



**GRANT 13-328-09
CITRUS COLLEGE DISTRICT CONSORTIUM
FINAL REGIONAL PLAN 3.1.15**

CCDC Members:

**Citrus College
Azusa Unified School District
Claremont Unified School District
Duarte Unified School District
Glendora Unified School District
Monrovia Unified School District**

Table of Contents

Preface: CCDC Member Contact Information	iv
Preface: CCDC Partner Contact Information	v
Chapter I: Executive Summary.....	1
Executive Summary of the CCDC Regional Plan.....	1
Chapter II: Description of the Citrus College District Consortium Region.....	4
Regional Demographics	4
Regional Economic Profile.....	9
Institutional Demographics	10
Chapter III: CCDC Structure, Leadership, Faculty Involvement and Communication	15
Progression of Organizational Structure	15
Shared Leadership	15
Faculty Involvement.....	17
Communication	17
Chapter IV: Initial Data	18
Executive Summary of Data Gathering.....	18
Chapter V: Objective #1 – Services & Programs Currently Provided by CCDC Members	21
Current Services for Five Program Areas	21
Academic and High School Programs.....	21
English Language Learners	22
Adults with Disabilities.....	23
Career Technical Programs	24
Apprenticeship Programs.....	25
Overview: What the Data from the Tables Reveals.....	25
Chapter VI: Objective #2 – Evaluation of Current Needs for CCDC Members	27

Needs by Five Program Areas.....	27
Assessment of Needs Unmet	28
Regional Data Sources.....	30
Chapter VII: Objective #3 – CCDC Plan to Integrate Existing Programs.....	32
Guiding Principles	32
Phases to Create Consortium-wide Integration Plan.....	33
Integration Plans	36
Integration Plan for Program #1 – ASE and ABE	36
Integration Plan for Program #2 – Classes for Immigrants.....	38
Integration Plan for Program #4 – Career Tech	40
Sharing Consortium Data on Progress Indicators	42
Transition Strategies.....	42
ASE / ABE Articulation Agreements	42
Table 3.1	43
Chapter VIII: Objective #4 – CCDC Response to Gaps Identified.....	48
Program and Service Gaps by Program	48
Apprenticeship Programs.....	48
Resources Needed to Implement Capacity Building Strategies	49
Table 4.1	50
Chapter IX: Objective #5 – CCDC Plans to Accelerate Student Progress	54
Comprehensive Plan to Accelerate Student Achievement of Academic and Career Goals	54
Table 5.1	60
Chapter X: Objective #6 – CCDC Plans to Collaborate in Ongoing Professional Development	65
Comprehensive Plan for Ongoing Professional Development.....	65
Table 6.1 Current Professional Development.....	67
Table 6.2 Collaborative Professional Development Plan	68

Chapter XI: Objective #7 – CCDC Plans to Leverage Existing Regional Structures	69
Comprehensive Plan to Leverage Existing Regional Structures	69
Table 7.1	72

Preface: CCDC Member Contact Information

Monrovia Community Adult School

920 S. Mountain Ave.
Monrovia, CA 91016
Tel: (626) 471-3035
Fax: (626) 471-3036

AB86 Project Coordinators:
Flint Fertig, Director of Adult Ed
(626)471-3065

ffertig@monroviaschools.net

John Russell, Asst. Principal
(626) 471-3002

jrussell@monroviaschools.net

Citrus College

1000 W. Foothill Blvd.
Glendora, CA 91741
Tel: (626) 852-8022

Jim Lancaster
Dean of Curriculum, Career/Technical, &
Continuing Education

jlancaster@citruscollege.edu

Debbie Vanschoelandt
Supervisor, Continuing Education

dvanschoelandt@citruscollege.edu

Azusa Adult School

1134 S. Barranca Ave.
Glendora, CA 91740
Tel: (626) 852-8400
Fax: (626) 852-8407

Mary Ketza
Director of Adult Education

mketza@azusa.org

Claremont Adult School

170 W. San Jose Ave
Claremont, CA 91711
Tel: (909) 624-6402 ext. 4002

Felipe Delvasto
Coordinator of Alternative Education
and Nutrition Services

(909) 398-0609 ext. 40001

fdelvasto@cusd.claremont.edu

Glendora Adult School

301 S. Lorraine Ave.
Glendora, CA 91741
Tel: (626) 852-4586
Fax: (626) 852-4519

Rebecca Summers
Director of Curriculum & Instruction,
Staff Development, and Categorical
Programs

