# DVC Accreditation: Workgroup #1
**Agenda—April 24, 2009**
9:00 AM – 10:50 AM  
**Location:** PS 265  
Approved

Work Group #1 Members Present: Ted Wieden, Tish Young, Maria Barno, Julie Walters, Teresa Molnar, Lindsay St. Hill, Sue Handy, Beth Hauscarriage, Kathleen Costa, Laurie Lema, Jocelyn Iannucci  
Guests: Michael Almaguer, Nancy Ryanen-Grant, Bill Oye, Cathy Walton-Woodson, Judy Walters, Rachel Westlake, Will Parks,

## Topic/Issue

### Agenda Review:
Sue Handy said at this meeting they will be going over what Maria Barno and Laurie Lema, and Julie Walters researched on current Leadership and Planning Council charges at other colleges, as well as how the committees structure surrounding the College Council. She said they will also work to get agreement on the charge and responsibilities of the College Council and complete the discussion of Management on the College Council. She explained the major committees are listed on the board and can be moved for this discussion. She said they need to be prepared for the Integration meeting following this one.

### Announcements:
Jocelyn Iannucci said she took pictures of the flip charts from the IBB she could post and distributed copies to the group. Tish Young said these are a draft work product and suggested they go into an evidence file and the minutes reflect the resolutions from those discussions.

### Review Minutes from April 3, 2009 meeting:
The minutes were approved with the following addition:  
VIII ff) All understood and agreed that classified, faculty and management rotates in the chair role.

### Responsibilities, charges and functions of the College Council:
Maria Barno distributed a draft charge she developed using some things that were still valid from the current Leadership and Planning Councils’ charges, as well as the Accreditation Commission Report and from previous Work Group 1 discussions. She explained there are 4 drafts on the handout. Draft 2 has Julie Walters’ additions, draft 3 has Laurie Lema’s additions, and draft 4 has Ted Wieden’s additions that incorporate the previous drafts. The group agreed to start looking at draft 4. The group proceeded to discuss the document.

### Goals and Objectives
Bullet 1 – good  
Bullet 2 – good
Bullet 3 – There was a brief discussion on how the 10+1 will be defined. It was agreed that is not under this groups charge.

Bullet 4 – good

Bullet 5 – Tish Young asked if we are asking the Council to review itself. Ted Wieden agreed this should be clarified. After discussion the group agreed to change the word perform to participates.

Bullet 6 – good

Bullet 7 – Jocelyn Iannucci asked how recommendations would be made. After discussion the group agreed to change the second sentence to “Receives and makes recommendations…”

Communication

Bullet 1 – The group has concerns with the word “fosters”. Ted Wieden suggested something more proactive. After discussion the group agreed to the following wording — Facilitates communication Models and facilitates effective communication among college entities and among constituent groups by establishing, using, and supporting minimum standards of communication.

Bullet 2 – Tish Young is concerned with the word “input”. She asked if it should read “…input and recommendations…” to show respect for the work and recommendations of committees.

Laurie Lema asked if we are talking about internal or external communication. After discussion the group agreed on the concept to add another bullet to address external communication. Bill Oye suggested modifying the first bullet under Budget Planning and Resource Allocation as a fourth bullet to address external communication. He suggested “Takes input from the proposals of the sub-committees and makes final recommendations to the president”. The group agreed on the concept and will wordsmith outside the meeting and bring it back for review.

Bullet 3 – The group agreed to use the word “Responsible” instead of “Initiates”

Ted Wieden asked if we should include something to address communication with the community outside of DVC. Judy Walters responded that we have mechanisms in place to communicate with the local communities. The group agreed this is not part of their charge.

Judy Walters asked under Communication Bullet 1 where would college-wide plans such as Accreditation, the Strategic Plan, and the Educational Master Plan go for oversight. After discussion the group agreed to reword the bullet to include a reference to college-wide plans and list those.

Budget Planning and Resource Allocation

Bullet 1 – Tish Young asked if the word Requests was appropriate. She said it was agreed at previous work group meetings requests do not start with the College Council but through the Budget process or whatever sub-committee is charged with making recommendations for particular resources. She said some requests do not come out of a Program review, where do they go?

