

Northland Pioneer College

Instructional Council (IC)

10-09-09

Voting Members: Mark Vest (Chair), Lynn Browne-Wagner, Debra McGinty, Doug Seely, Joan Valichnac (proxy for Shannon Newman), Paul Clark (proxy for Kenny Keith), Cynthia Hutton, Eric Henderson, Sandy Johnson, Ruth Zimmerman

Non-Voting Members: Cindy Hildebrand, Trudy Bender, Russell Dickerson (recorder)

Guests: Ryan Jones, Gary Mack

I. Approval of 09-25-09 minutes

- a. Lynn moved to approve the 09-25-09 IC minutes as presented; second by Ruth.
- b. The motion to approve passed with a majority of votes. Paul abstained.

II. Subcommittee reports

a. Subcommittee Chairs 09-10

- i. Brenda Manthei, Placement Subcommittee.
- ii. Ryan Jones, Professional Development Subcommittee.
- iii. Gary Mack, Learning Technologies Subcommittee.
- iv. Eric Henderson, Assessment of Student Knowledge Subcommittee

b. Dual Enrollment Standing Subcommittee

- i. Mark reported that the two Dual Enrollment Standing Subcommittees are considering a merger, as allowed by State statute.
- ii. The group, once formed, will report to the President, through IC.
- iii. A likely reporting schedule for the group: beginning of year (goals), mid-year (accomplishments/status), and year end wrap-up (accomplishments).
- iv. Dual Enrollment reports to be incorporated into the IC Subcommittee schedule.

c. Subcommittee reporting order 09-10

- i. First monthly IC meeting (second Friday of month):
 1. Professional Development and Learning Technologies to report (audio).
- ii. Second monthly IC meeting (fourth Friday of month):
 1. Assessment of Student Knowledge (ASK) and Placement to report (in-person).

d. Discuss charges to subcommittees

i. ASK:

1. Taken from the 09-25-09 IC minutes, Goals, iv. *Eric suggested taking a look at General Education throughout the curriculum and see how various disciplines are doing with Gen Ed and what is the overall view of Gen Ed by IC and how should it be delivered to the college. How broadly do we want to diffuse out, to the other courses, these Gen Ed principles? The ASK to lead this discussion.*
2. Clarification of Goals, iv: every course at NPC touches on one or more general education outcomes. How do we evaluate outcomes in courses that are not considered general education? Over time, would like to begin to ask faculty to look at aspects of courses

and assess the general education components of the course, effective communication, for example.

3. Debra suggested that ASK could assist faculty in this effort by formulating specific questions to be asked and answered.
4. Mark suggested that ASK put together an outline how to investigate this (gen ed outcomes/evaluation in non-gen ed courses) and bring back to IC for discussion and review.
5. Eric noted that this process will not be conducted on all curriculum, all at once. The process will not likely begin this year as it will prove difficult.
6. Deadline: ASK will present an outline of how to investigate general education outcomes at the December 11, 2009 meeting for discussion and review.
7. Responses from Planning Day: ASK will focus on a means of looking at critical thinking, effective communication, quantitative reasoning/scientific thinking.
8. Should ASK identify issues beyond the original charge, the subcommittee is to bring them back to IC for discussion.

ii. Placement:

1. Taken from 09-25-09 IC minutes, Goals, ii: *Sandy reminded IC members that last year, the Placement Subcommittee called for departments to review, and if necessary, adjust their cut scores. Does IC want to keep a one size fits all approach for Gen Ed courses or is IC comfortable with departments adjusting cut scores to meet their departmental needs? Information will need to come out of Institutional Research but there may be some difficulty in getting large enough sample sizes for some departments.*
2. The Placement Subcommittee will spearhead the review of departmental cut scores. The subcommittee will need to meet with department chairs to coordinate the review. The subcommittee will gather and collate departmental cut score data, generate reports for IC, and eventually, present a recommendation IC based on information collected.
3. Taken from 09-25-09 IC minutes, Goals, iii: *Look at General Education co-enrollment in TLC depending on placement scores. Eric sees this as a Placement Subcommittee issue as co-enrollment is based upon placement scores. Mark suggested that the Placement Subcommittee look at this issue and perhaps develop new recommendations.*
 - a. An analysis of performance rates versus performance rates of those above cut scores does not currently exist.
 - b. There is no communication between instructors (of gen ed courses) and TLC. Does system work?
 - c. The Placement subcommittee will contact Institutional Research for data and develop a new recommendation.
4. Taken from 09-25-09 IC minutes, Goals, viii: *Should NPC follow the Maricopa/Pima model and allow high schools to install COMPASS testing at their locations without direct supervision by college employees? Placement Subcommittee to review the issue, especially academic integrity aspects and submit a clear recommendation to IC for action. The Dual Enrollment Committee also needs to look at this issue.*
5. The Placement subcommittee is charged with the development of a recommendation to proceed, or not proceed, with Compass testing at high schools. The subcommittee should:

