

Citrus College District Consortium
 Certification of Eligibility Status Meeting
 Meeting Minutes – January 13, 2014

Time: 10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.
 Locale: Citrus College, Technology and Engineering Building – Room 114
 Facilitator: John Russell, Monrovia Community Adult School
 Invitees: Felipe Delvasto, Claremont Adult School; Flint Fertig, Monrovia Community Adult School; Sue Kaiser, Monrovia USD; Mary Ketz, Azusa Adult School; Jim Lancaster, Citrus College; Jim Moore, Azusa USD; Kevin Morris, Duarte; Joyce Roys-Aguilerra, Office of State Senator Carol Lui; Rebecca Summers, Glendora Adult School; Debbie Vanschoelandt, Citrus College

Minutes by Agenda Items

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
Item 1.0	<p>Call to order:</p> <p>1.1 Present were John Russell, Felipe Delvasto, Flint Fertig, Mary Ketz, Jim Lancaster, Jim Moore, Joyce Roys-Aguilerra, Rebecca Summers, Debbie Vanschoelandt</p> <p>1.2 Members reviewed and approved proposed agenda.</p>
Item 2.0	<p>Review Pre-COE Process to Date</p> <p>2.1 John outlined that at the 11/18/13 initial meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • members discussed the five categories and how each institution served students from those categories. • members discussed the seven objectives the consortium needed to accomplish in regards to each category. • Monrovia agreed to create a pre-COE template to be used to gather data for each of the seven objectives. <p>John discussed that though the COE templates for the seven objectives are different than the pre-plan ones, much of the initial data requested is the same.</p> <p>2.2 John outlined that at the 12/16/13 meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • members shared out initial data collected for the pre-plan template. • an election was held and members decided Monrovia would be the Regional Fiscal Agent. • an election was held and members decided that Monrovia would chair Grant Coordination Committee and would take the lead on writing the planning grant. <p>John stated that formal minutes for the 11/18 and 12/16 meetings would be generated and presented for approval at the next meeting.</p>

Item 3.0**Certification of Eligibility Review**

- 3.1 Overview – John stated that it is important that all members understand that the two most critical outcomes for adults served in all consortium programs is to transition to postsecondary education or the workforce.
- John stated that the grant is non-competitive, that the consortium will get some level of funding and then the consortium will need to demonstrate that it deserves to continue to receive funding.
 - This point was reiterated by Joyce from a governmental point-of-view, saying that everyone will get funded but funding will be distributed by the quality of the grant presented.
 - Problem with “campers” needs to be addressed because they are not transitioning.
 - Importance of a survey mechanism to gather survey data to identify career and academic goals was discussed.
- 3.2 John noted that the data members collected before the COE was released has dovetailed with the data for which the COE is asking.
- 3.2.1 Members went through Appendix C (pp. 20 – 39) in a detailed fashion
- Objective 1 – Enrollment numbers were discussed. It was noted that members need to analyze cost of instruction in addition to enrollment.
 - Objective 1 – Flint stated that as a consortium we needed to make sure that we had accurate enrollment data because the CDE has accurate numbers. Members need to make sure it is unduplicated enrollment from the five categories, and does not include concurrent high school and ROP enrollments.
 - Objective 2 – Importance of getting regional economic data. It was discussed to use some of the the budget to pay for Citrus College’s economic survey instrument. Jim stated that it is called EMSI and he would provide more info on it.
 - Objective 2 – Joyce discussed in terms of partnerships that the San Gabriel Valley Economic Group wanted to partner with us.
 - Objective 5 – Plan to accelerate adult students needs to focus on three strategies outlined in COE: accelerated, competency-based, and contextual. Discussion focused on benchmarks to accelerate ASE students.
 - Objective 6 – Need for Professional Development that addresses these three strategies.
 - Objective 7 – Need for members to discuss.
- 3.3 John reviewed Consortium Eligibility and Criteria and proposed a working name for the consortium as the Citrus College District Consortium (CCDC).
- 3.4 John reviewed initial important dates
- 3.4.1 COE Cover Sheet, Due 1/31/14 – John advised that Monrovia would send this well before 1/31.
- 3.4.2 Member Signature Forms – Citrus, Azusa, and Glendora gave Monrovia their signed forms.

