

Northland Pioneer College

Instructional Council (IC)

01-25-13

Voting Members Present: Clover Baum, Lynn Browne-Wagner, Janice Cortina, Eric Henderson, Rickey Jackson, Michael Lawson, Julie Neish, Ryan Rademacher, Carol Stewart, Mark Vest and Ken Wilk

Non-Voting Members Present: Cindy Hildebrand, Jake Hinton-Rivera, Wei Ma, Leslie Wasson and Hallie Lucas (recorder)

Guests: Eric Bishop, Tracy Chase, Ruth Creek-Rhoades, Peg Erdman, Thomas Hodgkins, Janet Hunter, Ryan Jones and Jeannie McCabe

- I. Roll Call
- II. Approval of 12-14-12 IC Minutes
 - a. Ryan **MOVED** to approve the minutes of 12-14-12; **SECOND** by Lynn.
 - i. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
- III. New Business Not Related to Curriculum (for this meeting, moved to front of agenda per 12-14-12 IC Minutes)
 - a. Guidelines for Creating & Modifying Courses
 - i. There was a discussion regarding the need for some clear guidelines for course and program development. There is also a need for recommendations for: 1) load; 2) how to calculate credits; 3) define lecture vs. lab.
 - ii. Lynn **MOVED** that IC creates a three person task force to develop an immediate checklist and a long-term plan regarding course and program development, and the task force will report back to IC; **SECOND** by Ken.
 1. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
 - iii. Volunteers for the task force include Ken, Janice (she would like to be released from the Catalog Review Subcommittee and placed on this task force), Carol, Lynn and Clover [later Hallie was notified that Rickey would also like to participate].
 - iv. Michael would like to consider serving on the Catalog Review Subcommittee.
 - v. IC is comfortable with having more than three people on this Program/Course Development Task Force. The Task Force hopes to report back to IC by the end of February 2013 with an immediate checklist.
 - vi. **Task:** Michael and Janice will follow up with Dr. Hodgkins regarding this possible change in the Catalog Review Subcommittee membership.
 - b. Distance Education Guidelines - Legacy Online Course Issue
 - i. Changes include:
 1. Clarify that after the 3035 has been approved by IC, then the online course can begin to be developed using the Quality Matters Rubric.
 2. Average score of 81 points (not 72) must be achieved.
 3. Michael **MOVED** that we adopt those changes. Motion **DIED** for lack of a **SECOND**.

- ii. There was a general discussion regarding the various recommendations that have come from Learning Technology (LT) Subcommittee over the last year (some have already been approved, but not necessarily updated in various versions of the Distance Education Guidelines). It would be helpful if LT would take the Distance Education Guidelines, incorporate all the recommendations into an edit and submit the edited version to IC for a comprehensive read and vote.
 - iii. Michael **MOVED** that LT review and revise the Distance Education Guidelines with their recommended changes (that are not already incorporated into the 10-28-10 version of the Distance Education Guidelines) and bring it back to IC for their review and approval; this will be added to the LT Charge from IC for 2012-2013; after IC's approval is given, the new version needs to be posted in all locations on NPC Web sites where it currently resides (this includes the eresource page); **SECOND** by Ken.
 - 1. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
 - iv. **Task:** Hallie will send the Word document of the Distance Education Guidelines to the co-chairs of LT.
- c. Library Research Assessment Data
- i. Leslie reported that the library needs help from faculty to gather data regarding: 1) do students use library resources?; 2) which resources do students use?; 3) how much do students use the resources? Every semester the library sends out forms to gather this information; however, they have trouble getting the forms back. The Library staff is asking for feedback from faculty to help support their assessment.
 - ii. **Task:** Ryan is happy to assist with providing information from his classes and Leslie will send him a reminder e-mail with specifics.
 - iii. As a side note, we need to pull together ideas regarding what NPC should do for the quality initiative for our accreditation review. One idea for a quality initiative project is the introduction of information literacy into the curriculum and the assessment of information literacy across the college.
 - 1. After the college retreat in March, a survey will be sent to employees, so that they can vote for their favorite project.
 - 2. **Task:** If anyone has an idea for a quality initiative, send it to Mark by the middle of next week.
- d. Faculty Compensation – Recommendations from Faculty Senate
- i. Fall 2011, Mark suggested to the Faculty Association that they look at all the ways they are paid beyond base pay and make recommendations through the shared governance process about; 1) what should be written into procedure; 2) what should be kept; 3) what should be dropped; 4) what should be edited. Several of the pay practices are not in procedure. Many of the issues are a mixture of compensation, instructional policy, instructional quality and other items that affect the way we do business in the Instructional Division (the way we deliver courses).
 - ii. Dr. Swarthout has requested recommendations or commentary from IC as they look at these practices from the perspective of instructional quality and academic policy and procedure; how will these items positively or negatively affect academic policy and process at the college.

