Northland Pioneer College

Instructional Council (IC)

11-13-09

Voting Members Present:	Mark Vest (Chair), Cynthia Hutton, Lynn Browne-Wagner, Debra McGinty, Eric Henderson, Shannon Newman, Ruth Zimmerman, Sandra Johnson
Non-Voting Members Present:	Trudy Bender, Jake Hinton, Cindy Hildebrand, Russell Dickerson (Recorder)
Guests:	Gary Mack, Ryan Jones, Don Richie

I. Approval of 10-23-09 Instructional Council minutes
   a. Lynn moved to approve the 10-23-09 IC minutes as presented; second by Ruth.
   b. 10-23-09 IC minutes approved by a majority vote; Debra abstained.
II. Subcommittee reports
   a. Learning Technologies
      i. IC members reviewed the subcommittee report posted to IC MyNPC.
      ii. Lynn moved to accept the 11-13-09 Learning Technologies subcommittee report; second by Shannon.
      iii. The 11-13-09 Learning Technologies subcommittee report was accepted unanimously.
   b. Professional Development
      i. Ryan asked IC members for clarification on the changing role of the Professional Development subcommittee. In the past, the subcommittee has acted as an evaluating body that reviewed professional development applications, set funding criteria and awarded funding based upon funding guidelines.
      ii. Ryan reported that ideas for use of professional development funds include subscriptions to professional journals and the utilization of web-conferencing (like Skype) to push out professional development to a larger audience. Ryan asked what kind of limitations there are with regard to spending professional development funds.
      iii. Shannon suggested that it is up to the committee to initiate discussions to determine effective ways to spend professional development funds and to set the criteria for funding.
      iv. Trudy noted that the library has been asked to reduce spending on subscriptions and to not spend money from the book budget. Ryan suggested that individual departments are looking to professional development in response to budget limitations placed upon the Library. Should such subscriptions be housed in the library or in individual departments? Trudy commented that when subscriptions are housed at different locations, people do not know where they are located and could be lost. Trudy noted that the Library does have a professional development collection of books, audio and video material that is not being used. Trudy suggested that specific workshops, relevant to faculty needs, would be a better way to go.
      v. Ryan reported that the only seminar activity that has been suggested is a Moodle workshop to be led by John Chapin.
      vi. Mark suggested that should the subcommittee identify key professional development journals, it should make a recommendation to the Library to obtain it. The subcommittee would then need to advertise the newly obtained journal to faculty members so it is used. Mark also cautioned Ryan against the subcommittee ordering journals as subscriptions create a recurring cost. Mark suggested that the subcommittee should work with Trudy to inventory current professional development materials, recommend journals to obtain and to identify materials that need to be weeded out of the collection.
      vii. Ryan asked if the subcommittee is now to be involved in the logistics of setting up workshops or trainings in addition to determining what activities will be funded. Shannon suggested that the role of the subcommittee has changed, not necessarily to be involved in the logistics, rather to determine standard guidelines for use of professional development fund. Factors to consider should include guidelines for trainer payment, compensation for participants. The subcommittee should also look at trends in professional development to ensure that funds are spent on quality learning opportunities. Debra suggested that a questionnaire or survey could be used to determine what people are interested in. Debra also suggested that regular training sessions, such as a Moodle workshop, could be made into a standard offering available to existing faculty as well as a new faculty orientation component.
      viii. Mark suggested that the subcommittee should not focus on spending professional development funds on new technology but should make recommendations to Information Services to acquire technology that will lend itself to quality professional development.
      ix. Debra moved to accept the 11-13-09 Professional Development subcommittee report; second by Lynn.
      x. Motion to accept the subcommittee report passed unanimously.

