

Q8. 8. What gaps (if any) in systems need to be addressed in order to support the planning efforts, research needs, or communication issues necessary for this committee to function more effectively?

1	The biggest issues with this work group is that the Academic Senates must recognize that they are represented at this committee by their appropriate representatives. It creates problems when recommendations are made to DCAA and the Academic Senates then feel they have to vet the procedures at Senate meetings. The vetting at the colleges should happen at the time the procedures are being developed through DTRW-SS. Then they come through DCAA and can move through the process. DCAA is for the larger instructional and student service issues - the crafting of the future, not to redo what DTRW-SS (and I) have already done.	Mar 25, 2013 10:28 AM
2	None.	Mar 18, 2013 10:37 PM
3	None	Mar 16, 2013 10:01 AM
4	More formalized communication regarding decisions made at DCAA that affect DTRW-SS	Mar 14, 2013 1:41 PM
5	The role of DCAA and the flow of the Administrative Procedures (APs) was confusing this year.	Mar 13, 2013 11:22 AM
6	Members should review the agenda packet prior to attending the meeting and their submissions should not be hand carried to the meetings. Handouts at meetings invite confusion regarding the versions of submissions. They should also indicate the version they are presenting by putting it in the footer of their document.	Mar 13, 2013 10:12 AM

Q9. 9. Discuss agenda items that need completion, items for future consideration by the committee, and/or changes needed to improve the effectiveness of this committee.

1	See #8 above. I think this is a very functional group, but the Academic Senates need to trust their colleagues to do their work, vet it on campus to the appropriate groups, and then allow it to move through the process.	Mar 25, 2013 10:28 AM
2	Continue review and refinement of policies, especially related to the student code of conduct.	Mar 18, 2013 10:37 PM
3	Most of the policies and procedures in Chapter 5 have been reviewed in time for the two year accreditation review cycle, however, there are a few lingering items as a few of the members are requesting more time for constituent feedback or have not finished their items that were delegated to them by the Chair of the workgroup.	Mar 13, 2013 10:12 AM