

# DVC Integration Council

Friday, March 18, 2011

LC 104/106

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Present: Sue Handy, Maria Barno (note taker), Marcia Giovanni, Peter Garcia, Marva DeLoach, Rc Lim, Maureen McCollum, Kathleen Costa, Vicki Brown, Pam Hawkins, Cheryl Martucci, Andy Barlow, Melissa Jacobson, Brenda Jerez, Marcia Giovanni, Alex Silva

Absent: Keith Mikolavich, Jeanie Dewhurst (note taker), Susan Lamb, Lupe Dannels, Tish Young, Beth McBrien, Gloria Zarabozo, Mohamed Eisa, Michael Gong, Rick Gelinas, Steve Coccimiglio, Neal Skapura  
Carla Rosas

1.	<p><b>Announcements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Report from IC Schedule Task Force Members</b> Because many of the absent IC members were attending the Schedule Task Force meeting that morning, this report was postponed till Task Force Members could report.</li><li>• <b>Request from Budget Committee</b> Sue and Keith received an email advocating the ranking process from IC—as it supports the work required of the Budget Committee—and encouraging the IC to provide a verified list of needs for possible funding if any one time funds are available next year.</li><li>• <b>Request from Institutional Planning Committee</b> Sue and Keith received an email from the Institutional Planning Committee (Council) enlisting the attendance of the Integration Council co-chairs at meetings regarding the time line and development of our college wide plans. (the IPC meetings.) The IPC is working on the college wide planning process. Their goal is better coordination of all committee work. The IPC is requesting the involvement of the co-chairs of the governance committees to facilitate the discussion. Sue and Keith are attending. Sue requested interested volunteers to attend when Sue or Keith can't.</li><li>• <b>Request from College Council re: College Wide Committee Evaluation Survey</b> Sue and Keith received an email from College Council reminding IC to complete the yearly self-evaluation. Also, CC asked for contributions to the questions on the college-wide survey. Questions must be received by 3/24. IC members confirmed general satisfaction with the questions that we developed for the process last year, with encouragement to contribute any additional ideas to Sue or Keith by the 23<sup>rd</sup>.</li></ul>
2.	<p><b>Approval of March 4 minutes</b> Postponed</p>
3. 4.	<p><b>Sub-group Reports on Reading/Ranking Process and Results</b> <b>Whole group Discussion of Reading/Ranking Results and Development of sub-group recommendations.</b></p> <p><u>Human Resources subgroup</u> (present: Brenda Jerez, Maureen McCollum, Melissa Jacobson)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Determined a documented need for student assistants and tutors. Re: Brenda, 70 % of our students are taking remedial coursework.</li><li>• Melissa: the group identified possibilities for overlap in student services personnel needs. For example, possible “rovers” could be assigned to go where the need is.</li><li>• Many requests for professional development support.</li><li>• Brenda: we should investigate possibilities for consolidation.</li><li>• Marva: verified in PRs that tutoring impacts student success.</li><li>• Pam: understands interest in consolidation but wants us to rethink whether it best serves students with special needs like International Students to continue consolidation when we are again in better economic times.</li><li>• Andy: we don't have clear strategic plan. Because of this, it complicates the process of ranking. The bigger questions impact discussion of ranking. We need to know where we want to go as a college.</li><li>• Peter: there are economic necessities that require us to roll-back now, with our present framework to guide the roll-back, developing strategies that are tied to our college-wide</li></ul>

	<p>goals when we are able to expand, rather than continuing our old practice of supporting mainly “entrepreneurial enterprise” as the guiding force for funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marva: tutoring advisory committee and the task force on achievement gap can be resources for IC.</li> <li>• Human resources ranking received consensus approval from attendees.</li> </ul> <p><u>Equipment subgroup</u> (present: Marva Deloach)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marva: subgroup had divergent ideas of process. Noted the general recommendations that were gleaned from the PRs by the subgroup (see subgroup final ranking spreadsheet).</li> <li>• Kathleen: also noted the disconnect between info in the executive summary and the info in PR. Suggested that incomplete PRs need to be stopped at the validation level.</li> <li>• Peter: recommended discussion between all impacted parties re: coordinating the PRs and the executive summary for all three areas: Instruct, Admin, SS.</li> <li>• Rc: how should we respond to the PRs that are not completed correctly?</li> <li>• Equipment ranking received consensus approval from attendees.</li> </ul> <p><u>Facilities subgroup</u> (present: Maria Barno)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Established ranking principles in this order: 1) safety first, 2) state/federal mandated requirements, 3) infrastructure needs – direct individual impact, 4) active learning support, 5) unranked critical needs.</li> <li>• Peter: challenge...how to balance repair requests (immediate needs) with new initiatives and innovative ideas</li> <li>• Facilities ranking received consensus approval from attendees.</li> </ul> <p><u>Technology</u> (present: Cheryl Martucci, Pam Hawkins)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two primary areas were defined: hardware and software. Each had five ranked general recommendations.</li> <li>• Impossible to evaluate the hardware/software requests that are specific to disciplines. Could make general recommendations only.</li> <li>• Pointed out how some areas traditionally receive “hand-me-downs”. Support moving these areas up as priority.</li> <li>• Andy: lists are “pie in the sky”. Would have appreciated more practical suggestions to IT needs and requests.</li> <li>• Cheryl: tech committee currently addressing outdated computer replacements.</li> <li>• Andy: we still need action plans to address our immediate concerns since we don’t have money for ranked items.</li> <li>• Brenda: appeal for funding from corporate resources.</li> <li>• Kathleen: confirming that our “supported” rankings will be forwarded to appropriate committees for possible action. Important to be aware of that.</li> <li>• Technology ranking received consensus approval from attendees.</li> </ul>
5.	<p><b>Suggested Process for Development of Subgroup recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subcommittee needs to refine document. Subcommittee established with: Cheryl, Brenda, Marcia, and Andy.</li> <li>• Subcommittee sends out draft by Monday, 3/28.</li> <li>• Meet as full IC on Friday, 4/1, to review and support final document.</li> <li>• Peter: our work <u>is</u> important and appreciated, and wanted to thank IC members.</li> <li>• Sue will send out rankings and suggested issues and themes notes that the subcommittee will use to develop their draft report.</li> </ul>
6.	<p><b>Confirm future meeting schedule:</b></p> <p>The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 1, 10-12pm, BFLCCC.</p>