(626) 963-1611 ext. 327

rsummers@glendora.k12.ca.us

Duarte Adult School

1400 Mt. Olive Dr.
Duarte, CA 91010
Tel: (626) 599-5902
Fax: (626) 599-5984

Kevin Morris
Principal, Alternative Programs

kmorris@duarteusd.org

Preface: CCDC Partner Contact Information

Foothill Workforce Investment Board

1207 East Green Street
Pasadena, CA 91106
Tel: (626) 584-8395
Fax: (626) 584-8375

Phillip L. Dunn
Executive Director
pdunn@ci.pasadena.ca.us

San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership

4900 Rivergrade Road Suite B130
Irwindale, CA 91706
Tel: (626) 852-3400
Fax: (626) 856-5115

Brad Jensen
Director of Public Policy
bjensen@valleyconnect.com

Business Education and Community Outreach Network (BEACON)

620 South Myrtle Avenue
Monrovia, CA 91016
Tel: (626) 253-0072

Becky Shevlin
City Councilmember
beckyshevlin@gmail.com

Monrovia Public Library

321 S. Myrtle Avenue
Monrovia, CA 91016
Tel: (626) 256-8273
Fax: (626) 256-8255

Edward William
Literacy Coordinator
ewilliam@ci.monrovia.ca.us

Azusa City Library

729 North Dalton Avenue
Azusa, CA 91702
Tel: (626) 812-5232
Fax: (626) 334-4868

Cathay Reta
Adult Literacy Coordinator
creta@ci.azusa.ca.us

Santa Anita YMCA

501 South Mountain Avenue
Monrovia, CA 91016
Tel: (626) 359-9244
Fax: (626) 359-9247

Karen MacNair
Associate Executive Director
karenmacnair@ymcala.org

City of Azusa

213 East Foothill Boulevard
Azusa, CA 91702
Tel: (626) 812-5228

Joseph Rocha
Mayor
jrocha@ci.azusa.ca.us

Azusa Senior Center

740 North Dalton Avenue
Monrovia, CA 91016
Tel: (626) 812-5204
Fax: (626) 969-5611

Lenore Gonzales
Recreation Supervisor-Senior Services
lmgonzales@ci.azusa.ca.us

Preface: CCDC Partner Contact Information

Mt. Sierra College

101 East Huntington Drive
Monrovia, CA 91016
Tel: (626) 873-2120
Fax: (626) 359-5528

Tawny Hernandez
Director of Career Services
thernandez@mtsierra.edu

The California Association of School Counselors, Inc.

P.O. Box 1647
Duarte, CA 91009
Tel: (909) 815-5222
Fax: (951) 525-3078

Loretta Whitson
Executive Director
ExecutiveDirector@schoolcounselor-ca.org

Glendora Public Library

140 S. Glendora Avenue
Glendora, CA 91741
Tel: (626) 852-4896
Fax: (626) 914-8221

Janet Stone
Library Director
jstone@glendoralibrary.org

Harvey Mudd College

301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Tel: (909) 607-4015

Brian Gray
Assistant Director for Community Engagement
bgray@hmc.edu

Rowland Convalescent Hospital

330 West Rowland Street
Covina, CA 91723
Tel: (626) 967-2741
Fax: (626) 332-3781

Anthony Kalomas
Owner/Director

Citrus Valley Health Partners

140 West College Street
Covina, CA 91723
Tel: (626) 331-7331

Lourdes Salandanan
Director of Education
LSalandanan@mail.cvhp.org

Sierra Pharmacy

210 South Grand Avenue Suite 116
Glendora, CA 91741
Tel: (626) 335-2300
Fax: (626) 914-0713

Michael Globerman
President

Santa Teresita Hospital

819 Buena Street
Duarte, CA 91010
Tel: (626) 359-3242
Fax: (626) 932-3410

Sister Marie Estelle
Dir. of Staff Development
dsd@santa-teresita.org

Chapter I: Executive Summary

Executive Summary of the CCDC Regional Plan

This Citrus College District Consortium Regional Plan represents tremendous collaboration and effort by all CCDC members and their agents. During the previous sixteen months, consortium administration, faculty and staff have diligently worked together, progressing from data gathering to strategic planning to professional development to early implementation of the plan. As members have engaged in the difficult work of systems integration so that adults served by members can seamlessly transition to postsecondary education or careers, a Regional Plan has emerged that represents true positive change in the way consortium members plan to educate adults.

