

DVC Integration Council MINUTES

Friday, October 21, 2011

BFL CCC

10:00 a.m. –12:00 p.m.

In attendance: Kathleen Costa, Andy Barlow, Theresa Molnar, Beth Hauscarriague, Peter Churchill, Rick Gelinas, Lupe Dannels, Holly Kresch, Beth McBrien, Marina Crouse, Laury Fischer, Tish Young, Tonia Teresh, Marva DeLoach, Peter Garcia, Jeanie Dewhurst, Rc Lim, Kim Schenk (by phone)

Absent: Steve Coccimiglio, Sue Handy, Gloria Zarabozo, Cindy Goga, Je Chang (Eric) Lee, Vicki Brown, Michael Gong

Guests: Bill Oye, Stacey Shears, Nicola Place, Terry Armstrong, Rachel Westlake, Obed Vazquez, Susan Lamb, Cathy Walton-Woodson, Tonia Teresh

1.	<p>Announcements and Agenda Changes: There was consensus approval to move the announcements to the end of the agenda.</p>
2.	<p>Approval of Minutes of September 16, 2011: There was consensus approval of the September 16 IC minutes with one correction.</p>
3.	<p>Review of Council Structure/Membership/Terms This item will be postponed until the November meeting in order to address agenda item #7.</p>
4.	<p>Reflections on September 16th meeting: Planning processes at DVC Council members shared reflections on the presentations given at the September 16 IC meeting. These presentations gave an overview of efforts to create college-wide plans (Tutoring, Student Equity) and the action plans for Institutional Planning Committee. Institutional Planning Committee's goal is to create plans that are useful and connect to funding. The integration process is still at an early stage. It is difficult to determine the lines of connections and how the plans fit into the program review-planning-resource allocation process. A global look at resources spent in one area should be evaluated for the effects on another area. A concern was raised about the State Chancellor's report on Student Success, and its potential impact on planning. The important step is to determine how Integration Council incorporates all the kinds of planning on campus when making its recommendations. IC members need to understand the importance of the connection to funding, the implication to governance and how it functions, and the need to have a global perspective informed by a realistic and specific strategic plan for the entire college to bring individual plans together in order to set priorities.</p>
5.	<p>Program Review SSPR – Bill Oye Bill Oye, Stacey Shears, Nicola Place, Terry Armstrong, Tonia Teresh, and Cathy Walton-Woodson attended to answer questions on Student Services program reviews. Bill Oye explained the purpose and alignment of program review in student services. Assessment is different in Student Services than in the instructional areas. The data that is collected is selected based on the assessment of the best ways to assess students' experiences at DVC. Oye explained how the components of assessment are used. Student Services is beginning to address program review connections with budget development and strategic planning. Bill presented a brief history on the development of student services program review. Student Services is committed to helping the college understand how it is organized and how best to describe the student profile and to capture performance outcomes. Student data is collected directly from students. These data are then used to determine what's working and what's not working. The comprehensive report is completed every three years. Each unit writes an annual report in the interim that evaluates the comprehensive report. Validated recommendations tied to the college's strategic plans are the output of the program review process.</p>

	<p>APR- Kathleen Costa, Rachel Westlake The administrative program review (APR) is using a revised process this year. Training in the process is currently occurring. Rachel Westlake explained that the APR has a shorter history than Student Services and Instructional Unit Program Review (IUPR). The purpose of APR is to improve institutional effectiveness in order to support student learning and achievement. A key difference with APRs is that they do not measure the direct interaction with students that is captured by Student Services and IUPRs. APRs seek to capture trends that are impacting administrative, student services, and instruction units. The APR is customized in that specific trend categories were developed for the business services type administrative units. APR will use the same executive summary document as all program reviews. A major difference between APR and IUPR, is that the APR is more of a narrative rather than data driven. APR is on a two year cycle. The two year cycle will allow for evaluation and application during the second year. One suggestion brought forth was that APRs should perhaps be completed after IUPRs and Student Serves PRs as a way to support the work in both those areas.</p> <p>IUPR-Obed Vazquez, Susan Lamb Susan Lamb and Obed Vazquez reviewed the process and purpose of IUPR. Beginning this year, there will be no difference between the comprehensive and annual reports. They are also going on the two-year cycle. The process is in three parts: introduction, an analysis, and the summary. There will be a college-wide validation the first Friday in December. The goal is to link program review to program changes for continuous improvement. The process is linked to SLO and budget.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Integration Council Responses to Changes in Program Review A concern was expressed that the data for the IUPR continues to be incorrect. It is important to get correct data because it is the basis of all qualitative assessments in the IUPRs. Susan Lamb explained that a data warehouse is being created to hopefully correct the problems, and that once corrected, the data will be in the IUPR templates for succeeding cycles.</p> <p>Council members expressed concerns about the timelines and work needed to create the Integration Council’s recommendation document. The hope is to help shape and manage the workload of the IC. The dialogue commitment of the IC is getting short-changed in the process that now exists because there is too little time for reflection and dialogue once the program reviews are completed. It is important that IC’s decision making process be shared with the college in order for the units to understand how IC completes its rankings. The administrative program reviews should be aligning with the individual unit program reviews. There is a trends section in the APR template that draws the trends from the individual units. The overall notion of impact for the Administrative program review is unclear. APR deadlines should trail college-wide program review in order to evaluate overall needs of the college.</p> <p>Program reviews cannot just be written from the bottom up. IC needs to be able to communicate to the college what it thinks program review should be used for. Conversations should be structured during the fall semester in order to address the timeline issue.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>10-11 Integration Council Recommendations Andy Barlow stated that, per President Garcia’s request, the Budget Committee is requesting a more detailed description of IC’s recommendations on resource requests, including dollar amounts. It looks like there will be carryover money to fund program review requests. He asked the sub-groups to get back together (technology, human resources,</p>

facilities, and equipment), with leads selected from those on the IC who were in these sub-groups last year. . Bill Oye asked IC for a thoughtful review of the student services recommendations. Sub-groups were asked to add to their lists to include more recommendations as well as to provide a general statement about the rationale for the recommendations. .

A concern was expressed about how vetted the resource requests were knowing that the faculty were not part of the process towards the end of the spring semester. Peter Garcia responded that the cultural issue for the college is it still seems very bound by the decisions made under duress during Show Cause. There seems to be some question on whether IC actually believes that the recommendations made in its Final Report are valid. Garcia stated that he sees the current problem with decision making: timeliness, sequencing, mistrust, the number of groups who have a bite of the apple, and incorrect data. The resource allocation process needs to be completed by April. DVC cannot afford to leave money on the table. Any money that rolls over will be at risk. Critical timelines need to be honored.

Next Meeting:
November 4th, 2011, BFL-CC