III. Old business not related to curriculum
  a. Plagiarism Task Force presentation
      i. IC members reviewed a plagiarism PowerPoint presentation posted on IC MyNPC.
      ii. The task force developed a 4 question, 2 part survey that went out to full time and adjunct faculty and staff members to determine whether NPC has a plagiarism problem. The group also contacted the office of the Vice President for Student Services for information on what types of action have been taken in response to student plagiarism. In the last 10 years, only 26 students were seen by the VP of Learning and the VP of Student Services.
      iii. Lynn summarized the actions taken which ranged from failure on the assignment to expulsion. Many faculty members reported that student ignorance is the main factor in plagiarism, often as a result of not properly citing sources. Faculty responses also indicate a lack of knowledge regarding the availability of student writing resources.
      iv. Task Force recommendations:
          1. New plagiarism policies and management to be called Plagiarism Traffic School
          2. Policy 2625, Student Rights and Responsibilities—Student Code of Conduct
              a. Add under Article II: A. Instructors may refer students to Plagiarism Traffic School prior to activation of this Article. To be followed by subsections B through D.
          3. Procedure:
              a. Student referred to the Writing and Citation Assistance web page.
              b. Student can be referred to the NPC Student Writing Center.
              c. Student can be referred to VAIL (Virtual Academic Integrity Lab) if plagiarism is still a problem.
          4. Goal: provide another option to help students be more successful by educating them about plagiarism and plagiarism avoidance.
          5. Ask for access to faculty plagiarism resources directly from MyNPC.
      v. Explanation of VAIL
          1. Instructor gives VAIL referral to student.
          2. Student logs on to VAIL, completes course.
          3. If student passes, receives a completion certificate that is given to instructor and also kept on file in office of the Vice President.
          4. If VAIL doesn't work, student referred to the Vice President to address conduct issue.
      vi. Trudy clarified that the proposed changes are intended to give the instructor the option to refer a student to Traffic School, or straight to VAIL or to the Vice President.
      vii. Questions/comments:
          1. Having instructors handle situations differently does not seem like due process. Lynn agreed and expressed a desire for an explicit order of steps in the event the student ends up being referred to the Vice President.
          2. Is there a way to make it mandatory in TLC or in English 101?
          3. Eric asked if a CARS field could be created to note Traffic School completion. Who would do the data entry?
          4. Could the issue of plagiarism be referred to a faculty committee? Shannon noted that last spring the Faculty Association put forth a recommendation to address such academic issues.
          5. Mark suggested that the faculty committee would need to be able to meet quickly and give the student due process to ensure action while the course is still in session.
          6. Set, rotating or ad hoc faculty committee to address instances of plagiarism? Set group so there is no opportunity for a student to accuse a faculty member of "stacking" the committee.
          7. Is there a way to incorporate VAIL into the first week of English 101? English 101 not a gatekeeper course. Recommend to faculty, who teach courses that have writing assignments that VAIL is available and should be used.
          8. If everyone has to do VAIL, then it is not punitive and does not presume a student's guilt. Eric stated that faculty may not want to put students through a 90 minute plagiarism presentation in the first week of class. Such material should be included in an orientation class instead.
          9. Must get faculty buy-in and input before implementing plagiarism programming.
      viii. How to proceed
          1. Trudy will put up a link to VAIL and inform faculty members that it is available.
          2. Task Force to send a request to Dr. Swarthout to speak to the Faculty Association following convocation.
          3. Consolidate all writing assistance and plagiarism links in one location for easy access by faculty and students.
  b. 3035 form revisions
      i. It is possible to make ACRES forms align directly to the 3035 form so that the 3035 can be eliminated as an attachment. Lengthy course topics and outcomes could be posted as an attachment to the ACRES 3035 form.

     ii. If we switch to using only ACRES forms, attachments must be printed and placed in the course outline binders along with the ACRES 3035 form.

     iii. Do we really need to print copies? Trudy reported that the course binders don't get much use. Sometimes adjunct faculty members refer to the binders. Shouldn't adjunct faculty go to their department chair or dean? Trudy suggested one master print copy to be housed in the VPL office.

     iv. What else needs to be done to the ACRES 3035 form? IC members were OK with eliminating the attached 3035 form and going solely with the ACRES form. Deans and deans secretaries need to be notified that their faculty members will have to attach lengthy course objectives and outcomes to ACRES 3035 forms.

     v. Will deans' offices still maintain 3035 forms? Mark stated that the deans will need to, at a minimum, maintain hardcopies of what is currently being taught in their respective divisions. The VPL office will maintain a complete archival record of all curriculum—noting changes over time. Deans can keep own archive if desired, but would be required to have a record of what is currently being taught.

     vi. Sustainability marker: Sandra reported that she did not add it to the Faculty Association agenda for discussion. Still on hold.

     vii. Delete textbook information from 3035 form. Leave off ACRES form.

     viii. Individualized Instruction: was included to indicate a course could be offered as a learning contract. Why would we want to eliminate the possibility of any course being offered as a learning contract?—leave it to the Dean and instructor to decide if it will be offered as a learning contract. Eliminate Individualized Instruction from the ACRES 3035 form.

     ix. Mark moved to revise the 3035 forms as discussed; second by Lynn. Motion to revise the 3035 form passed unanimously. Only pending piece is the sustainability marker.