Guiding Principles

The CCDC member process to create and implement this Regional Plan was driven by three guiding principles shared by all CCDC members: an aversion to bureaucracy, positive, vigorous engagement in collaboration from all stakeholders, and respect of individual institutional autonomy. The CCDC AB86 planning process has invariably been streamlined and efficient: burdensome or superfluous committee structures were not created and outside consultants were not hired to drive the process. That efficient approach will continue to drive implementation of this plan. Also, the cooperation between the Community College member and the K-12 members from administration, staff and instructors was unparalleled. Our team had heard of the difficulties other consortia had in the planning process, but that was simply not the case for the CCDC. All CCDC members, including certificated and classified staff from both institutional worlds, would definitely say that their voices have been heard in all stages of the planning process and those collaborative efforts have yielded true change in members' approach to serving our population. Finally, CCDC members have agreed individual institutions must have a level of autonomy. Each partner serves a unique population with special needs and circumstances. CCDC members recognize the individual efforts over the years to cater to the geographic footprints each of them serves. There is a goal for uniformity and easy transition between institutions. Industry and curricular standards will uniformly drive pathways, but the approach each member takes to address these standards will be respected within the consortium, as long as institutional data reflects success.

Executive Findings

This Regional Plan, informed and driven by extensive data, calls for significant member integrations in data collection, curriculum articulation, resource utilization, student

acceleration, professional development and partner interaction. The Executive Findings of this Regional Plan are summarized below:

- Data demonstrates that unduplicated enrollment for CCDC members dropped 50% in the aggregate from the 2008-2009 school year to the 2013-2014 school year and members believe this is due to budget cuts.
- Data suggests the need for consortium educational services is compelling. In the fourteen cities served by the CCDC members, 97,928 adults over 25 do not have a high school diploma and approximately 115,000 adults over 25 have a high school diploma, but no postsecondary education. Also, 150,982 adults speak English “Less Than Very Well” and 251,946 adults are “Foreign Born.” Finally, though the regional economy is improving, unemployment rates for the region are slightly higher than the state.
- Going forward all CCDC members will collect uniform demographic and enrollment information about their students and share this information on a regular basis. Correcting data collection procedures has been an important outcome from the AB86 planning process.
- CCDC members have uniformly established measures to better address initial assessment data for incoming students. Institutional autonomy allows for differentiation in assessments, but all K-12 programs are uniformly using TABE and CASAS testing as a direct result of this planning process.
- Consortium leadership structures have grown to accommodate the input of all stakeholders and to address the goals of AB86. The original CCDC Committee of the Whole and Data Analysis Sub-Committee evolved into a Steering Committee structure to honor institutional autonomy. Faculty Advisory Committees were eventually formed to address curriculum integration with great success. An Allocation Committee was formed to handle the allocation of resources.
- All member ASE and ABE programs have articulated uniform standards alignment. All CCDC ASE programs have purchased the same online curriculum and are creating common challenge assessments to accelerate student attainment of secondary diplomas.
- Both K-12 and Community College ESL programs have articulated uniform curriculum standards such that there is a clear understanding of program level advancement for all ESL programs. While all programs may not have the identical number of levels, articulation has clearly identified how CCDC members can link a student in the level from one program to the level of another program.

- All CCDC CTE programs have articulated uniform industry-driven standards. CCDC members are using powerful data tools from EMSI and SGVEP data to drive the creation of programs. Creation or continuation of CTE programs is being determined through data-driven consortium-wide committees and processes.
- CCDC members have taken a uniform approach to professional development focusing on accelerated and contextualized strategies. While there is still work needed to push instruction and programs to the level for which members are striving, the foundation has been set to achieve measureable goals.
- A consortium website, www.sgvccdc.edu.org , is under construction that will serve two purposes. Through a member login, it will be a depository for all consortium communication, agendas, minutes, and committee decisions. Also, it will serve as common advertising for the consortium to educate the public on the meaningful career and educational opportunities the consortium is working to provide.
- All members have leveraged the Work Investment Board, economic partnerships, local libraries, community organizations, and local governments as partners in an attempt to grow efforts to address the needs of adults they serve.

The exhaustive efforts CCDC members have made in creating this plan will be matched by extensive work to implement the changes it calls for in the 2015-2016 school year.

Chapter II: Description of the Citrus College District Consortium Region

Regional Demographics

The Citrus College District Consortium (CCDC) is comprised of six institutional members: Citrus College, Azusa USD, Claremont USD, Duarte USD, Glendora USD, and Monrovia USD. Approximately 90% – 95% of the adult students served by CCDC live in fourteen municipalities and the unincorporated areas surrounding those cities along an approximate 28 mile corridor of Interstate 210 in the San Gabriel Valley. The area is bounded by Pasadena to the west and Upland to the east and West Covina, Covina and Pomona to the south.

