

Consortia Report on Governance Compliance of Rules and Procedures

Download and save this Word document, open it and fill in the various fields, print the completed form, sign, scan and email to the AB86 inbox: ab86@cccco.edu. Due by October 31, 2015 or sooner so that we can accept your 15-16 annual plan, consortium allocation schedule, budget, and 1st Quarter expenditure report.

Consortium Name:

Planning Grant Fiscal Agent Name (for tracking purposes only):

Consortium Point Person (or person submitting this document):

Name:

Consortium Role: E-

Mail:

1. Have all community college districts, school districts, or county offices of education, or any joint powers authority consisting of community college districts, school districts, county offices of education, or a combination of these, located within the boundaries of the adult education region been allowed to join the consortium as a member?

[Yes, all eligible agencies have joined the consortium.](#)

2. Have all members committed to reporting any funds available to that member for the purposes of education and workforce services for adults and the uses of those funds? How will the available funds be reported and evaluated?

[Yes, all members have committed to reporting funds used for education and workforce services for adults and have already submitted the data as part of our consortium's internal allocation process. The project director is responsible for general oversight of the available funds, facilitating Steering Committee review and evaluation of the uses of funds, and for any related internal or required reports.](#)

3. How will you assure that each member of the consortium is represented only by an official designated by the governing board of the member?

[Each member agency has identified an officially designated consortium representative using its own approval procedure \(board or superintendent approval\).](#)

4. How will you assure that all members of the consortium shall participate in any decision made by the consortium?

All members of the consortium have committed to attending Steering Committee meetings, Executive Team meetings, and to participating in required electronic communications used in the process of decision-making.

5. What will be the relative voting power of each member?

e.g. 1 member = 1 vote

e.g. 1 institution = 1 vote (thus giving districts with multiple institutions multiple votes)

e.g. Other (e.g., votes proportionate to adult students served)

Consortium representatives have determined that consensus will be the sole decision-making procedure for the time being. The consortium has decided to review voting procedures and relative voting power in winter 2015-16 in order to have a back-up plan in the unlikely event that consensus cannot be reached.

6. How will decisions be approved?

e.g. by majority vote of 51%, or 50% +1 vote, or $\frac{2}{3}$ of votes

e.g. by consensus

The consortium will continue to make decisions by consensus as it has since its inception.

7. How did you arrive at that decision-making model?

Consensus has been the model used since the beginning of the Chabot-Las Positas consortium. In Steering Committee discussions regarding the possible use of a different model, it was decided that the consortium's success is due at least partly to the transparent communication and healthy compromise that the consensus process has supported. Therefore, members agreed to re-commit to the consensus process and used consensus to arrive at that decision in Steering Committee meetings and public meetings of October 21 and October 28.

8. How will proposed decisions be considered in open, properly noticed public meetings of the consortium at which members of the public may comment?

The consortium will notify the public of meetings via emails to stakeholders and public agencies, notifications posted on the consortium website, and postings in strategic locations throughout the region. Public meetings will alternately provide information for comment and present consortium decisions including consideration of public comment.

9. Describe how will you provide the public with adequate notice of a proposed decision and consider any comments submitted by members of the public?

As mentioned above in #8, the consortium will broadcast information about meetings widely through electronic and hardcopy postings with at least a week's notice prior to the meetings. Public comments will be recorded during the meetings and will be forwarded to consortium members for review and consideration. The consortium administrator will gather, analyze and synthesize members' recommendations based on public input, and then recommend potential changes to prospective decisions for further member consideration prior to formal decision-making at Steering Committee meetings.

10. Describe how comments submitted by members of the public will be distributed publicly.

The consortium administrator is responsible for distribution of public comments and will use the same electronic and hardcopy posting communication system outlined above in #8 and #9.

11. Describe the process by which the consortium will solicit and consider comments and input regarding a proposed decision from other entities located in the adult education region that provide education and workforce services for adults. Such entities will include but not necessarily be limited to, local public agencies, departments, and offices, particularly those with responsibility for local public safety and social services; workforce investment boards; libraries; and community-based organizations.

Many of the types of agencies listed above are partners in the consortium and already routinely receive communications and updates; many attend Steering Committee meetings; all receive notices of public meetings. The consortium administrator will seek input from members and partners to identify additional entities to invite to Steering Committee meetings and to public meetings and will continue to seek comments and input by specifically requesting perspectives on proposed decisions in written and verbal communications.

12. How will you determine approval of a distribution schedule pursuant to Section 84913?

The consortium conducted an internal allocation request process through which members asked for funds aligned to consortium objectives. An allocation request review team analyzed all the requests, ensured that major consortium objectives were addressed through well-integrated planned activities, suggested modifications to several requests to ensure AEBG compliance, and presented a recommended distribution schedule to the Steering Committee and the public for discussion and approval. The Steering Committee approved the draft schedule on October 21 and the final on October 28.

13. Has the consortium A) designated a member to serve as the fund administrator to receive and distribute funds from the program or B) chosen to have a funds flow directly to the member districts based upon the approved distribution schedule?

The consortium has opted out of the fund administrator option and has chosen to have funds flow directly to member districts.

14. How will members join, leave, or be dismissed from the consortium?

All known eligible members have joined the consortium. When the two local ROPs were recently identified as eligible by the AEBG office, the consortium administrator notified them and invited them to join; if additional members are identified in the future, the same invitation process will apply.

As monitoring of consortium budgets and activities occurs as required throughout the year, the administrator will bring to the attention of the Executive Committee any evidence of non-compliance, negligence or inactivity on the part of any member for review and discussion. Members requiring assistance will be offered support and an opportunity to rectify any issues prior to any consideration of dismissal, which would occur only in extreme situations and would require consensus of the Steering Committee. Members have the option of leaving the consortium at any time with appropriate notice to the Steering Committee.

15. Does the consortium have a formal document detailing its working beyond the questionnaire?
(Please provide a link)

The consortium does not yet have an updated formal document describing its governance but is likely to develop a comprehensive governance plan when it addresses the issue of voting as mentioned in #5 above.

Consortium Member Signature Block

Name:

Castro Valley Adult and Career Education/CVUSD

Consortia Member:

Susie Passeggi

Email:

spasseggi@cv.k12.ca.us

Date:

October 28, 2015

Signature Box:

Name:

Chabot College/CLPCCD

Consortia Member:

Matt Kritscher

Email:

mkritscher@chabotcollege.edu

Date:

October 28, 2015

Signature Box:

Name: Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

Consortia Member: Julia Dozier

Email: jdozier@clpccd.org

Date: October 28, 2015

Signature Box:

Name: Dublin Adult School/DUSD

Consortia Member: Bill Branca

Email: brancabill@dublinusd.org

Date: October 28, 2015

Signature Box:

Name: Eden ROP

Consortia Member: Stefanie Bradshaw

Email: sbradshaw@edenrop.org

Date: October 28, 2015

Signature Box:

Name:

Hayward Center for Education and Careers/HUSD

Consortia Member:

Guy Zakrevsky

Email:

gzakrevsky@has.edu

Date:

October 28, 2015

Signature Box:

Name:

Las Positas College/CLPCCD

Consortia Member:

Roanna Bennie

Email:

rbennie@laspositascollege.edu

Date:

October 28, 2015

Signature Box:

Name:

Livermore Adult Education/LVJUSD

Consortia Member:

MaryAnn Frates

Email:

mfrates@lvjUSD.k12.ca.us

Date:

October 28, 2015

Signature Box:

Name:

Consortia Member:

Email:

Date:

Signature Box: