## DVC Accreditation: Workgroup #1
**Agenda—February 27, 2009**
**12:00 Noon – 3:00 PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Issue</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Review</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Members add or delete items from the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Minutes from Feb 20, 2009 meeting</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Approve minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review DRAFT charge and composition of Workgroup 1 (see attached)</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Agreement on charge and composition of Workgroup 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review DRAFT version of committee structure from 2/20 meeting</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Further clarification on future committee structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT Classification for Various Committee Structures</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Classification and definitions that can be used to compliment diagram of committee structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued discussion on governance models and committee structures</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>50 minutes</td>
<td>Refinement of possible governance and committee structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to engage the entire campus</td>
<td>Laurie/Tish</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>Ideas for activities to engage the entire campus (both PHC and SRC) and all constituent groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around the table</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>13 minutes</td>
<td>Members report on activities since the last meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Meeting of Recommendation 1 and 7 Accreditation Work Group

Attendance: Ted Wieden (Lead), Laurie Lema, Kathleen Costa, Tish Young, Julie Walters, Michael Almaguer, Beth Hauscarriague, Maria Barno, Teresa Molnar, Sue Handy. Absent: Lindsay St. Hill (student rep).

Guest: Jocelyn Iannucci

NOTE: All items contained in these minutes are DRAFT IDEAS and not DECISIONS made by WorkGroup #1

Agenda: Addition: Discussion of possible survey questions (Maria)

Review of 2/20/09 Minutes: minutes approved after correcting a few clerical errors

Review Draft charge and composition of Workgroup:

Draft Charge Examined:
Provided by Oversight Committee was distributed and discussed (follows at end of minutes). All agreed with it as written. Discussion pertaining to the use of term Manager verses Administrator – Boss verses facilitator role. The type of language used can limit or stifle cross constituent communication.

Membership: Remove asterisk from Julie Walters indicating SRC—We are one College-DVC!

Draft Classification for Various Committee Structures:
Ted Presented Draft “Classifications for Various Governance Structures” adapted from Butte College committee structure. The Classifications are intended to help clarify major focus areas of each committee. Classifications include: A (Academic and Professional Matters); S (Associated Students Matters); G (General Participatory Governance); O (Operational-groups focused on day-to-day operations); P (Professional-Bargaining and management groups); C (Community Input-advisory groups). A committee may have overlapping classification (and they do at Butte). Not everyone liked this approach, but generally all agreed that a way to delineate groups roles would help everyone understand the roles of college committees and the decision making areas. Further discussion is needed on this topic.

Review of Draft Committee Structure from 2/20 meeting:
Ted passed out to the committee his draft model based on our last discussion (Draft Governance Structure). This draft (rough!!) takes into account most of the decisions that need to be made (see 2/20 minutes) and the existing committee(s) we identified that would remain. The diagram replaces Leadership Council with larger membership College Council that would be charged with making major decisions on campus other than academic and professional matters. This group would rely on the work products of other committees that make recommendations.
**Discussion on Governance Models and Committee Structure:**

- There is agreement on the creation of a ‘College Council’. Current Leadership Council is not an effective group. Centralized versus decentralized power brief discussion. It is important that the College Council doesn’t concentrate all the power. It is important that Council is informed by and relies on the work done by relevant committees and follows guidance from the DVC Strategic Plan and College Mission Statement.
- Any new structure that is implemented will be evaluated within the first two years. All plans that are developed will be reviewed using a set of rubric. Workgroup #1 will draft rubric(s) as part of their developed plans.

All items below and in this document are DRAFT IDEAS and not DECISIONS made by WG#1:

- Educational Master Plan drives Program Reviews (Admin, Student Services, Instructional) and Program Reviews must drive resource allocations (facilities, staffing, budgets and technology). Since so much will ride on Program Reviews, they will need to be validated to ensure comprehensive documentation. Also, relevant components of the Program Reviews need to be directed to Technology, Budget and Facilities Committees and staffing committees.
- Recommendations from all these committees with detailed analysis will go to the College Council. If College Council disagrees with recommendations of feeder committees, clear written reasons must be given. If possible, College Council should request additional information from feeder committees prior to making final decisions.
- Broad discussion on participatory governance and academic and professional matters as these relate to a college structure and decision-making processes.
- Some feel that if existing committee representatives ‘did their job’ we could eliminate the need for additional committees (i.e. current Instructional Council). Others felt like it is slower to go through representatives and back and forth. Representatives job is hard because they essentially have to write minutes to inform constituent groups about meetings and solicit their ideas and feedback. Real-time minutes (podcast?) could help. Also, individual learning styles impact this. Not everyone can be actively listening, taking notes and contributing to the conversation.
- Two variations of governance structures were brainstormed. These focused on integrating planning groups/committees into College Council (chart diagrams attached). This sparked more conversation relating to what committees are needed under College Council and who would be responsible for validating program reviews.
- One model (orgchart #1) relied on Technology, Budget and Facilities committees to review relevant aspects of program review, summary request and their ranking; decisions would be made by College Council. A clear connection between FSC, CSC to President and College Council is delineated.
- The second model (orgchart #2) contains three Budget & Planning Teams: Instructional, Student Services and a Facilities team. These committees would inform the College Council that would be charged with final decisions related to budget and college wide planning. The ‘Communication Council’ (a Dialogue Council) would have broad membership and be used as a vehicle for cross constituent dialog (similar to current Instructional Council except membership would change to be more inclusive of the entire college. Where do we have common discussions?
- This discussion is far from over. Many different ideas are expressed, though everyone wants there to be an inclusive voice in governance. It is important to get ideas from others as
soon as possible if we are going to meet our short timeline.