In analyzing the consortium region, CCDC members have utilized 2010 census data, recent Bureau of Labor Statistics and the San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership (SGVEP) *2014 Regional Overview*. In order to grasp a global perspective of the region, CCDC members felt the most important characteristics to analyze were total adult population, census data on educational attainment, place of birth and language spoken at home, most recent city unemployment rates and San Gabriel Valley ethnic breakdown. As Table 8 on the next page demonstrates, in the fourteen cities of the CCDC region the total population of citizens over the age of 18 is 663,604 and the total population of adults over the age of 25 is 555,769. Thus, the six institutions of the CCDC region serve quite a significantly sized adult population.

Table 8 also speaks to the critical need of improving educational outcomes for the residents in the CCDC region. The table indicates that 52,020 of adults over the age of 25 have less than a 9th grade education and 45,908 have a 9th to 12th grade education, but no diploma. As nearly 100,000 individuals over the age of 25 in the CCDC region do not have a high school diploma, the member institutions are very aware of the critical mission to address this need. Additionally, almost 115,000 adults have only a high school diploma and no postsecondary education, and another 121,296 have some college, but no diploma. Thus, approximately 236,000 adults in the region are potential candidates that could benefit from AB86 collaboration and linkages. By examining this educational attainment data, CCDC members better recognized the vital need for the ASE and ABE services our institutions provide in the five program areas.

In addition to aggregate totals, CCDC members wanted to focus on those cities where a high percentage of the adult population has not earned a high school diploma. Table 9, on the page after, demonstrates the aggregate data from Table 8 by percentages. CCDC members identified four cities that had percentages of adults without a high school diploma that are near 20% and higher: Duarte (19.3%), Azusa (24.9%), Montclair

(31.3%) and Pomona (35.8%). CCDC members are more aware of cities in the region that have a greater need for ABE and ASE programs.

Table 8 – Population 18 or older, Older than 25 and Educational Attainment by CCDC City*

	Pasadena	Arcadia	Monrovia	Duarte	Azusa	West Covina	Covina	Glendora	San Dimas	La Verne	Pomona	Claremont	Mntclr.	Upland	Total
Educational Attainment	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	
18 or older	111,893	44,049	36,598	16,618	34,446	79,215	35,306	38,012	26,858	24,590	105,404	28,077	26,896	55,642	663,604
Older than 25	98,720	39,610	24,900	14,960	25,277	67,854	30,394	32,567	23,245	21,180	84,661	21,581	22,601	48,219	555,769
Less than 9th grade	9,274	1,914	1,716	1,753	3,676	5,426	1,823	1,209	797	467	17,236	630	3,567	2,532	52,020
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	6,015	1,575	1,102	1,137	2,586	6,557	2,464	2,078	1,056	1,211	12,216	941	3,493	3,477	45,908
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	13,442	5,934	5,326	3,767	7,217	15,579	7,425	6,882	4,976	4,493	20,837	2,367	6,429	10,181	114,855
Some college, no degree	16,692	5,804	5,683	3,054	4,977	16,729	8,487	9,840	6,204	5,965	15,445	4,033	4,793	13,590	121,296

*Based on 2010 US Census

Table 9 – Percentage of Educational Attainment by CCDC City*

	Pasadena	Arcadia	Monrovia	Duarte	Azusa	West Covina	Covina	Glendora	San Dimas	La Verne	Pomona	Claremont	Mntclr.	Upland
Educational Attainment	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
Older than 25	98,720	39,610	24,900	14,960	25,277	67,854	30,394	32,567	23,245	21,180	84,661	21,581	22,601	48,219
Less than 9th grade	9.4%	4.8%	6.9%	11.7%	14.6%	8.0%	6.0%	3.7%	3.4%	2.2%	20.4%	2.9%	15.8%	5.3%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	6.1%	4.0%	4.4%	7.6%	10.3%	9.7%	8.1%	6.4%	4.5%	5.7%	14.4%	4.4%	15.5%	7.2%
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	13.6%	15.0%	21.4%	25.2%	28.6%	23.0%	24.4%	21.1%	21.4%	21.2%	24.6%	11.0%	28.4%	21.1%
Some college, no degree	16.9%	14.7%	22.8%	20.4%	19.7%	24.6%	27.9%	27.8%	26.7%	28.2%	18.2%	18.7%	21.2%	28.2%

*Based on 2010 US Census

Since CCDC members provide numerous programs for immigrants, CCDC members wanted to analyze two different census categories to understand the size of the population that could benefit from these services. Members wanted to analyze what percent of the region was foreign born and that spoke English Less Than “Very Well.” The total population that spoke English Less Than “Very Well” for the fourteen municipalities was 150,982, a total that represented 22.8% percent of the population over the age of 18. The population of foreign born individuals was even higher: 251,946 individuals identified in the 2010 census as Foreign Born. That total represents 38.3% of the region’s population over 18.