iii. Audio/Video, Model Classroom and Stand Along Courses – Faculty Senate Recommendation

1. First Recommendation – minimum number of students for a class to make – lower from 15 to 12 at the campuses and 15 to 10 at centers
 - a. Discussion points included: 1) Eric H. noted that the consensus of Deans seemed to be favor live classes (as much as is practical); 2) benefits of small class sizes in ENL 101 are well documented; 3) physical space in classrooms can limit the number of students.
 - b. The Deans estimate that the budget impact (discussed after three recommendations were presented) would be less than \$70,000 per year.
2. Second Recommendation – extra compensation for each additional student beginning with the 21st student (1/20th load factor for each additional student)
 - a. Discussion points included: 1) how caps are set – different disciplines have different traditions – amount of effort required to teach various courses is not necessarily equal; 2) ethical problems; 3) maybe the question is to decide where each class should capped and not worry about the additional compensation?; 4) to some extent, this would promote adding students to classes for compensation purposes; 5) it really does depend on where, what and how you are teaching; 6) often times we do not have the flexibility to open up additional sections, due to limited audio/video slots available and the number of faculty available; 7) pedagogically, some instructors prefer live classes; 8) sometimes the Deans are limited to the number of students they can allow in a course – and may vary at different locations.
3. Third Recommendation – proration calculated based on enrollment on Friday of the second week of class (note – it is currently set for the Friday of the first week of class)
 - a. Discussion included: 1) this was likely an attempt by the Faculty Compensation Committee to standardize the date, and they are not necessarily in favor of the second week vs. the first week; 2) we do not want to encourage students to register after the first day of the class; 3) if the Business Office would like to see the withdrawal date changed, they need to submit a formal recommendation to IC; 4) there is data to support that late registration decreases completion rates.
4. Summary to Provide to Dr. Swarthout:
 - a. There seemed to be universal consensus in IC that it is a good idea to drop the number of students for a class to make from 15 to 12 at the campuses and 15 to 10 at the centers. There seemed to be a general consensus in IC that keeping the prorate day for the first Friday of the first week of class is a good idea. There was a lot of discussion regarding the large class size number (setting additional compensation to begin with the 21st

student); however, no one seemed to offer a specific recommendation regarding whether or not we should have a number at which we provide extra compensation (and if we should have one, what that number should be). Setting aside the question of compensation, the only universal theme seemed to be that it is difficult to address the class size, given the differences in the modalities of instruction and the differences between instructional disciplines.

