

**DVC Integration Council  
MINUTES  
Friday, November 4, 2011  
BFL CCC**

**10:00 a.m. –12:00 p.m.**

**Present:** Kim Schenk, Andy Barlow, Tish Young, Vicki Brown, Theresa Molnar, Steve Coccimiglio, Laury Fischer, Marva DeLoach, Beth McBrien, Kathleen Costa, Rc Lim, Eric Lee, Marina Crouse, Tonia Teresh, Peter Churchill, Jeanie Dewhurst, Beth Hauscarriague, Lupe Dannels, Rick Gelinias, Peter Garcia, Holly Kresch

**Absent:** Sue Handy, Gloria Zarabozo, Cindy Goga, Michael Gong

**Guests:** Chris Leivas, Lisa Orta, Ted Wieden, Susan Lamb, Ray Goralka, Michael Almaguer, John Hanecak

<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Announcements</b></p> <p>The co-chairs for Budget Committee, College Council, and Integration Council met Thursday, November 3, to review the resource allocation process. Concern was expressed about timelines. Integration Council recommendations need to be available to the Budget Committee by its November 18 meeting. College Council will be validating the recommendations and process. College Council wants to see the documentation on how IC made its decisions. College Council is the final step in the recommendations to the president.</p>
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Review of Agenda</b></p> <p>The agenda was reviewed with no changes.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Approval of Minutes of October 21, 2011</b></p> <p>It was moved (Crouse) and seconded to approve the minutes as presented. There was consensus approval.</p>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Reflections on October 21<sup>st</sup> meeting: Program Review at DVC</b></p> <p>Several comments were given. Originally IC was told that funding would occur with the current year's program reviews. Funding based on last year's program review is a change in the process. There appears to be a lack of common understanding about the resource request/needs section. Information and justifications need to be more detailed. Having a mechanism to find out how much a request costs would be helpful. It needs to be stressed that even without expectation for funds for resource allocation requests, needs must be included in the program review. Once the two-year program review cycle begins, units should be told they are planning for two years. Timelines conversations will continue.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Reports from Integration Council Subcommittees</b></p> <p>There is general acknowledgement that the program reviews were written without the assumption there would be funding. Last year's subcommittees were asked to go back to their rankings from last year and attach dollar amounts. They were also asked to determine if there were further items to add to the list and to assess confidence in the numbers and rankings. Each subcommittee will write a narrative that describes to the Budget Committee and the College Council how IC's decisions were made, and an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the basis for those decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Facilities</b> Lupe Dannels and Maria Barno were on the original subcommittee. Some facilities requests have been completed and a couple of the requests were moved to equipment. Two of the student services requests are being taken care of with the new building. That allows for two of the unranked requests to move up. The introductory narrative will include a request for further discussion of the \$10,000 in the food services request, which appears to be a duplicate.</li> </ul> <p>It was moved (Dannels) and seconded to approve the rankings as presented by the Facilities Subcommittee. The motion was approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Equipment/Supplies</b></li> </ul>

Marva DeLoach reported. This subcommittee reviewed all the costs for their rankings and did not add additional needs. Justifications came from program review. The subcommittee did not discuss how much would go to the ranked requests if there weren't sufficient funds for the total; that will be determined by the Budget Committee. The narrative will explain the need for safety items to be funded first. There was a conversation about the lack of experience with definitions on the differences between facilities, equipment and IT. A concern was expressed about the "package" items and if all items in the "package" are highly ranked. This ranking within a ranking will be included in process improvement. IC members agreed to make the addition of a backboard in the PE area as a top priority.

It was moved (DeLoach) and seconded to approve the ranking as presented by the Equipment/Supplies Subcommittee. The motion was approved with two abstentions.

- **Human Resources**

Beth McBrien reported for the Human Resources Subcommittee. She explained the challenge with human resources was that the bulk of the requests were for permanent positions. It was difficult to determine if units requesting permanent positions could use hourly employees to fill the gap for the spring semester. Lab coordinators, tutoring, and permanent full-time classified positions were highly ranked. A recommendation was made to account for "hidden" human resources needs that will be required by some of the equipment and facilities requests in the narrative.

It was moved (McBrien) and seconded to go back to the five areas that requested lab coordinators/techs, and the six areas that requested tutoring to ask for a clarification of hours and dollar amounts for spring 2012 and to verify if the needs are still critical. The money is not available until March.

It was moved (Gelinas) to not go back out to the areas. After discussion, the original motion was amended:

It was moved (McBrien) and seconded (DeLoach) to send the recommendation as is to College Council with the understanding the dollar amounts need to be vetted. Motion was approved with one abstention.

A request was made to extend the meeting until 12:15 p.m. There was agreement.

Peter Garcia stated that the other governance bodies are doing the vetting of the dollar amount of each request, and he asked for a value statement for the college from IC. He will spend some time with the college community talking about the logistics. He would like to hear from the IC what the college wants to be when it receives the funding.

- **Technology**

In spring 2011, this subcommittee broke up into two groups: one reviewed administrative and student services program reviews, and the other reviewed instructional unit program reviews. The IUPR group felt there was not sufficient data to provide rankings and did not prioritize. On the administrative approach they prioritized servers and network equipment. Tish Young and Holly Kresch explained that they would like to go out using a one week timeframe to ask for an updated list with clear justification on how any resource award will impact students. The subcommittee would then meet to create a ranked list.

It was moved (Young) and seconded to give permission to the technology subgroup to

	<p>craft a memo and a spreadsheet that will compile technology requests information. This will go out to all program units with a deadline to submit by Friday, November 11 at noon. The sub group will meet Monday, 11/14, and Wednesday, 11/16 from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m. to complete the rankings and will include the justifications. This will be sent out to IC members, Budget Committee Chairs, College Council Chairs and college President electronically on November 17<sup>th</sup> so that Budget Committee can consider the recommendations at their meeting on November 18. Motion carried with one opposition and one abstention.</p> <p>IC's responses should go back to Kim Schenk who will record them and roll into the recommendations going to the Budget Committee.</p>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Integration Council Ranking/Validation of Subcommittee Recommendations</b></p> <p>There is general consensus that all four sub-areas areas are inter-connected and couldn't exist without the other. Tutoring continues to be an area of concern. Proportionality is recommended to be used as a guiding principle, but specific investigation has to be done to ascertain the critical needs within the lists of recommendations. Safety and mandated needs are a priority.</p>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Next Agenda – Integration Council Program Review Process 2011-12</b></p>

**Next Meeting:**  
**December 2nd, 2011, BFL-CC**