Members then drilled down into this data a little further. We focused on those cities with percentage rates higher than 20% for the category Speaks English Less Than “Very Well.” Six cities in the CCDC region met that criteria: Arcadia (29.6%), Azusa (23.6%), Duarte (22.8%), Montclair (31.2%), Pomona (28.6%),and West Covina (20.6%). We discussed the importance of improving outreach efforts to those cities. Recognizing that the region has 150,000 individuals with poor English skills and 250,000 individuals born in a foreign country, members realize the enormity of services that need to be provided in the region. Table 10 on the next page details the data from the 2010 US Census.

Table 10 – Language Spoken and Foreign Born inCCDC Region by City

City	Speaks English Less Than “Very Well” Total	Speaks English Less Than “Very Well” %	Foreign Born Total	Foreign Born % Rate
Arcadia	15,944	29.6%	27,012	47.8%
Azusa	10,205	23.6%	14,439	31.0%
Claremont	2,350	7.0%	6,371	18.2%
Covina	3,561	8.1%	10,647	22.7%
Duarte	4,591	22.8%	7,287	34.0%
Glendora	3,839	8.1%	7,477	14.9%
La Verne	2,106	7.0%	4,419	14.2%
Montclair	10,560	31.2%	14,126	38.3%
Monrovia	4,519	13.3%	9,139	24.9%
Pasadena	23,319	18.0%	41,967	30.6%
Pomona	39,482	28.6%	51,583	34.5%
San Dimas	2,812	8.8%	7,369	22.0%
West Covina	19,896	20.1%	36,159	34.0%
Upland	7,798	11.2%	13,951	18.5%
TOTALS	150,982	22.8%*	251,946	38.0%*

(2010 US Census Data)

* = percent of citizens 18 or older (2010 US Census Data)

CCDC members also analyzed regional ethnic data. Instead of using valuable time investigating demographic data from each regional municipality, members analyzed demographic data from the entire San Gabriel Valley. Table 11 below depicts ethnic breakdowns for the San Gabriel Valley obtained from US census data and California Department of Finance and cited by the SGVEP in its *2014 Regional Overview* (14).

Table 11 – Ethnic Breakdown for San Gabriel Valley

Race	% of Population
African-American	3.5%
Asian	26.7%
Hispanic	45.2%
White	21.0%
Other (includes American Indian, Pacific Islander, Two or more races)	3.1%

(San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership, 2014 Overview)

That nearly 75% of the population in the San Gabriel Valley was either Hispanic or Asian was most notable to CCDC members. This was not surprising as these are the two largest ethnicities served for both the K-12 and community college CCDC members. A further analysis of institutional demographics is presented in the next section.

Regional Economic Profile

In addition to educational attainment, CCDC members endeavored to consider unemployment rates for the fourteen cities in the CCDC region. Members have thoroughly bought into the notion that all consortium resources and practices must be brought to bear on two vital outcomes: postsecondary education and the workforce. It is of the utmost importance that the CCDC members integrate existing programs to provide adult students seamless transitions to the workforce, therefore members have needed to analyze overall unemployment rates. This was especially critical as the region recovers from the worst recession in decades. Table 12 demonstrates unemployment rates for the fourteen cities in the CCDC region as of May 2014 (BLS May 2014).

Table 12 – Unemployment Rates of CCDC Region by City

City	Unemployment Rate
Arcadia	4.5%
Azusa	8.7%
Claremont	4.1%
Covina	5.6%
Duarte	8.0%
Glendora	4.1%
La Verne	4.5%
Montclair	7.6%
Monrovia	7.0%
Pasadena	6.0%
Pomona	8.9%
San Dimas	4.6%
West Covina	7.0%
Upland	5.6%

(May 2014, Bureau of Labor Statistics)

Members discussed the importance of improving outreach efforts to those cities near our institutions with unemployment rates 7% or greater. Thus, Azusa, Duarte, Montclair, Monrovia, Pomona, and West Covina were identified as cities with which members needed to improve communicative efforts. CCDC members noted that those cities with the highest unemployment rates (Azusa, Duarte, Montclair and Pomona), also had the highest percentages of the adult population without a high school diploma.

Institutional Demographics

The simple process of member institutions providing demographic data for their student population quickly brought to light that members have disparate data collection systems. Because it uses Banner, Citrus College was able to quickly provide detailed demographic data over three years that included retention and success rates by program and ethnicity. Citrus administration did note one limitation in what Banner collects: respondent choices for ethnicity are not as expansive as they should be. The administration's belief is that many respondents do not fit in the available categories, which limits the data's effectiveness. It is the CCDC's suggestion that the state add the category "Other" so that Citrus could measure where existing categories fall short in describing respondents' ethnicity.