- a. Perform an analysis of security protocols utilized by other districts and find out how other districts feel they are working. Will a similar approach work for NPC?
- b. Provide a cost analysis that takes into account that NPC IS staff would have to coordinate the install with high schools personnel and that NPC personnel would have to coordinate testing at high schools by turning the system on to allow testing and then log out of the system once testing is completed.
Question to consider: Does NPC want to give another entity password access to our software?

iii. Professional Development:

1. According to Mark, there is approximately \$27,000 in the 09-10 Professional Development-Instructional Support budget line.
2. Mark has discussed Professional Development with Dr. Swarthout:
 - a. Given an upcoming, minimum 15% additional cut to the operating budget, the subcommittee should spend no more than one-half of the \$27,000 by the end of January.
 - b. Dr. Swarthout will not approve travel for professional development activities.
3. The Professional Development subcommittee is charged with investigating and identifying creative ways to utilize funds, despite further budget cuts and travel restrictions, by focusing on opportunities such as in-house trainings, use of an outside trainer to provide multi-site trainings, or webinars. The subcommittee will act as a coordinating body and work with the deans and the faculty association to get input that will guide the investigation into on-site professional development activities. Once a suitable professional development activity has been identified, the subcommittee will submit a proposal that includes information as to cost, the intended audience and how the proposed activity will impact the college.
4. Mark will send out an email notifying affected personnel that travel, and professional development activities that involve travel, will not be approved.
5. What about recertification? Professional Development activities that result in a recertification should be brought before the subcommittee, incorporating input from department chairs and deans, and utilize the current application system for consideration.
6. Ryan was involved in the development of the current guidelines and was of the opinion that the guidelines do not need to be revised.

iv. Learning Technologies:

1. Taken from Dr. Swarthout acceptance letter to IC: *...I recommend continued work on the Guidelines over FY 2009-10 to refine and improve the document and to address any areas of omission.*
2. Russell to contact Mindy Neff to post NPC Distance Learning: Guidelines for Management and Development of Internet Courses document on Faculty MyNPC page.
3. Areas of omission to address:
 - a. Guidelines only address courses, not programs.
 - b. Guidelines contain very little discussion on how the college should support an online learning environment.
 - c. Guidelines offer no recommendation about what role an online learning environment should play in the general direction or future of the college.

- d. Guidelines do not address whether the college will offer online degrees, do not offer a timeline for implementation and do not offer a plan to initiate HLC change order request to offer online degrees.
- 4. Learning Technologies subcommittee will broaden the scope of the accepted guidelines to include online programs and an online learning environment.
- 5. Gary suggested that the subcommittee could also be responsible for finding out what's new technologically. The subcommittee could then coordinate with the Professional Development subcommittee to find ways of relaying new technology information to the college for possible incorporation into the classroom experience. Mark noted that the new Faculty in Educational Technology position includes such functions in the job description.
- 6. Doug suggested that there should be some correlation between Information Services and Instructional Services.
- 7. The subcommittee will, at its first or second report to IC, provide prioritized list of what the subcommittee will look at for 09-10.
- 8. Russell to send subcommittee charges to chairs.
- 9. Russell to send out subcommittee reporting schedule to chairs, post to IC MyNPC.

III. Curriculum

a. ACRES

- i. DRF 120
 - 1. Is this really a course title change; not reflected in submitted materials.
 - 2. Is this course 3 or 4 credit hours?
 - 3. Catalog description: are architectural and technical drafting the same thing?
 - 4. Mark: use of ACRES requires more explanation in comments from IC members.
 - 5. Paul suggested that this course be returned for revision.
 - 6. Lynn asked if notification, for courses returned for revision, is delivered to the course originator or if they only go back to the dean or department chair. Eric thought that notification was sent back only to the most recent approval level.
 - 7. Lynn moved to take no action on DRF 120 and return for revision; second by Joan.
 - 8. Motion to return DRF 120 for revision approved unanimously.
- ii. WLD 131
 - 1. Catalog descriptions do not match.
 - 2. More general issue: should course catalog descriptions remain more general—this one is pretty specific.
 - 3. Course title does not indicate a concentration on armor fabrication.
 - 4. Ruth moved to return WLD 131 for revision; second by Debra.
 - 5. Motion to return WLD 131 for revision approved unanimously.
 - 6. Broader issue: connection between course outlines and course descriptions and their potential impact course flexibility with regard to instruction.
- iii. DRF 130
 - 1. Implementation date needs revision—spring 2010.
 - 2. What is individualized instruction?
 - 3. DRF 120 prerequisite?
 - 4. Eric moved to approve DRF 130 with the addition of DRF 120 as a prerequisite and the implementation date changed to spring 2010; second by Paul.
 - 5. Motion to approve DRF 130, as amended, approved unanimously.

