth C. – The very last sentence is all we need.
 - v. Dawn J. – I agree the rest is just fluff.
 - vi. Amelinda W. – The sentence could be broken up a bit to be made a bit clearer. Make it more to the point.
- e. Values review

- i. Integrity
 - i. Unanimous approval.
- ii. Inclusion
 - i. Unanimous approval.
- iii. Adaptability
 - i. Eric B. – I have some concern, because sometimes change is not good. I would like to see some tie-ins to the shared governance in adaptability.
 - ii. Pat L. – So change as long as we are all involved in that adaptation
 - iii. Eric B. – Loyalty needs to not be to anyone person but to the college we serve. Is there open and clear discussion?
 - iv. Mike S. – Maybe like “collaborative informed risk-taking
 - v. Eric B. – Something that says this isn’t any one person’s corporation, that when we change it is done together.
 - vi. Judy Y. – Maybe IC could think about adding to one of the bullets that the group setting would be collaborating to swap one of those bullets as a form of feedback
 - vii. Pat L. – Think about the language modification you would like to see.
- iv. Compassion
 - i. Pat L. – As a faculty member this is a tricky one for me; we are always balancing compassion with rigor. We have daily opportunities to show compassion to students who come to us with difficulties. We can get taken advantage of by students who are lazy. Compassion is something that I try to incorporate in to my classes.
 - ii. Eric B. – Compassion has to have levels. It can be harmful to be too compassionate. As an institution, we are very compassionate.
 - iii. Gary S. – I don’t know how I feel about this compassion business. I have students coming to me with all kinds of emotional issues, and I am not in any way qualified to handle my students’ emotional problems.
 - iv. Eric B. – I see what you are saying, maybe emotionally shouldn’t be there.
 - v. Amelinda W. – I would say that helping a student emotionally can be as much or as little as you need it to be. If you are giving them feedback on how you move forward, that is supporting them. We aren’t just building their minds, we are building the whole person.
 - vi. Elizabeth O. – Strategically, it does set up some pretty big expectations. It is a big charge.
 - vii. Pat L. – For some students being in a classroom with other students and a functioning college professor is a huge boost emotionally.

viii. Gary S. – One of the things as we go through these shared values that bothers me is that it dictates what your mental state/emotional response should be. My job description says what I have to do, but I resent being told what my mental state is to be.

v. Access

- i. Ruth C. – I don't like this wording...if my student moves are we going to support them with dorms?
- ii. Eric B. – It is too detailed and too broad at the same time which is odd.
- iii. Amelinda W. – Half of it is already covered by inclusion.
- iv. Ruth C. – First bullet, it makes it sound like we are going to find a way that you can take classes anyway despite your financial situation.
- v. Eric B. – But it is contradictory as well. We don't do student loans anymore. There are students being disenfranchised, because they didn't qualify for grants, but they couldn't get loans. Instead we should focus on doing everything we can on making it more affordable.
- vi. Mike S. – This was more saying that we will remove barriers that prevent students from having access to higher education.
- vii. Josh R. – It was more a focus of assuring access not assuring receipt.
- viii. Eric B. – Instead of saying removing barriers, could we say reduce?

vi. Fun

- i. Eric B. – Is this really a value? I think it is great to try and have fun in your work and classroom, but this is an institution of higher education and I feel like this could undermine our institution.
- ii. Gary S. – The students get to a point where it stops being fun. Differential equations are not fun. As soon as they think it stops being fun they just check out. They stop putting in the work. It is not a shared value that I have. If you can do it, great, but it can't be an expectation.
- iii. Pat L. – This value for me is a hard no. It is not a value, it is a normal outflow of human behavior. If we make it a value, can we be called out when something isn't fun.
- iv. Amelinda W. – Even this meeting, while intellectually stimulating, I would not call it fun, but it is necessary and incredibly valuable. If we make a value, will that language be used to dictate what I can and can't do in the classroom?
- v. Eric B. – On a broader scale when it comes to these values, it isn't something that is directing an individual's behavior, it is a wider scope for the college as a whole.

vi. Pat L. – These are guidelines but not standards of behavior for individuals

vii. TASK – All IC Members to review the Mission, Vision, Values Statement to think about and document any language modifications you would like to see before our next meeting.