One issue with Citrus demographic data is that the total number of students was different than the numbers included in Table 1.1A (substantially higher for program area #1 and slightly lower for program area #2). There are a few reasons for this.

Demographic data for Citrus College credit courses is generated at the program level. Therefore, the data represented for Category #1 Credit Basic Skills is of **all** students in English and Math, including students below college level and those on-level. This issue is further discussed at length in Chapter III. Noncredit demographic data has been disaggregated by apportionment area.

Despite these slight inconsistencies, CCDC members analyzed the percentages by ethnic breakdown and felt that they decently represented Citrus student demographics. Hispanics were by far the largest ethnicity at 55.7%, followed by Whites at 18.1% and Asians at 14.2%. The demographic data for Citrus College 2012-13 is available in Table 13 below:

Table 13: 2012-2013 Citrus College Enrollment by Program and Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Pac. Islander	2 or more	Unkwn	White	Total
Category 1 Basic Skills Credit	1,949	888	10,767	42	40	500	695	3,473	18,354
Category 1 Basic Skills Non-Credit	148	103	1,338	0	17	14	329	276	2,225
Category 2 Immigrants Credit	900	7	143	0	0	2	44	66	1,162
Category 2 Immigrants Non-credit	181	5	273	0	1	0	30	143	633
Category 3 Disabilities	6	0	44	0	0	3	0	18	71
Category 4 CTE Non-Credit	46	37	15	256	3	190	81	19	647
Category 5 Apprentice	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0
TOTAL	3,216	1,012	12,650	42	58	519	1,117	4,106	22,720
Percent of Total	14.2%	4.5%	55.7%	0.2%	0.3%	2.3%	4.9%	18.1%	

Note: Demographic Data for Citrus College credit courses is generated at the program level. Therefore, the data represented for credit basic skills is of all students in English and Math (below college level and on-level students). Noncredit demographic data has been disaggregated by apportionment area.

Adult ed institutions were not able to provide quality demographic data due to a variety of reasons. First of all, two of the K-12 institutions are not big enough to use ASAP, the standard adult education data system. One of these smaller members did provide accurate data from CASAS, but the data did have one problem in that 25% of students left the question of ethnicity blank, choosing not to respond to the question. This same problem existed with two of the consortium's larger institutions that do use ASAP. Thus, the second largest category in the ethnic breakdown is "Blank" (19.3%). Through the course of communications and meetings, members do recognize this as an issue that needs to be addressed. Though collections systems may differ, a uniform approach to data collection will now be the consortium standard. After extensive discussions,

members have agreed to uniform data collection standards in the area of student demographics.

One other aspect of the K-12 ethnic data needs to be further explained. ASAP may provide dissimilar results depending on the parameters of the report requested. That is the case when comparing unduplicated enrollment numbers (report #2.46) to demographics (report #4.13a). For example, in Table 1.1A, as pulled from report #2.46, Monrovia states total unduplicated enrollment for 2013-14 as 2,335 (category 1 – 573, category 2 – 1,254, and category 4 – 508). However, when running demographic reports from report #4.13a, only 1,756 students are totaled in the report. This is due to the same student participating in more than one program. K-12 adult ed partners believe that it is accurate to use the unduplicated enrollment for Table 1.1A because those students are utilizing services in each of the programs in which they participate.

This does cast a light on the disparate data collection methods that lead to different member approaches just in analyzing enrollment and demographics. Citrus College's demographic data included students that attended multiple quarters, while K-12 institutional demographic data included unique enrollment (even if a student participated in more than one program). For Table 1.1A purposes, the converse was true. Citrus College used unduplicated enrollment (i.e. a student that may have attended multiple quarters was only counted once) and K-12 counted a student every time he or she participated in a different program. To further complicate matters, Citrus College data included adults enrolled in basic education who are outside the purvey of AB86.

Despite these issues, CCDC members have some confidence in the percentages revealed in K-12 demographic. At 49.3%, the Hispanic population was by far the largest for the K-12 adult ed institutions. Asians represented 13.7% and Whites represented 12.1%. The population of these three largest groups closely resembled the breakdown revealed by Citrus College's breakdown (Asian population is almost equal). K-12 members believe that reducing the percent of "Blanks" would increase the percentage of Hispanic population to be very similar to Citrus as well. Table 14 below has the K-12 ethnic breakdown by AB86 program.