iv. Internet Courses – Faculty Senate Recommendation

1. First Recommendation – IC has already agreed that we support keeping the prorated day for the first Friday of the first week of class.
2. Second Recommendation – reduce the number of students for an Internet class to make from 15 to 12
3. Third Recommendation – continue to load Internet courses at a load factor of 1.33 per credit (in Distance Ed guidelines, but not in college procedure – documented process)
 - a. Discussion included: 1) we are the only community college district in the State that loads Internet courses differently than it loads other courses; 2) Faculty Senate provided supporting rationale and references to support that Internet courses are more work for the instructor; 3) providing instruction in audio/video/model classrooms also requires extra work; 4) an Internet instructor spends a lot of time up front designing the class and getting everything online; 5) one IC member believes that you can come up with documentation to support that there is equal amount of work in the lecture environment; 6) if IC believes that the strength of instruction is in face-to-face, stand-alone courses, why would we incentivize teaching in the online environment?; 7) earlier in the history of the college, instructors were paid to design the course and they received regular pay to teach the course; 8) many of the Internet courses are basically “canned” by the publishers (as seen during Quality Matters Rubric review); 9) creating a course for Internet is different than creating a course for a stand-alone environment and should be built into the compensation package; 10) one instructor of an online course noted that she sent and received 700 e-mails in one semester; 11) consideration – additional load points to develop course and for first few semesters instructor teaches it; 12) if you get a new book, you have to completely redo the course online; 13) with Moodle/JICS, we are increasingly blurring the lines between stand-alone and online coursework; 14) one IC member stated that he is not a fan of Internet courses for pedagogical and student success reasons, although he noted that they are important in some areas; 15) is the strength of NPC in audio/video/model classroom environment?; 16) in a recent assessment, one IC member noted that in general the pass rates in Internet courses are 50%, as compared to 60% in audio/video/model classrooms; 17) teachers in

general constantly have to revise their courses; 18) Internet classes can, at times, undermine live classes; 19) much research shows that hybrid courses are best; 20) in NUR they use a lot of online resources, which takes a great deal of time, and one IC member feels that it is likely the same amount of work as an online course, when you also take into consideration that their courses have to be updated yearly.

4. Fourth Recommendation – extra compensation for each additional student beginning with the 21st student (1/20th load factor for each additional student)
5. Summary to Provide to Dr. Swarthout:
 - a. IC seems to be in agreement to set the number of students for an Internet class to make at 12. As stated above, there seemed to be a general consensus in IC that keeping the prorated day for the first Friday of the first week of class is a good idea. There were many points of view regarding the 1.33 load factor for Internet courses. We took a poll and ask each IC member the following question “Are you supportive of the recommendation to continue to load Internet courses at 1.33 with additional pay beginning at the 21st student?” Results were: no = 8, yes = 1, abstain = 1.
- v. Travel Pay – Faculty Senate Recommendation
 1. History – for a long time, the college has had a practice to pay for required travel (practice is not officially documented). It has been handed down from dean to dean as something that we do. This is commonly known as windshield time.
 2. First Recommendation – faculty will be compensated for required travel exceeding two hours per week each semester – the travel pay will be the equivalent of the adjunct per hour pay rate
 - a. Discussion included; 1) per the deans, the proposed language is different from what we currently do – currently, only full-time faculty receive this pay (not adjunct faculty – who don’t have an assigned home campus) and is limited to a teaching assignment (because the current practice wasn’t clearly stated in the proposal, the proposal complicated the conversation); 2) in Arts and Sciences, if a full-time instructor is assigned to teach somewhere other than their home campus, a mileage/times chart is used to calculate and instructor is paid for their travel time that exceeds two hours per week; 3) does this incentivize driving around, instead of teaching?; 4) is this driving time adding to hourly load?; 5) it is believed that the intent of the Faculty Compensation Committee was to simply state what the current practice is, which they support and there was no intent to change the current practice.
 3. First Recommendation *clarified* – current travel practice – to include only full-time faculty - will be compensated for required travel to assigned teaching that regularly exceeds two hours per week per semester