VI. CIP Codes Changes for Programs – Michael Broyles – (information)

a. Classification of Instructional Program Codes

- i. They are not regulatory nor do they indicate level, but they do indicate content.
- ii. CIP codes in ACRES are located fourth down on the left.
- iii. There are grants that do look at CIP codes, specifically the Carl Perkins grant, which are looked at to ensure that they are assigning grant monies to appropriate programs.
- iv. At previous institutions, I would use CIP codes on directing students on specific career path.
- v. DOE updated their CIP code assignments for content in 2020
- vi. Would like input from IC on how we can get changes made relatively quickly, but in a very transparent and collaborative way.
- vii. Gary S. – You said that the CIP codes that would need to be changed would primarily be on Carl Perkins.
- viii. Michael B. - That is just one that takes in CIP codes for consideration.
- ix. Gary S. – If we made a change in CIP codes, would we have to do a program modification for each change?
- x. Eric B. – CIP code is only required in our new program forms. We don't make people go back and change these for a program modification. My suggestion would be to work with those involved, Michael, and then bring back to IC as one action.
- xi. Pat L. – Jeremy is that something your area may be able to help with?
- xii. Jeremy R. – Absolutely, we can get that information to Dr. Broyles pretty quickly, and he already has the handbook that has the new 2020 changes.
- xiii. Pat L. – As far as the timeline, I think this is something needed sooner rather than later, take the time needed. Rather it be done well as opposed to quickly.
- xiv. Jeremy R. – Because the CIP codes have already changed for this year, and we are currently required to report out on some adjustments. But only for the ones where CIP code was completely eliminated or where we needed to report on a student's enrolled program holding up Pell grants.
- xv. Pat L. – Michael, once you get an idea of the scope of the work, let us know and periodically update us.

VII. Sending out call for Agenda and Packet to be sent out to ALL NPC – Pat Lopez – (action)

- a. Eric B. – I think we should send out the meeting packet, but not the call for agenda. Too much stuff might come in that IC shouldn't be spending time on as far as who should be asked for agenda items.
 - b. Pat L. – Should we allow everyone to have access to IC SharePoint?
 - c. Eric B. – Everyone should have access to SharePoint.
 - d. Pat L. – I am in favor in all NPC access to agenda packets emails and SharePoint, but not the call for agenda items
 - e. Eric B. – IC, CASO president, Faculty Association president on call for agenda items, make SharePoint, Agenda Packet, and meeting invite available to everyone in the college as well
 - f. Gary S. – Should send as above, SharePoint access for all, IC Agenda to all
 - g. **MOVED** by Gary Santillanes to approve
 - h. **SECOND** by Dawn Johnson
 - i. **APPROVED** by unanimous vote
- VIII. Announcements & Reporting of Previous Tasks – Pat Lopez
- a. Renee Freese has filled the vacant spot for faculty from NAH left by Ruth Zimmerman
 - b. Bylaws for all groups subject was brought up at LC and it was well received. One comment was that there should be a standardized way of formatting these. Need to look at the revisions of 2125 and the minutes for LC to see what the next step will be.
- IX. Other (action as needed)
- X. Future Agenda Items – Pat Lopez
- a. DE subcommittee
 - b. Revisit the LMS discussion after rewrite
 - c. Course Improvement Surveys-Dr. Yip-Reyes
 - d. Mission, Vision, Values statement-Dr. Yip-Reyes
 - e. Program level outcomes with Dr. Broyles
 - f. Changes denied to Early Childhood program, have discussion if it is still our position
- XI. Adjournment – Pat Lopez
- a. **MOVED** by Gary Santillanes to adjourn
 - b. **SECOND** by Ruth Creek-Rhoades
 - c. **APPROVED** unanimously