

DVC Integration Council
Friday, January 28, 2011
BFL Community Conference Room
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

In attendance: Peter Garcia, Xi Zhi (Rc) Lim, Beth McBrien, Marva DeLoach, Marcia Giovanni, Carla Rojas, Gloria Zarabozo, Kathleen Costa, Vicki Brown, Maria Barno, Jeanie Dewhurst (note taker), Sue Handy, Keith Mikolavich, Neal Skapura, Peter Churchill, Mohamed Eisa, Lupe Dannels, Melissa Jacobson, Rick Gelinis, Maureen McCollum, Tish Young, Cheryl Martucci, Steve Coccimiglio, Susan Lamb

Guest: Laurie Lema

Absent: Brenda Jerez, Michael Gong, Andy Barlow

1. The Role of Program Review in Planning and Budget Decisions:

Sue Handy introduced Carla Rojas and Marcia Giovanni from student services who are replacing Pamela McDaniel and Michelle Zapata. Vicki Brown is the new representative from the Workforce Development Committee.

Keith Mikolavich began the meeting by giving the definition of “crisis” and sharing that program review when first developed was to drive resource allocation. Mikolavich feels that program review is central to the college’s planning process and that IC’s role is to make a link between program review and planning. The goal is to help the president make decisions. Mikolavich expressed concerns about how to accomplish this. He feels that it is more important for IC to develop a report that gives the president guiding principles on areas that should be protected. During this difficult time, he would like to see IC’s charge be more focused on principles than ranking. Mikolavich also stated that he would like the president to respond to IC explaining why some recommendations were accepted and some were not.

Handy explained that one of the subgroups will not be responsible for resource requests but will be reviewing the reports for critical issues that bubble up. She asked the subgroups to track these issues. She hopes that the scoring does not overrule the issues that rise.

Peter Garcia shared that he is attending governance committee meetings in order to hear the conversations on campus. He feels that Mikolavich’s concern is warranted on how to link the process in governance to the decisions made. If the decisions made are unexpected there needs to be a reasonable explanation on why the decision went the way it did. Planning assumptions were originally based on resource allocations and not the state meltdown. Garcia feels there is work to be done around planning assumptions. The college needs to take a brutal realistic look at where it is. The conversation for the next couple of years should be on resource adjustment. He would like to see IC give itself some breathing room in the evaluation process. He recommends that IC plan to re-engage the dialogue so that a relationship continues that is not fractured by decision making. He shared that the dialogue in the management ranks has already begun.

Several suggestions were given to enhance the dialogue.

- What is the first place to cut?
- What is essential, almost essential, and maybe not quite as essential?
- What kind of an institution is DVC able to be in light of the budget?
- What is core to DVC?
- DVC’s vision needs to be dialogued by the whole college
- IC should push these conversations
- The dialogue should include explanations on how the context is changing
- Read program review for reasons on why the area is vital looking at collegewide needs.
- Read program review with a view of the core rather than just resource allocation.

	<p>There was a reminder that IC was criticized last semester for not ranking program review reports.</p> <p>Beth McBrien expressed concerns that decisions may be made without being informed. She wonders how the college will understand how the Applied & Fine Arts Division meets the critical core needs of student without going through the program review process.</p>
	<p>Approval of December 3, 2010 Minutes Postponed</p>
3.	<p>Agenda Review – Announcements Handy reminded Council members that last spring (2010) a decision was made to have Mikolavich extend his term for another year until May 2011. It was agreed to bring on a third co-chair for the remainder of this semester. Maria Barno agreed to be nominated. This topic will be addressed again at the February 4 meeting.</p>
4.	<p>Follow Up Report: 9-10 IC Recommendation Outcomes: Technology Committee – Neal Skapura postponed</p>
5.	<p>Program Review Reading/Ranking Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update on College Wide Plan Summary Requests <p>These summaries are going to be reviewed in changing circumstances. The summaries will be placed on IC's U:Drive. Whatever is current and exists will be placed on the U:Drive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review Practice Run Plan, Materials and Directions <i>Three Areas have volunteered their program reviews to help us test our ranking rubric. It is understood that our scoring today is just practice and will not be kept as an official score for these volunteers.</i>
6.	<p>Practice Run: Individual and Small Group Scoring/Ranking of Volunteer PR's</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Individual members will read/score Art Resource Requests: 15 minutes Sub groups will review/compare scoring: 15 minutes 2. Individual members will read/score Marketing & Transfer Center Requests: 15 minutes Sub groups will review/compare scoring: 15 minutes 3. Sub groups will compile a group Ranking of Requests: 15 minutes
7.	<p>Break</p>
8.	<p>Practice Run: Large Group Ranking Discussion: 30 minutes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The entire IC membership will compile a collective ranking of resource requests
9.	<p>Discussion: Review Practice Run for Suggestions/Clarifications</p> <p>Comments from Council members include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The link to the strategic directions is meaningless • Some subgroups could not rank at all • Add a section on consequences to the college if the program or service is cut • The Executive Summary was not useful • The ranking instrument is imperfect

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranking program reviews for supplies, etc., when there is no money seems an exercise in futility. <p>Council members continued to discuss the need to rank given the budget situation. There was a reminder that the ranking process is important for the career technical programs and the Foundations for College Success Committee. Mikolavich asked if the consensus of Integration Council is the ranking process is not working, then what should IC be doing? He asked IC members to think about if we have the right to shift directions. Several members felt that IC would lose integrity if the ranking process was not completed.</p> <p>Mikolavich and Handy agreed to send out a memo to Council members with guiding questions to assist in the decision process.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Wrap Up/Agenda Items for next meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation of all directions/access to documents for our reading/ranking process

Next Meeting:
Friday, February 4, 10-12pm
BFL Community Conference Room