

**DVC Integration Council**  
**Friday, December 2, 2011**  
**BFL CCC**  
**10:00 a.m. –12:00 p.m.**

**In attendance:** Rc Lim, Jeanie Dewhurst (note taker), Kim Schenk, Cindy Goga, Teresa Molnar, Beth McBrien, Andy Barlow, Vicki Brown, Laury Fischer, Gloria Zarabozo, Steve Coccimiglio, Tish Young, Peter Garcia, Lupe Dannels, Marina Crouse, Marva DeLoach, Rick Gelinias, Kathleen Costa, Tonia Teresh, Beth Hauscarriague, Peter Churchill

**Absent:** Holly Kresch, Sue Handy, Eric Lee, Michael Gong

**Guests:** Michael Almaguer, Stacey Shears, Nancy Deason, Ann Patton

<b>1.</b>	<b>Announcements</b> There were no announcements
<b>2.</b>	<b>Review of Agenda</b> The agenda was approved as presented
<b>3.</b>	<b>Approval of Minutes of November 4, 2011</b> It was moved (Young) and seconded to approve the minutes with the stated changes. There was consensus approval.
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Technology Subcommittee Outcomes</b></p> <p>Council members discussed the process used for the technology sub-committee results in order to inform the process for future recommendations. All IC funding recommendations have now moved forward to the Budget Committee. Members agreed that there needs to be integrity and consistency in IC's processes. Due to insufficient time with the IT requests, there was no time to match the technology requests with the Technology Master Plan or to have the final Tech Subcommittee recommendations reviewed/endorsed by the IC. An accurate college-wide inventory of IT equipment is needed, as is clear criteria and process for replacing outdated equipment and software. The next IT ranking process should include the Information Technology Committee members. In fall 2011, a secondary ranking process was completed by the subcommittee using a different set of criteria. A recommendation was made to include experts in the final ranking decision.</p> <p>Andy Barlow summarized some lessons learned. There was a lack of specific IT data in the program reviews last year and the Council did not ask for clarification in the spring. This led to gathering the information outside the regular Program Review process. Barlow suggested using other collegewide committees (such as Facilities) to assist with other parts of the ranking process. The issue of lack of specific data in the Program Reviews should be addressed in the next program review cycle before IC begins ranking. This may be the time to determine if IC will rank individual requests from unit program reviews or take a collegewide view.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Evaluation of 2010-11 IC Program Review Process and Outcomes</b></p> <p>In order to continue the ranking process with integrity, approved rubrics should continue to be improved and utilized. It might be helpful for IC to review the rubrics and definitions to ensure that recommendations can be developed. Education needs to occur with those completing program review to assure that units provide the IC with adequate and specific information in the justification for requests. The key is to educate the college to create an expectation on what program review should provide. The IC agreed to send an immediate memo to PR leads and validation team members about the importance of providing such specific information. A copy of the rubric will be included.</p> <p>Three areas need addressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The validation process – IC needs to be confident that validation works;</li> <li>• Outcomes of collegewide planning processes, data and information should be available to the committee (technology, facilities, etc.);</li> <li>• The rubrics should be made into a living part of the work of IC and the program review</li> </ul>

	<p>process.</p> <p>Program review requires that units reflect on their progress and their needs throughout the PR cycle. IC should not be ranking permanent human resource requests. One of the challenges of program review is the de-centralized review process. The conversation should focus on the linkage of all three silos (Instruction, Administration and Student Services) and clarify the process about how changes to program review will be made.</p>
6.	<p><b>College Council Perspective on IC Recommendations</b></p> <p>Ann Patton, Stacey Shears, and Nancy Deason were present to talk about College Council's perspective on the Integration Council recommendations. College Council appreciates all the work that went into the recommendations. College Council's concern is to insure that all of the IC recommendations are linked to justifications in a transparent way. College Council found some recommendations that did not seem to have a clear connection to program review. The suggestion is to show transparency on how the recommendations were made in order to eliminate any distrust. It was pointed out that Integration Council membership was designed to bring expertise to the committee. Part of the problem last spring was that the scheduling taskforce work conflicted with IC meeting dates, impacting the ability of many faculty members to participate in the review of the IC's final recommendations. Patton will forward the College Council suggestions to Jeanie Dewhurst who will forward to IC members.</p>
7.	<p><b>2011-12 IC Program Review Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Timeline –</b> A statement of values, trends, initiatives, and broad general themes to inform planning with preliminary rankings will be established by the end of the spring semester. Recommendations for improvements to program review will be formulated by May. Rankings will be finalized in Fall 2012. A timeline chart will be developed at IC's January meeting. The co-chairs of IC, Budget Committee and College Council will meet to finalize the timelines.</li> <li>• <b>Rubrics</b> The rubrics will be reviewed at the January meeting. The sub-committee will meet to review the past year's rubrics. Beth McBrien and Cindy Goga agreed to serve on the sub-committee. Beth will see if Marva DeLoach will join. Dewhurst will send out the rubrics with the definitions to Council members. Schenk and Barlow will forward these documents to all unit program review heads. A recommendation was made to have an IC member as part of the validation training.</li> <li>• <b>Subcommittees</b> It was agreed that there will be four sub-committees this year. There will be no overall, thematic sub-committee as there was last year. The statement of values, the identification of trends and themes will be done by the IC as a whole as part of the work in Spring, 2012. Schenk and Barlow will assign members.</li> </ul>
8.	<p><b>Integration Council Structure/Membership</b></p> <p>Postponed</p>
9.	<p><b>Next Agenda – Finalize Integration Council Program Review Process 2011-12</b></p>

Meeting adjourned: 12:00 noon

**Next Meeting:**  
**Friday, January 27th, 2012, BFL-CC**