IV. New business not related to curriculum

   a. Online student evaluation proposal

     i. Mira White reported that the HEAT application, heavily used by Information Services, has a survey tool that the college can use without any additional cost. Use of this HEAT survey tool could be a paperless and more efficient way to conduct student surveys. Mira requested IC guidance on whether to proceed with developing online student surveys to be implemented in the spring 2010 semester.

     ii. Mira reported that it takes approximately 1 to 2 weeks to get the paper surveys out and that it takes from 2 to 3 weeks for a person to manually input the data into a spreadsheet. Use of the online survey tool would decrease the data processing time by approximately two-thirds.

     iii. Mira presented a blank survey for IC member review. Mira noted that the survey can be customized for each class thereby eliminating the need for the student to enter course information.

     iv. Question: what is the response rate for online surveys? Debra Myers reported that two online instructors are using online surveys for their classes and that one instructor has about a 50% response rate. Debra McGinty agreed that an online process is more efficient but stressed that we need to consider ways to increase the response rates.

     v. Shannon suggested that the class time devoted to filling out paper forms could be used to take students to the library or computer lab to fill out the online survey. Audio and video student surveys may be a problem as there is no way to track whether or not a particular student has completed the survey.

     vi. Is there a way to integrate with JICS? Cindy noted that JICS has a minimal survey tool available currently. Does the survey have to be anonymous to IR staff?

     vii. Another concern: when surveys are done in class, we get responses from everyone ranging from strongly positive to strongly negative and those who are indifferent. Would the move to an online form result in only getting strongly positive and negative responses only as the indifferent students would most likely choose not to complete the online survey?

     viii. Eric suggested that the college could use Scantron machines to reduce the back end data processing time. The HP multifunction machines could also be used for surveys but it would not be able to process comments.

     ix. Eric suggested that moving to an online survey method, which may yield a 50% response rate, does not provide adequate responses to produce useful information in terms of evaluating instructor performance.

     x. Mark suggested that the college communicate with other schools that face similar distance issues and see if they have developed a novel solution. IC members agreed that we need to find a solution that will eliminate hand-entry of data while maintaining the integrity of the survey.

     xi. Changes to the student evaluation survey are a separate issue that needs to be run through the Faculty Association.

     xii. Debra suggested that the online survey be used on a trial basis for a subset of classes, especially the online courses, for spring to evaluate performance and response rates.

     xiii. Shannon moved that IR proceed with the online student survey proposal, as presented, for the spring 2010 semester, to be used by faculty members who are willing to accommodate it; conditional second by Eric provided that the motion be amended to include "non-probationary faculty members".

xiv. Shannon amended her motion to: IR proceed with the online student survey proposal, as presented, for the spring 2010 semester, to be used by non-probationary faculty members who are willing to accommodate it; second by Eric.

xv. Roll call vote:
1. Yea: Cindy, Eric, Shannon, Sandra.
2. Nay: Lynn, Debra, Ruth.
3. Motion passed with 4 yea votes.

xvi. Additional discussion
1. Those who voted against the motion were not satisfied with the proposal in terms of ensuring survey validity and are not in favor of piloting a new system until validity issues are resolved.
2. Those who voted to approve the motion acknowledged that the new system is not perfect but that it is worth trying in an effort to save time, labor and resources.
3. Debra requested that the deans send IR a list of instructors who are willing to try the online survey. Paper forms will be mailed to those instructors who prefer to stick with the paper surveys. The online survey form will be identical to the current paper survey form.
4. Lynn requested that in the meantime, IR look to resolve validity issues. Debra asked if IR should request the student ID number in an effort to provide validity. Mark again suggested that we contact other colleges and see if they have developed an elegant, non-intrusive solution.
5. Sandra suggested that information from other schools may be incorporated into our survey process and may result in changes to survey questions. Debra Myers is to report her findings back to IC in January.
6. Deans are to remind A/V instructors that survey forms are available and need to be filled out by their students.