Table 14: 2013-2014 K-12 Adult Enrollment by Program and Ethnicity

	Am. Indian	Asian	Black	Filipino	Hispanic	Pac. Islander	White	Unsp. (Blnk)	Other	Total
Category 1 ABE, ASE	5	57	63	15	1,032	3	226	265	17	1,683
Category 2 Immigrants	2	430	4	3	630	--	54	405	30	1,558
Category 3 Disabilities	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0
Category 4 CTE	1	46	37	15	256	3	190	81	19	647
Category 5 Apprentice	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0
TOTAL	8	533	104	33	1,918	6	470	751	66	3,888
Percent of Total	0.2%	13.7%	2.8%	0.8%	49.3%	0.2%	12.1%	19.3%	1.7%	

Chapter III: CCDC Structure, Leadership, Faculty Involvement and Communication

Progression of Organizational Structure

During the previous 16 months, the process in which the CCDC has been engaged to produce this Regional Plan has been a beacon of collaboration and cooperation. The Citrus College District Consortium organizationally thrives today because it benefits from the same organizational principles used since its inception: disdain for bureaucracy. CCDC leadership structures have placed a premium on efficiency and functionality since the group began meeting before the COE was released. The original organizational structures have grown and evolved to facilitate input from all stakeholders and partners. The outcome has been significant integrations and foundational work to achieve measurable goals.

The following outlines the progression of the CCDC organizational structures to address AB86 objectives and create the Regional Plan:

- Committee of the Whole
- Data Analysis Sub-Committee
- Steering Committee
- Faculty Advisory Committees
- Allocation Committee

These structures and their effects on shared leadership strategies are explored in the next section.

Shared Leadership

Prior to the release of the Certification of Eligibility (COE), representatives of every member in the regional consortium met a number of times as a Committee of the Whole. After the release of the COE and during initial reporting periods, CCDC members maintained that organizational structure. It was unanimously decided in the first Committee of the Whole meeting after the release of the COE that each member would have one equal vote and that partners could have input, but had no voting rights. Also in that first meeting, Monrovia was unanimously selected as the Fiscal Agent and the Monrovia administration team was selected as the Project Coordinators.

During the data collection phase, the Committee of the Whole structure served members well by avoiding unnecessary bureaucracy and streamlining communication and data sharing. Administrators and staff availed themselves over weeks to numerous emails and phone calls so that they could answer clarifying questions and resubmit data as requested. This process led to numerous foundational conversations between

administrators and staff about evaluation of existing programs. The walls were knocked down and consortium members learned that though we serve a similar adult population, we administer and evaluate these programs differently. In subsequent Committee of the Whole meetings, members presented data and findings and edited drafts of the report. During these meetings, information gleaned from individual conversations was shared and discussed with all members present. The genesis of future common evaluative practices occurred in these meetings. Individual member conversations also analyzed the intentions of the data instruments and led to clarifying conversations with the AB86 Work Group. Again, it cannot be overstated how well CCDC members worked together during the data collection process.

To address Objective #2 data collection again was the order of the day. Critically, the consortium utilized Economic Modeling Systems Inc. (EMSI), an exhaustive economic and employment data tool that provides profoundly valuable data. The consortium believed it was an important enough tool that it unanimously voted to commit nearly 10% of planning resources to purchase it. The Data Analysis Sub-committee was then formed to analyze EMSI data. This committee reports out to the Committee of the Whole and its findings drive the creation, continuation and placement of CTE programs throughout the consortium in a uniform approach.

Eventually in order to best administer the alignment of current programs with the goals of postsecondary education and/or career pathways, members created a CCDC Steering Committee. The Steering Committee has now replaced the CCDC Committee of the Whole and is in charge of implementing the Regional Plan. The Steering Committee is comprised of administrators, certificated, and classified staff with representation from each partner. Any number of member stake holders may serve on the Steering Committee, but each member still has only one vote. All partners have attended every committee meeting with the exception of Duarte USD. Duarte has been invited, but has often not attended. The interests of the Duarte community have been maintained, however, by Monrovia Community Adult School, which serves the City of Duarte within its footprint.

The CCDC Steering Committee has six primary responsibilities: foster communication between CCDC members, workforce agencies and consortium partners, supervise the ongoing articulation of alignment of placement, curriculum, and assessment across all programs, work with Faculty Advisory Committees to use newly agreed upon data rubrics and benchmarks to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of all programs, administer the process of consolidation and creation of CTE programs by using relevant economic data, address gaps between current programs and expanded pathways and oversee the continued efforts of the CCDC Integration Plans.

Most recently, the state has directed AB86 consortia to form Allocation Committees. The Steering Committee has started to address how to construct this committee according to current state directives. However, CCDC leadership finds very disconcerting the announcement to create Allocation Committees less than two weeks before the Regional Plan was due. CCDC leadership questions why such a structure was mandated without having analyzed any consortia Regional Plans. CCDC members will make an Allocation Committee work in its current organizational structures, but the current state of affairs has members vexed.