Sue Handy suggested folding bullet 1 and 2 together. The group agreed this is a
discussion for the integration meeting but agreed to recommend wording to the effect of:
Recommends allocation of college resources based on validated, prioritized program
reviews, approved college plans and District/State mandates, and requests from college-
wide committees. Maria Barno and Julie Walters will work on word-smithing this item to
incorporate the work group’s recommendation

**Tish Young moved to approve a modified version of Bullet 2 of Budget Planning
and Resource Allocation after word-smithing as agreed to by Work Group 1.**
Electronic modification would occur over the next several days. After the
integration discussion it would be incorporated and post the approved draft on the
website under Work Group 1. Jocelyn Iannucci seconded the motion. The question
was called on the motion. All in favor. Motion approved.

---

**Management Representation on the College Council:**
Tish Young proposed to modify agenda by moving this item last on the agenda to ensure
time for the next item on the agenda. The group agreed.

**Committee structure surrounding the College Council:**
The groups discussed the college-committees posted on the Board and how they would
be structured around the College Council. The committees listed were Matriculation,
Staff Development, Diversity, Technology, Budget, Facilities. These are committees we
are legally required to have. Kathleen Costa said they need to know the charges of the
committees before they can decide where they belong in the structure.
Jocelyn Iannucci asked if the Planning Council should be included. Sue Handy agreed
they discuss whether or not there should be a body that coordinates all of the
plans. Tish Young asked if planning is a committee or a work product. She pointed out
we have an Office of Planning and Research and asked if we need a committee that
reflects a job description or does that office go to other committees for information. She
suggested the College Council form task forces for things such as the Educational Master
Plan that is done every five years.
Jocelyn Iannucci suggested the group not eliminate any committees until they understood
what are their charges. Tish Young said it is the goal to reduce the number of committees
from what we currently have. Ted Wieden told the group we have to figure out what we
need instead of figuring out what we have.

The group reviewed the charge of the Diversity Committee but the charge overlaps in
academic and professional matters and college-wide matters. Judy Walters suggested a
parking lot for committees that we don’t know what to do with until the integration
discussions.

Laurie Lema said when looking at the committees, keep in mind the priorities for the
College Council are budget, space, and technology. Tish Young suggested adding
diversity.

The group agreed not every college-wide committee needs to be directly tied to college
council. Sue handy suggested the Sustainability and Safety committees be sub-
committees of Facilities.

Kathleen Costa clarified for the group by law, academic and professional matters
includes input and advice from classified and students. It does not mean faculty don’t want to hear from these constituencies but academic and professional matters are decisions made between the Senate and the President. Tish Young added that there are classified members on several Faculty Senate Committees.
Sue Handy summarized the point that even if a committee has it’s “home” under academic and professional matters that there is a way for the entire college to benefit by having area representation, and expertise.

Judy Walters explained Matriculation is mandated by AB1725 and has allocated funds tied to it. They report to the Vice-President of Student Services. But when discussing integration, coordination of instruction and student services needs to be addressed even though matriculation is under Student services. Laurie Lema suggested we find a different way to talk about the “sides of the house” in trying not to silo our areas. Laurie Lema suggested an Academic Council to coordinate and disseminate matters between instruction and student services. Some group members thought this is what the Instructional Council currently does. Tish Young is on the Instructional Council and said they do not have a clear responsibility and not all areas are represented. Sue Handy suggested calling it an Integrated Planning Council. Tish Young said it should be called the Academic Council because if they are charged as an Integrated Planning Council then they are the same as the college council. It must be a broad group that includes student services. She said they could address things that are not tied to a specific program. The group agreed to put this idea in the parking lot.
Kathleen Costa reminded the group we are gaining by including both instruction and student services. Maria Barno proposes group members that understand how this idea would work to write a draft for the group to review and discuss.

Upcoming Integration Meeting:
This item was cancelled due to time constraints.

Around the table:
This item was cancelled due to time constraints.

Other:
This item was cancelled due to time constraints.

Next Meeting:
The next meeting is scheduled on Friday, May 2 from 12-3 in PS 265.

Adjourn:
Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.