- a. Discussion included: 1) should there be a change to include adjuncts?; 2) this is an issue that needs to go back to the Faculty Senate; 3) from an instructional quality standpoint, there is a tie-in to provide more live instruction at remote locations.
- 4. Second Recommendation – any faculty may pick up a car at the nearest campus, regardless of the faculty’s base – alternatively, faculty will be reimbursed for use of personal vehicles from the nearest campus
 - a. Discussion included: 1) people felt that because they were assigned to a home campus, it became difficult to get a vehicle; 2) IRS issue – you are hired at a location – the college can’t help you get to work; 3) should this be kicked to the college attorney and have him review the tax implications? – then the attorney and Blaine Hatch could meet with the Faculty Senate; 4) the second part of the recommendation “alternatively, faculty will be reimbursed for use of personal vehicles from the nearest campus” – Eric H. believes that the current practice is reimbursement from your home campus or your home, whichever is the nearest mileage; 5) evidently the Faculty Senate has already addressed this with Blaine Hatch and he is working on the travel pay issue.
- 5. Summary to be Provided to Dr. Swarthout:
 - a. There are two issues here that need to be reviewed by the attorney and Chief Business Officer to get their input, and IC does not support the recommendation as it is written; the President and the Faculty Senate probably need to discuss this more.
- vi. Procedure 2940 – Faculty Senate Recommendation
 - 1. First Recommendation – change procedure to read “Resident faculty are limited to nine overload points or three classes per semester...”
 - a. Discussion included: 1) this would effectively broaden the amount of overload that faculty can teach before VP approval is needed; 2) because many of the Career and Technical Education courses are loaded at 3.4, the current practice only allows an instructor to have 2 overload courses (without VP approval) – however, a class is loaded according to the amount of time it takes to teach; 3) an example was used that you could potentially receive 23.4 load for three classes; 4) another example – in Biology full load can potentially be made with 3 classes (15.1 load) – if you taught 3 additional classes of the same nature, this would create a 30.2 load (36 contact hours per week!); 5) one law enforcement course is 36 credits; 6) one IC member noted that this was an attempt to standardize the practice; however, he is not comfortable with this wording; 7) we have a compensation system based on load, but we have a model of academic integrity based on course work – if these things are mixed, it becomes complicated; 8) suggestion to change wording “Resident faculty are limited to 9 overload credits per semester or 6 credits in each SU session.”

2. Second Recommendation – change procedure to read “...or 6 (should read - load points) per summer (SU) session (I or II)”
 - a. Discussion included: 1) since we only have one SU session, the 6 per SU session may not make sense, at this point; 2) SU will be discussed at the March All College Retreat.
 3. Third Recommendation – change procedure to add “Full time faculty will have preference to teach additional classes (rather than an adjunct) when there is a need for additional classes to be offered. If a full-time faculty in the discipline declines to teach additional classes, then adjunct faculty will be hired to teach the additional classes. Faculty may request review by the Vice-President of Instruction.”
 - a. Discussion included: 1) this would take the decision making authority away from the Dean in this matter; 2) this recommendation was brought to the Faculty Compensation Committee by several faculty who were not in overload, but the available overload classes were offered to adjuncts; 3) could affect the quality of instruction; 4) this is an issue much bigger than Procedure 2940; 5) we want to motivate quality adjuncts; 6) should this be between the dean and faculty member?; 7) some IC members feel that full time faculty should be given first preference with regards to “right of refusal” to teach a class; 8) should be pulled out of the discussion dealing with Procedure 2940 - it belongs in a general statement about the role of faculty in an institution - full time faculty should be involved in discussions regarding the creation of classes, in the delivery of classes, scheduling, what is taught & who teaches it & when and where - these items should be separate from pay issues.
 4. Discussion regarding all three recommendations: 1) suggestion – table all of this pending a discussion of the instructional quality issues and come back in a more appropriate cycle to address it; 2) what is going to work in terms of providing a good instructional environment?; 3) there are many variables involved in these issues.
 5. Summary to be Provided to Dr. Swarthout:
 - a. Regarding the recommendation to modify Procedure 2940, IC members were asked three questions:
 - i. “How many people think that this is a good idea (to change this Procedure as recommended) = 0 responses
 - ii. “How many people think this is a bad idea and should not stand” = 4
 - iii. “How many people think that this is in the inappropriate place to have this discussion – we need to split it out of this (third) recommendation and have the discussion at another time, in a different venue” = majority of votes
- vii. **Task:** Hallie will create the commentary for each process, as determined at the IC Meeting, which will be sent to Dr. Swarthout.
1. **Task:** Mark will carbon IC on the summary that is sent to Dr. Swarthout.