	<p>3.4.3 John advised that Project Management Plan, Preliminary Due, and Member Signature Forms are due 2/24/14.</p> <p>3.4.4 John advised that the Preliminary Budget Summary had only seven line items.</p> <p>3.5 John advised that Monrovia will handle the submission process properly.</p> <p>3.6 John reviewed key dates pointing out Plans-to-date are due 7/31/14, 10/31/14 and that the Regional Draft plan is due 12/31/14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At this point there was an important discussion about what the funding levels would be after the planning period (i.e. for the 2015-2016). While the legislature’s budget for adult is still unknown, it is the understanding of the members that funding for the 2015-2016 school year would be comparable to 2008-2009 levels. Members were unclear about the amount of that funding. Would it be 2008-2009 funding based only on the five categories or all ADA for adult education programs? • Joyce was going to seek clarification on this matter. • Members discussed how trying to create a plan without understanding funding amounts is very difficult from a staffing report. • Also, members discussed whether Parent Ed would receive funding.
<p>Item 4.0</p>	<p>Project Management Plan</p> <p>4.1 – 4.4 John reviewed the four areas addressed in Project Management Plan: Organizational Structure, Shared Leadership, Project Planning, Communication</p> <p>John again reiterated that the outcomes of consortium programs need to focus on transition to postsecondary and employment. This led to a very robust discussion about planning for students that do not progress.</p> <p>Rebecca expressed concern about community members that did not fit into that focus, that those who “wanted to learn English better to be more functional in the community or help their students with their homework” would not be served.</p> <p>Flint discussed that type community members would need to be addressed through CBET funds.</p> <p>Mary discussed how it is difficult to separate out those users and that it could be done with by checking a box on the CASAS form.</p> <p>John also discussed how the 231 WIA grant would also address those students</p> <p>Both Felipe and Rebecca discussed how “campers” are a large percentage of their students, which is a concern in light of what this grant does.</p> <p>Jim L. discussed that a wage gain could be used as indicator of success.</p> <p>Mary wanted to know how we would generate that data.</p> <p>John and Flint proposed tracking it through survey data.</p> <p>Jim L. mentioned that there was a system that was tracking that kind of data (need clarification on this).</p> <p>A discussion between Flint and Jim M. led to the hope that moving a student incrementally through the system would provide benchmarks that would lead to funding. The key takeaway was again, “campers” will not lead to funding.</p>

	<p>4.1 – 4.4 John discussed the importance of making the partnership list more robust. Jim L mentioned that he would email to John some Citrus College partners. Rebecca asked about where ROP was in terms of serving as a partner in the planning process and it was discussed that they are in their own competitive grant process and that they should not be included.</p> <p>The members discussed potential ways to organize committee planning and leadership.</p> <p>Jim L. proposed two different structures: 1) where the Committee of the Whole is a Steering Committee and each institution is responsible for all five categories and seven objectives from an institutional point of view or 2) break up into sub-committees based on the five categories and member staff come together and work together,</p> <p>John said option 1 sounded more organic, but...</p> <p>Jim mentioned that option 2 would be more long standing and would generate more interaction and collaboration. Jim did mention that from a staffing point of view, option 2 may be more difficult.</p> <p>Jim M mentioned that you could potentially use both points of view depending on agenda and what needed to be done. No decision was made, but it was decided to be addressed at the next meeting.</p> <p>John mentioned the possibility of creating an advisory board in terms of regional economic input.</p> <p>Jim L. felt that was premature until we determined gaps and had a clear purpose for the advisory board.</p> <p>John outlined the role of the Grant Coordination Committee as outlined in the Project Management Plan.</p> <p>John outlined comprehensive communication system.</p> <p>A discussion about partnerships outlined ways each institution can reach out to partners.</p> <p>Rebecca made a great suggestion – even though Glendora does not have CTE classes, they could discuss with Glendora’s Chamber of Commerce about working with</p>
<p>Item 5.0</p>	<p>Budget Discussions</p> <p>5.1 John discussed that planning grant was for \$211,056</p> <p>5.2-5.7 John went through the seven line items in the budget.</p> <p>Flint and John went through the rough budget proposal. A copy of that budget will be included in the official minutes. Members were going to analyze budget and return for further discussions</p>
<p>Item 6.0</p>	<p>Dealing with Questions</p> <p>6.1 John outlined webinars and FAQs on AB86 website</p>
	<p>Meeting came to close and next meeting was scheduled for January 27, 2014 for 10:00-12:00 at Citrus at TE 114</p>