

DVC Integration Council
Friday, February 4, 2011
BFL Community Conference Room
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Present: Sue Handy, Keith Mikolavich, Jeanie Dewhurst (note taker), Susan Lamb, Ted Wieden, Marcia Giovanni, Carla Rojas, Lupe Dannels, Tish Young, Peter Garcia, Beth McBrien, Marva DeLoach, Gloria Zarabozo, Rc Lim, Maureen McCollum, Kathleen Costa, Vicki Brown, Maria Barno, Peter Churchill, Mohamed Eisa, Michael Gong, Rick Gelinias, Steve Coccimiglio
 Absent: Cheryl Martucci, Andy Barlow, Melissa Jacobson, Brenda Jerez, Neal Skapura

1.	<p>Our focus today: An IC Role in the College Dialogue about Scheduling and Budget Reduction</p> <p>Keith Mikolavich began the meeting with a lovely picture of his son. He shared some of the highlights of the report from ACCJC's visiting team. The team found evidence that the decisions made over the past year fostered institutional effectiveness through careful attention to program reviews and use of them to set priorities by the Integration Council, the Budget Committee and College Council regarding where cuts should be made to minimize the effects on students. Mikolavich also showed several other comments on how the college has achieved its goal of sustaining the dialogue and communication and that the Integration Council has established an environment for open collegewide dialogue on the results of program review. Given the review of the Accrediting Commission's visiting team, Mikolavich stated that the rumor that IC will not read program review is very incorrect.</p> <p>Sue Handy summarized that today's meeting will inform Integration Council about how the schedule is built and the formulas used. Mikolavich asked members and guests to hold their questions until the end of the presentation. Mikolavich shared his proposal on how IC can help to inform cuts to the schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Educate council and college about factors that must be used to make schedule cuts ▪ Define key terms (e.g., "core courses," "state mandates") ▪ Examine assumptions and ask tough questions ▪ Provide alternative views to the same data ▪ Seek other experts on campus to answer critical questions ▪ Link program review and college planning documents to resources <p>Ultimately provide an auditing to ensure the cuts reflect our values and priorities as an institution.</p>
2.	<p>Approval of December 3, 2010 Minutes Postponed</p>
3.	<p>Agenda Review – Ground Rules Handy and Mikolavich reminded Council members that we are not to advocate for a specific program. IC's charge is to look at the larger college view.</p>
4.	<p>The Construction of an Instructional Schedule that Reflects DVC's Core Values: Informational Presentation by Susan Lamb and Ted Wieden</p> <p>Peter Garcia introduced Ted Wieden, senior dean of curriculum and instruction and accreditation liaison officer, and Susan Lamb, vice president of instruction. He shared that it is very important that IC is hosting these conversations. They are dealing with a highly placed academic and professional matter. The Faculty Senate Council is also addressing this topic. Garcia stated that the first draft of the fall 2011 schedule is out to the departments. Lamb and Wieden are providing a service to the college and they maintain a control function over fiscal responsibility. Any criticism should be directed to the president.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">a. the timeline for schedule finalization</p>

Ted Wieden reviewed the schedule building timeline. The tentative date for fall registration is April 29. The schedule will become available to students on the website by April 18. After discussion it was agreed that IC input should be available by March 21. Garcia pointed out that there is approximately 90% agreement on the schedule. Lamb stated that in order to meet budget reduction numbers, the schedule should be reduced by 6%. Laurie Lema stated that the Faculty Senate is significantly involved in receiving department input prior to March 21.

b. the background factors affecting the scheduling process

Susan shared that there are two major external factors affecting the scheduling process: the State budget and comments from the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). Lamb reviewed how the schedule is built based on FTEF to produce FTES. There was a request for a handout on how to compute FTES max and FTES/FTEF.

c. presentation of the proposed schedule

DVC's will need to reduce FTES by 1,055.35 FTES, approximately 5.9%. It was agreed that the information shared today will be on the U:Drive for further review. Any questions on the information should be emailed to Wieden. In order to meet the new FTES target of 15,996.65, there will be an FTEF reduction of 34.021. Garcia pointed out that the college is currently short of its funding base. If the spring efforts don't get the college back to base, we may need to roll back some summer 2011 FTES.