V. Curriculum
a. Law Enforcement Academy
i. Request from law enforcement agencies in Navajo and Apache counties to work with the college to reestablish a police academy using the AZPOST curriculum.
ii. Dr. Richie reported that in developing the proposed curriculum, his division looked at law enforcement classes offered by Pima Community College. The proposed program would consist of three courses that would lead to a certificate and be prepared as either a paid, professional law enforcement officer or a volunteer law enforcement officer.
iii. Trudy asked if this program would shift to the CTE division. Dr. Richie reported that that has not been officially decided but would fit within CTE as the courses lead to a direct career pathway.
iv. Shannon asked if a new law enforcement degree is in the works. Dr. Richie reported that law enforcement would like to have a degree option.
v. Dr. Richie reported that the training would occur at the NATC facility in Snowflake/Taylor. Students would access law materials at SCC. Trudy noted that the libraries have no funding to purchase law materials.
vi. Cost of program? Instructors would be provided by the law enforcement community. Strictly administrative costs for the college. Law enforcement agencies have committed to providing class materials.
vii. AJS 150:
1. Debra noted that the lab hours are omitted. Lynn agreed that the lab hours were omitted from the original materials she reviewed.
2. Students would have to be admitted to the college and must be sponsored by a local law enforcement agency to gain admission into the program.
3. Cynthia asked if firearms will be used. Mark verified that NATC is approved for firearms and that a firing range is being developed at the NATC facility. Defensive driving courses will also be held at the NATC facility.
4. Cynthia noticed that Technical Writing is not included in the proposed courses. Dr. Richie explained that report writing is covered throughout the curriculum.
5. Eric commented that the Nevada POST curriculum is broken down into more classes versus the proposed large blocks. Lower credit hour courses may provide better transferability. Will students get credit for taking Criminal Law if they go through the proposed program? How would a Dean assess and award credit for Criminal Law or Criminal Procedure when they are not reflected in the proposed curriculum? How do you place students that wash out of the program and decide to return to the college to pursue a different degree?
6. Lynn and Dr. Richie said that individual law enforcement course information is available and can be presented at the next IC meeting. Pima has both options—individual classes and large blocks. Eric was of the opinion that a public institution should not offer courses and degrees that restricted program admission. To set up curriculum that ignores the possibility of public involvement is wrong.

7. IC members want to see the individual classes and want to know what resources will be contributed by the law enforcement agencies. Debra suggested that law enforcement personnel be contacted to get answers to IC member questions. Shannon also wanted to see the degree that this program will lead to.
8. What about academic credentials of law enforcement instructors? It is assumed that they will be AZPOST certified, but will they have to meet the same criteria as other NPC instructors? Yes, they need to have the same qualifications/academic credentials as other college instructors.
9. Eric moved to table all Law Enforcement curriculum until next meeting; second by Lynn.
   a. IC members requested that Dr. Richie bring back answers to IC questions, including levels of law enforcement agency commitment and to return the Law Enforcement curriculum that is presented in such a way as to align the courses for transfer.
   b. Motion to table Law Enforcement curriculum passed unanimously.
   b. IMO
      i. Proposal to create a new IMO Certificate of Proficiency. In Kenny Keith's absence, Lynn explained that the intent of the presented materials is to create a hybrid operations and maintenance CoP in Industrial Maintenance and Operations.
      ii. Dr. Richie indicated that the presented materials have not officially been approved by his office.
      iii. IC members agreed that the materials should go through Dr. Richie's office before being addressed by IC. No action taken.

VI. Other
   a. Meeting schedule
      i. Fourth Friday IC meeting canceled due to Thanksgiving.
      ii. Next meeting to be in-person, at SCC, from 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Russell to check on room availability.
      iii. All subcommittees to report at 12-11-09 IC meeting.

Lynn moved to adjourn; second by Shannon. Motion to adjourn passed unanimously.

Next meeting: In-person meeting on Friday, December 11, 2009, SCC, 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. (or 1:00)