

Diablo Valley College
ACCREDITATION INTEGRATED WORK GROUP
Summary Notes
March 20, 2009, 3:00 p.m.
Trophy Room

In attendance: Richard Livingston, Judy Walters, Deborah Blue, Mark Steidel, Chris Leivas, Ben Seaberry, Dale Craig, Laurie Lema, Emily Stone, Rachel Westlake, Keith Mikolavich, Kathleen Costa, Robert Burns, Ray Goralka, Milagros Ojermark, Ben Pradyr Laohapornsvan, Sheirla Puspitasari, Michael Almaguer, Ann Patterson, Ligia Morcillo, Cheryl Martucci, Claudia Hein, Tish Young, Coleen Lento, Russ Holt, John Baker, Ted Wieden, Mario Tejada, Stacey Shears, Dona DeRusso, Mohamed Eisa, Jocelyn Iannucci, Lesley Agostino, Maria Barno, Lyn Krause, Susan Lamb, John Mullen

Topic	Summary
Welcome/Introductions	<p>Richard Livingston, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. He gave a brief overview of how the work groups were created. From the beginning there was a realization that there is an overlap of tasks. Since the initial work needs to be completed before the end of the semester, we now need to determine what needs to be connected and how to accomplish this.</p> <p>Livingston distributed a chart showing his suggested connections among work groups. The solid lanes show those linkages mandated by the Accreditation recommendations. The dotted lines show suggested linkages from Livingston. We want involvement and input but at the same time we need to get things done. Resources need to flow to college planning and decision making. He stressed that we don't have time for animosity and rivalry. Susan Lamb, Accreditation Liaison Officer, shared that the SLO, program review, and curriculum process work groups have already met to discuss integration. Tish Young and Laurie Lema Work Group One members, shared they would like to see this group work on how to work together to create the linkages in the work group, a discussion on an open budget process with a governance structure that really has a substantive voice on how decisions are made.</p>
Work Group Integration Comments	<p>Work Group One: Ted Wieden, lead, stated that this work group is making decisions on how the shared governance body is going to receive requests for resource allocation in a ranked way so they can make a decision to send forward to the president. It was generally agreed that Work Group One is expecting to come up with a committee structure to handle the resource/budget needs. Work Group Two is developing the budget process. Livingston stated that the College will need to change its budget process in order to address the Accreditation recommendations. There needs to be a transparent open participatory process tied to planning. It will be important to define what is meant by "budget".</p> <p>Work Group Two: Mohamed Eisa, lead, shared that Work Group Two is looking at the entire integration process on campus beginning with Program Review. They have met with Work Group Three, who is addressing Program Review. There were discussions that program review recommendations will need to go to a college-wide committee with the budget allocation process being another tier. They also discussed the specialized plans that exist on campus which will go through a review process. Each unit will need to give an annual report. The question asked is how are we going to take care of the resource/budget issue in relation to governance. Work Group Two has begun the writing process and using the</p>

	<p>information provided.</p> <p>Work Group Three: John Baker, lead, explained this group is concerned about the program review calendar. They would like to see a flowchart calendar that meets the budget allocation dates. This group is currently working on criteria that the resource/budget group needs, and they wish to know who is going to make the decisions and how the decisions will be made.</p> <p>Work Group Four: Claudia Hein, co-lead, shared that her work group would like to work with Work Groups Three and Five to help tie together the program review cycle, SLO's.</p> <p>Work Group Six: Ben Seaberry, co-lead, asked about the linkage between program review and technology planning. They need to define what is technology planning and what is the role of the technology committee. Technology planning also needs to be tied into the District's technology planning. They would like to know if the Technology Committee can create their own sub-committees. It was suggested that the District and Work Group get together to discuss technology funding.</p> <p>It was agreed the meeting will adjourn with Work Group One and Two getting together.</p>
Closing remarks	<p>Judy Walters, President, pointed out that Deborah Blue and Richard Livingston created tasks for each Work Group to get us to where we need to go. It is important to keep focus on these tasks. Deborah Blue, Resource, suggested that each work group develop timelines for its tasks. They should get this information to Jeanie Dewhurst who will place them into the Work Plan document. Documentation should be tracked and given to Dewhurst. Walters, Livingston, and Blue thanked everyone for all their hard work.</p>

Next Meeting: April 3, 2009
3:00-5:00 p.m.
Diablo Room