Lamb projected several graphs that show the college's base productivity and the importance of balancing low productivity classes with the higher productivity classes. Financially it will be important to review what kinds of classes may be cut.

Lamb summarized that the schedule should preserve the core transfer classes, career technical education and basic skills, and at the same time meet the 2011-2012 FTES target. There is also an importance to minimize the financial exposure of the college due to possible new State restrictions. Garcia pointed out that the first run of the schedule is conservative and minimizes risk. The schedule is open for discussion.

Wieden shared a spreadsheet of fall 2010 classes categorized in several classes. He asked for feedback and corrections to be sent to him.

d. questions/discussion

Questions were asked during the presentation.

**5. Suggested Process for an IC Assessment of the Proposed Schedule:
Goal: To incorporate findings from our Program Review and College Wide Plan
Reading into the Scheduling dialogue**

Plan: Mikolavich shared a plan for IC to inform the schedule by using program review and college planning documents. He recommends that as IC read the instructional program review summaries (and delve into the specifics of the whole program reviews), review college planning documents and draw on the expertise of the college, comments should be made on the following:

- What story do these documents tell about DVC and who we are as an institution?
- What are our core values?
- How should our identity and core values be reflected in our schedule?
- To what extent must our current identity and core values give way to the tensions that are working against them? In other words, given what we are (and should continue being to serve student achievement and institutional effectiveness), the current budget reality, mandates from the state (which need to be interpreted), and the necessity of fiscal responsibility, in what ways does that story/identity need to change in the short and long

term? And what does that look like in terms of cuts to the schedule?

- How should we balance FTES and productivity on the local level and the larger college as a whole?
- What other critical factors are coming up that may not have been considered that are vital in making cuts to the schedule?
- Can we/should we buy time to make cuts less disproportionately so that we avoid unintended consequences and allow the longer-term discussion of academic priorities to be fully vetted so that we're making the best short and long-term decisions?
- How can we help with definitions of key terms and assumptions?
- What expert colleagues on the council and in the college do we need to consult?
- How can we improve the future schedule-building/cutting process?

There are 49 instructional program reviews to read. Handy asked if IC members are ready to take on the charge to do the program review and look at the indicators that point towards what's core to the mission, student success, and retention. Handy stated that it is important to bring in the program reviews in order to have recommendations. Additional recommendations and suggestions can also be solicited from the entire college.

Questions were asked about how program review reports factor in the needs of students to transfer and complete certificates and also how jobs are impacted.

Garcia asked Council members to think about what are the most serious impacts of the cuts being proposed, and what alternatives will be proposed to achieve the same cost reductions. The first draft will not remain in the same format. The schedule will be changing for the next 4-5 years.

Mohamed Eisa was asked to provide numbers on transfer students.

Mikolavich asked IC members to review executive summaries and program reviews in relation to the questions he proposed. He will provide his document to Council members. A meeting will be set up with the Physical Education Department on the issue of repeatability.

It was moved and seconded to take another 5-10 minutes to complete the conversation. Council members agreed.

A suggestion was made to use the Interest Based Bargaining (IBB) format in looking at the whole process. Concern was expressed that data is not provided in the program reviews and executive summaries to cover the issues. Mikolavich reminded IC that this committee is also expertise based and the knowledge should be here. There was a request to come up with a Plan B and C that addresses philosophically what the college needs to know to cut and still maintain the best for our students. Laurie Lema, Faculty Senate President, reminded Council members that this is an academic conversation and faculty should be deciding on academic priorities.

It was agreed that Integration Council members will incorporate findings from Program Review and College-Wide plans to inform the dialogue on schedule building. Tish Young would like to know what the outcome will be.

It was agreed to meet again next Friday, 2/11, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon.

By Feb 25 IC will

Timeline:

6.	Clarification of Program Review/College Wide Plan Reading Assignments and U: drive Access: Postponed
7.	Update on Resource Request Ranking Process for All Program Review Areas: Postponed
8.	Follow Up Report: 9-10 IC Recommendation Outcomes: Technology Committee – Neal Skapura - Postponed
9.	Wrap Up/Agenda Items for next meeting:
10.	Confirm future meeting schedule: The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 11, 10:00-12:00

Next Meeting:
Friday, February 11, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
LC 101