IV. IC Subcommittees

- a. Assessment of Student Knowledge Report to IC
 - i. Report will be deferred to the next meeting.
- b. Catalog Review Subcommittee Report to IC
 - i. Report will be deferred to the next IC Meeting.
- c. Learning Technology (LT) Subcommittee Report to IC – Ruth Creek-Rhoades
 - i. Most of the Learning Technology Subcommittee Report was already addressed in the Distance Education Guidelines section of this meeting. However, we discussed B) Charge II, priority c from the LT report regarding scheduling of distance courses in the audio/video/model classrooms. LT recommends that IC, as we roll out new modalities, have a discussion about the best way for the institution to schedule courses in the different modalities. Eric B. noted that Information Services would like to see a standardization of the Model Classroom scheduling, the way audio/video classes are currently handled, through the Support Center (after the Dean of Arts and Sciences has turned it over to them).
 - ii. Ken **MOVED** that we table this report until the first IC Meeting in March, 2013; **SECOND** by Carol.
 - 1. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.
 - 2. **Task:** Eric B. will attend the first IC Meeting in March, 2013.
 - 3. **Task:** Eric B. and Eric H. will create a flow chart to help illustrate how courses are currently being scheduled and will submit it to Hallie to post on the MyNPC IC page.
- d. NAVIT Subcommittee Report to IC – no report
- e. Professional Development Subcommittee Report to IC
 - i. Report will be deferred until the next IC Meeting.
- V. Curriculum (taken out of order from original agenda)
 - a. New Programs
 - i. BUS Proposal
 - 1. Hallie noted that apparently some of the BUS courses were “stuck” in ACRES and IC members couldn’t see them. Yesterday Wei sent them to the dean for re-approval.
 - 2. **Task:** Mark will ask Peggy to look at the BUS courses at her level in ACRES and either send them back to the creator, or approve them, so that IC members can vote on them.
 - 3. **Task:** It is imperative that voting IC members review all of the courses that they can see in ACRES before the next IC meeting.
 - ii. Paramedic to RN Proposal
 - 1. Lynn gave an overview of the program (as seen in the Paramedic to RN Feasibility study) and noted that it is a way of taking advanced healthcare workers, who already have a certification, and entering them into the NUR program. In the medical field, there is a need of more advanced, more skilled nurses for high critical care areas. A short discussion followed and all questions were adequately answered.
 - 2. Changes needed:
 - a. For the catalog format page, it needs to be changed to reflect that it is an Associate of Applied Science (AAS) in NUR with a separate specialization with a different core. Bring the AAS forward with two areas of specialization – one in NUR and one in Paramedic to NUR.

3. Ken **MOVED** that we approve the Paramedic to NUR Feasibility study with the change to the AAS in NUR layout to reflect two areas of specialization – one in NUR and one in Paramedic to NUR; **SECOND** by Janice.
 - a. A **roll-call vote** was taken: yes = 5, abstain = 1. Motion **APPROVED** by majority vote.
 - b. **Task**: Lynn will submit the courses to ACRES as quickly as she can and will also submit the revised program, so that it can be posted in MyNPC as soon as possible.
- b. Program Modifications
 - i. MDA
 1. All courses have been approved in ACRES.
 2. Changes that still need to be corrected:
 - a. All of the changes suggested at the IC Meeting of 12-14-12 were not changed in every area of the documentation.
 - i. **Task**: Peg will notify Karen Hanson and ask her to resolve the discrepancies in ACRES.
 - ii. **Task**: After Karen resolves the problems in ACRES, she should ask to have this on the agenda for the next IC Meeting.
 - c. ACRES - none
 - d. New Courses - none
 - e. Course Modifications - none
 - f. Course Deletions - none
 - g. Program Deletions - none
 - h. Program Suspensions – none
 - i. Misc. Curriculum - none
- VI. Old Business Not Related to Curriculum - none
- VII. Other - none
- VIII. Adjournment
 - a. Ken **MOVED** that we adjourn; **SECOND** by Clover.
 - i. Motion **APPROVED** by unanimous vote.