

DVC Integration Council

Friday, April 1, 2011

BFL CCC

10:00 a.m. –12:00 p.m.

In attendance: Keith Mikolavich, Sue Handy, Gloria Zarabozo, Vicki Brown, Marva DeLoach, Cheryl Martucci, Tish Young, Beth McBrien, Kathleen Costa, Pamela Hawkins for Peter Churchill, Rc Lim, Andy Barlow, Melissa Jacobson, Marcia Giovanni, Susan Lamb

Absent: Rick Gelinis, Lupe Dannels, Steve Coccimiglio, Carla Rosas, Maureen McCollum, Maria Barno, Gloria Zarabozo, Mohamed Eisa, Vicki Brown, Michael Gong, Neal Skapura

Meeting began at: 10:15 a.m.

| | |
|-----------|--|
| <p>1.</p> | <p>Announcements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report from IC Schedule Task Force Members Several members of the Faculty Senate Task Force gave an overview of the meetings. Keith Mikolavich explained that from his perspective the meetings were challenging but fair. Taskforce members looked at fill rates at census and productivity. Mikolavich explained that due to a lack of time, program review was not involved in the decision making as much as it should have been. Tish Young shared that the taskforce will continue to meet and further cuts will only get more painful. It was valuable to have IC representatives on the taskforce because they could provide a college-wide perspective. Young agreed to review the taskforce notes and share at the next IC meeting. Young reiterated the point that there needs to be discussion on where we are going as a college. Beth McBrien shared that she understands that people who were not part of the process could have concerns. The perception is that there were not firm criteria being used. She shared that the criteria was very much aligned with IC's rubrics for program review. Susan Lamb stated that one of the most difficult parts was deciding which students not to serve. Cheryl Martucci shared a comment from a faculty member in her department about concerns of faculty making decisions rather than management. Lamb stated that at the end of the day, you can still blame management because they make the final decision. Kudos was given to all the members of the taskforce.• Report from Institutional Planning Committee Meeting Sue Handy shared that the Institutional Planning Committee meeting was about the importance of college-wide plans and how the plans fit into committee work. The committees responsible for plans will be asked to prepare an annual report instead of an executive summary. |
| <p>2.</p> | <p>Approval of March 4 and March 18 minutes It was moved and seconded to approve the March 4 minutes with the correction to Maria Barno's name and the addition of Pamela Hawkins to the attendance list. There was consensus approval.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded to approve the March 18 minutes with the correction of the addition of Pamela Hawkins. There was consensus approval.</p> |
| <p>3.</p> | <p>Sub-committee Presentation of DRAFT IC Recommendations for 10-11 Council members reviewed the draft report. The sub-committee members were: Andy Barlow, Marcia Giovanni, and Cheryl Martucci. Barlow explained that the rankings are put together as an attachment to the report. The narrative provides an overview. The purpose is to explain to the college what came out of all program reviews. The report is organized around themes and is a passive filter. It is an interpretive document grounded</p> |

in the program reviews. Barlow stated that IC will need to be able to stand up to the question that the recommendations are grounded in program review. Handy reminded Council members that College Council can accept the IC's work and perhaps send its own report forward to the president. The following comments were given:

- 3. D Unused funds roll into the general pot which is then used to reduced deficit. After discussion it was agreed to use the wording, "student workers and tutoring". The Budget Committee is currently looking at not rolling over the unused funds in an area to the same area. This statement will be reworded. New GL's will be created for the newly designed areas. Andy will get the revised language to Jeanie Dewhurst.
- 3. C. Should include all program review areas (units) instead of divisions.
- 4. A. This is a general statement that needs to go to the enrollment management group making decisions. What does over-enrollment mean? The decision was made to delete the word, "over". The question was asked if the 19 unit limited should be lowered.
- 4. C. is illegal and will be deleted. We can limit access. Consider a plan to look at repeatabilities for Ws, Ds, or Fs.
- Provide a list of bulleted suggestions after, "DVC examine enrollment management practices to provide greater student access by:..."
- After discussion, it was agreed that this is not a legal document but a discussion document.
- It was agreed to delete C.
- It was agreed to add DVC's priorities to maximize student access and success and delete the "in a period of budget reductions"
- In the introduction, include the words that the recommendations come out of the dialog about program reviews.
- In #1, delete the words "commit to" and include "engage in" strategic planning
- The first sentence in the paragraph should be restated to show that ongoing needs should be documented and when the budget situation gets better these needs are well documented.
- In 2. E. Reword to make it clear what the original Transfer Center's mission is.
- 2. A. We need a plan that integrates the Achievement Gap with programs and services.
- In the introduction, last sentence, will be reworded for clarity.
- Beth expressed concern about the "dedicated budget". It was agreed to create an integrated approach and remove the "dedicated budget" wording.
- In 2. C, use just Staff Development for instructors' and staff's willingness...
- 2. B. "Efficiently" maintain and expand tutorial services. And add including a specific commitment to...
- 3. E. the report out will be for future planning purposes
- 3. G. add more efficient at the end.
- Add collaborative work with ASDVC's commitment to tutoring.

It was MSC to approve the document providing that Andy Barlow will complete the editing.

Handy requested volunteers for a sub-committee to work on IC's self-evaluation: It was agreed that Handy will email members to ask for sub-committee members. Handy will also include in the email the need for nominations for new committee co-chairs.

| | |
|----|--|
| | Another document will be prepared for IC program review recommendations. The rankings from the March 18 meeting were approved. |
| 4. | Follow up: Program Review Reading Process Suggestions/Feedback/Report Postponed |
| 5. | IC Committee Self-Evaluation Process Plan: Postponed |
| 6. | IC Continuity Plan: Nomination of 11-12 Co-Chairs Postponed |
| 7. | Agenda Items for last meeting of the year on May 6: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and Approval of Committee Self-Evaluation Report • Presentation by the College Success Inquiry Group: Progress Update Meeting adjourned: 12:02 p.m. |

Next Meeting:
Friday, May 6, 10-12pm
BFL CCC