• Our draft models seem more complex, but our school is larger than most we have examined. We are a large campus so it is a laudable goal to be inclusive even though it adds complexity.
• Participatory Committees/Councils could be Co-chaired or have rotating chairs. Classified staff (especially) are not always free to speak their minds if a ‘boss’ chairs committee. It can limit open dialog at the meetings.
• As we create a more transparent and understandable system more folks will engage in governance. It is important that all constituent groups affected by decisions be included early and throughout the decision making process.
• Changes to structure will require current governance groups to examine their charges and functions. Some may need to change. Some groups may be eliminated.

• New structure must have an evaluation mechanism to allow modifications. Timeline is short so plan will be rushed. A rubric for evaluation and modifications will be developed.

How to Engage the Entire Community:
• Most members report that their colleagues are aware of the ‘show cause’ findings. We will need to emphasize the short timeline so everyone is ready for rapid and significant changes.
• Send email to ‘everyone@dvc’ with the College Mission Statement. Ask everyone to consider their role in carrying out our mission of serving students.
• Tote bags with Mission Statement printed as a reminder to our college community.
• Create a Slogan we all can rally behind. Laurie shared an idea she heard that morning at District’s Strategic Planning meeting, “Student Success is Everyone’s Job”. Alternative, “Student Success is in Everyone’s hands!”
• Survey for community input. Narrative might be better. Include questions on Governance and Committee Structures and enhancing communication. Be clear about survey due dates and consider the amount of time it will takes (tell folks). Dept. Chairs have agreed to help spread the word to do the survey if adequate notice is given with realistic due dates.
• Preface survey questions with exact language used by the Accreditation Commission.

Discussion of possible survey questions
Engage with thought provoking questions!
1. 
2. Which Decisions Impact you daily?
3. I would like to have had input on the following decisions made in the past? Explain.
4. If we had a college council what decisions should they make?
5. Does the college community want Workgroup #1 to propose a draft plan?
6. At what point do you want to see the proposed governance structure?
7. How do you want to receive a proposed structure? Email, open forum and at what point in the process?
### Other?
- Need to have plan developed by May 1st for consideration and endorsement of constituent groups. Want Administration, Faculty and Classified ideas ASAP to shape plan. Email questions to consider for 1st forum prior to forum.
- Electronic discussion platforms are being created.
- Accreditation website updated with central calendar that includes links to Oversight Taskforce and Working Groups agendas, minutes etc.
- Discussion site (VPN) will be set up for our Work Group’s internal communications.

Concern expressed that some managers do not allow classified staff to have time off to participate in workgroups and open forums.

- Ted asked the management representative of Workgroup #1 to raise this issue in Management Council and see assurances from managers that they will allowed classified staff time off to participate.

### Next Steps
- **3/13 First Forum** Help Design the Structure mid-morning after Deans/Dept Chair/IC meeting.
- Need to organize for community Questionaires/survey and forums.
- Notify campus of upcoming open forums and provide background information to help people come prepared to participate.
- Schedule open forums so that a maximum number of all constituent members can be present.

### Timeline:
- Calendar timelines for our groups scheduled so folks
  - Mar 6–Continue discussions governance structure models, plan 1st forum
  - Mar 13–1st forum (Workgroup #1 debriefing/next step meeting too?
  - Mar 20 – 12-3 pm meeting PS265 Begin evaluation rubric development
  - Mar 27 – 12-3 pm meeting PS265 Solidify ideas on Structure and Rubric, plan forum #2
  - Apr 3 –2nd Forum final input on structure: Bring Rubric for Evaluation for shaping.
  - Apr 10 – 12-3 pm meeting PS265. Digest and incorporate ideas expressed in forum
  - Apr 24 – 12-3 pm meeting PS265
  - May 1 New structure submitted for endorsements and implementation
  - May 8 Constituent discussions/consultations. Revisions as necessary.
  - May 15
  - May 22 Ready to Implement Changes for Fall 2009. Work Group 1’s report is completed for incorporation into College’s Report (to be completed by end of August).

### Appendices: Draft Charge, OrgChart #1 and OrgChart #2
Recommendation 1 and 7 Accreditation Work Group

WorkGroup #1: Draft Charge:

**Work Group One for Recommendation 1 and 7**

**Recommendation 1:** The team recommends that the college clarify the decision making roles of constituent groups in the establishment of the campus organizational structure and implement a participatory process to advance the mission and goals of the institution. (Standards: IA3, IB1, IB2, IVA1, IVA2a, IVA3, IVB2b)

**Recommendation 7:** The team recommends that the college further improve communication to increase collaboration across organizational structures by promoting transparent decision making, honest dialogue and widespread dissemination of internal college documents. (Standards: IIIB2b, IIIC, IIIC2, IIID1a, IIID1d, IVA1, IVA2, IVA2b)

**Charge:** Design decision-making and organizational structures and processes that are clear, collaborative and participatory, and characterized by transparency, honest dialogue, and widely disseminated communications and documents that advance the college mission and goals.

**Membership:**
- **Lead:** Ted Wieden
- Faculty: Laurie Lema
- Faculty: Patricia (Tish) Young
- Faculty: Kathleen Costa
- Classified: Maria Barno
- Classified: Sue Handy
- Classified: Teresa Molnar
- Manager: Beth Hauscarriague
- Manager: Michael Almaguer
- Manager: *Julie Walters
- Student: Lindsay St. Hill

**Meeting Dates:** Every Friday 12-3 pm PS265
DRAFT: Organization Chart #1
DRAFT: Organization Chart #2