IV. Old business not related to curriculum

- a. Next agenda: recommend changes to changes to the current 3035 form.
- b. 3035 form sustainability proposal
 - i. Trudy explained that this proposal is part of the President's Climate Commitment. The long term goal is to know which educational offerings relate to climate change and sustainability.
 - ii. The first step, as proposed, is to have a check box on the 3035 form. When a new course or course revision is submitted, the sustainability box is to be addressed.
 - iii. The college has adopted a definition of sustainability, point 3 on the 3035 Sustainability Proposal: *Meeting the needs of present generations while not compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.*
 - iv. Eventually, we will get to the point where the majority of courses should be required to have a sustainability component implemented. Trudy emphasized that the college is not yet ready for that requirement. The proposal seeks an answer to the question, what are we doing right now?
 - v. Trudy reported that she went through all the course outlines and had developed a chart that shows which courses have a sustainability component based upon the course outcomes and descriptions. Trudy suggested that faculty and deans secretaries could confirm sustainability components of courses, as documented in the chart, by reviewing courses.
 - vi. Debra asked for examples of what is being taught in courses that would warrant marking the 3035 sustainability check box.
 - 1. Biology course that discusses environmental changes that affect species.
 - 2. English course that requires an essay that addresses some aspect of sustainability.
 - 3. Geography, Geology and Chemistry—easy to find some activity/subject matter that addresses sustainability.
 - 4. Nursing emphasis on safe handling and disposal of hazardous materials.
 - vii. Who will education faculty who are developing curriculum? Trudy indicated that Barbara Hockabout is heading the curriculum subcommittee of the Sustainability Committee and that she has been working with faculty on an informal basis and could continue to work to education on a more formal basis.
 - viii. After much discussion, Debra suggested that if the purpose is to increase awareness in order to determine where the college is at, then this is a larger issue that is not adequately addressed by a check box on the 3035 form. Faculty interest, awareness and buy-in are required to move this forward.
 - ix. Doug moved to forward the Sustainability Proposal to the Faculty Association for review and that the Association then return a recommendation to IC, pertaining to the sustainability as course content in curriculum, prior to the November 13th IC meeting; second by Sandy.
 - x. The motion was approved unanimously.
- c. Reinstatement of the Business Plan Task Force
 - i. Debra volunteered to lead and reconstitute the task force.
 - ii. Sandy has Business Plan information from Peggy Belknap and will forward it to Debra.
 - iii. Debra to review information before the 10-23-09 and give an update to IC.
- d. ACRES Administrator to be named
 - i. Is this a function that a faculty member will take on from year to year? Not Mark's preference.
 - ii. Also need to address connection between ACRES and ACETS.
 - iii. Mark still working on assigning ACRES administration duties. Mark to talk to Jake Hinton and Cindy Hildebrand. Mark feels that function should be in the Registrar's Office. IC members can give their input to Mark by phone or email.

- iv. Mark will name the new ACRES administrator by next week and send out an email.
- V. New business not related to curriculum
- a. ASU-NPC TAG MOU
 - i. Mark and the deans met with Dr. Maria Hesse on Tuesday and discussed a proposed transfer admission guarantee program between ASU and NPC with the goal of creating a culture of transfer of NPC students to ASU, effective fall 2010.
 - ii. Proposed benefits to NPC students:
 1. NPC students will receive some form of a guaranteed cap on tuition increases for 5 years, two at the community college and three at the university.
 2. NPC students will also receive guaranteed admission to a college within ASU, as long as the college does not have competitive admission.
 3. Guaranteed acceptance of transfer classes. Student will be locked into a specific set of coursework at NPC, and apply only to a handful of specific ASU majors, to be negotiated.
 4. Student must complete work at NPC within 3 years to qualify for cap on tuition increases—still subject to tuition increases as applied to native ASU freshmen.
 - iii. Long term goal: apply jointly to NPC and ASU and attend NPC and ASU jointly. NPC would essentially take over some current ASU functions.
 - iv. Dr. Swarthout would like a recommendation from IC whether to enter into the proposed agreement, or not.
 - v. Sandy noted that this agreement would defeat the purpose of the current articulation system, AGEC program and ATFs.
 - vi. How many of our students would this benefit? Not many. Perhaps a similar agreement might benefit 1-3 ECD students provided they were willing to relocate to Tempe.
 - vii. Implementation requirements: NPC to market program with ASU, develop joint professional development opportunities for advisors, increase the availability of ASU advising on campuses, implement a data system to monitor and evaluate the program, implement an electronic transcript system specifically with ASU and identify opportunities to increase financial support for NPC students. Dr. Hesse reported that there are currently very few ASU scholarship opportunities available.
 - viii. Sandy moved that NPC not participate in the ASU-NPC TAG agreement citing lack of benefit to NPC students; second by Cynthia.
 - ix. Concern: as ASU enters into more TAG agreements, it may choose to stop participating in the state transfer system and the system will begin to break down.
 - x. Eric suggested that the original motion be amended to include reasons for not participating.
 - xi. Amended motion: Sandy moved to recommend to President Swarthout that NPC not participate in the ASU TAG agreement because a) the agreement undermines the state transfer system and b) the agreement has limited or no benefit to NPC students given NPC's service area and student demographics. Cynthia seconded the amended motion. The amended motion passed unanimously.

Eric moved to adjourn; second by Joan. Motion to adjourn passed unanimously.

Next meeting: Friday, October 23, SCC, LC 111, 9:00-11:30 a.m.