Faculty Involvement

The creation of Faculty Advisory Committees (FAC) came out of initial consortium-wide faculty meetings and Steering Committee discussions. These FACs met on numerous occasions by program area to understand current practices, align curriculum and devise ways to accelerate student progress. Faculty involvement in the planning process at the K-12 and community college level was exhaustive and is discussed in detail in Chapter IX.

Communication

CCDC members utilized Google Drive as a repository of all consortium communication. A Drive site that was shared with all stakeholders housed agendas, minutes, decisions, correspondence, and tables. All stakeholders were able to access information and proceedings have been very transparent.

Though Drive was functional, members have decided to use planning funds to create a consortium website, currently under construction. The site will serve two purposes. Through a member login, it will be a depository for all consortium communication, agendas, minutes, and committee decisions that are currently being housed in Drive. And it will serve as common advertising for the consortium to educate the public on the meaningful career and educational opportunities the consortium is working to provide.

The domain for the website is:

<http://www.sgvccdc.edu.org/>

Chapter IV: Initial Data

Before the Regional Plan addresses each objective, CCDC members believed it was important to recount the process to gather initial data for Tables 1 and 2 and analyze what that data revealed.

Executive Summary of Data Gathering

As members gathered data, they embraced the process and recognized the tremendous benefit from simply entering the conversation. Though members are ostensibly serving a similar adult learner population that lives in the same San Gabriel Foothill region, every CCDC member has forged a unique approach in what programs are offered and how the success of those programs is evaluated.

Consortium members earnestly carried out the AB86 Work Group's request for data gathering and analysis and placed a premium on integrity and uniformity in the process. CCDC members refused to settle for simple answers, choosing instead to grasp the complexities of the data requested, by engaging in hearty discussions within the consortium and, when necessary, requesting clarification from the AB86 Work Group. Members truly believe the efforts to complete Tables 1 and 2 were exemplary and that the data and subsequent examinations have integrity and value. Members faced the difficult obstacles of limited time, occasional unclear parameters, and often inadequate internal data systems to create excellent data tables.

One of the most important benefits of this data gathering process was that it fostered foundational member discussions about programs and evaluative practices. Though these conversations were not always easy, they have been illuminating and became the starting point for the consortium to address the two major goals of AB86

During the course of the data gathering process, three major themes emerged for the CCDC members.

1. Member data systems are disparate and sometimes unreliable and data the AB86 Work Group was wanting was not always clear

CCDC member data collection systems and the data the AB86 Work Group exactly desired were critical areas for consortium discussions. In gathering data for the Tables 1 and 2, issues around member data collection systems frequently arose. Members had disparate enrollment data collection systems that functioned at varying levels of effectiveness. One critical outcome of the AB86 planning process has been to address this issue.

Also, the data requested by AB86 did not easily or readily correspond to the data gathered in these disparate systems and a lack of AB86 data definitions led to hearty internal consortium discussions. For example, members discussed at length whether or not it was the intention of the AB86 Work Group to have Costs (Table 1.1A) equal Funding (Table 1.1B). Though some CCDC members went to great lengths to ensure costs equaled funding (by including portions of overhead costs like administration, building lease, utilities, etc.), other members simply could not do so. The community college member has huge overhead costs in the form of administration, counseling, maintenance, etc. To try to apportion those costs into the program costs would have been folly. The main issue was CCDC members were not even clear as to whether that was the intention of Tables 1.1A and 1.1B. Also, Table 1.1B was not clear as to whether it wanted the institution's entire spending or spending on just the specific programs. CCDC members thought an analysis of the piece to the whole would be useful analysis and something that perhaps AB86 Work Group desired. Phone calls to the AB86 Work Group cleared these questions up.

In terms of data discrepancies members can control, we made great strides to address them during the planning process. The linkages and seamless transitions called for in this Regional Plan will not be achieved, if data collection for members is not significantly uniform. Though members do not all share the same data collection systems, we have agreed on uniform protocols for collecting demographic data for entering students so that all members better understand the population we serve.

2. Initial assessment and program evaluative processes are different for every member.

During the data gathering process, members discovered that each pursues different initial assessment protocols for incoming students. All institutions do transcript analysis, but that is where similarities end. Some institutions utilize CASAS and TABE at intake; others may only use oral examinations. Even the institution that uses assessment data has internal questions as to how that data is being disseminated and used. In addition to the different ways new students are processed, members use different tools to evaluate program success. Members have been willing to have the hard conversations around these issues of initial assessment and evaluation and are in the process of addressing them so that there is uniformity across the consortium.

3. Major trends in population served.

The Great Recession caused a great disruption in the local economy and member institutional budgets. Conventional wisdom would dictate that during a typical recession, workers who are laid off would go back to school to improve training skills. Adult ed institutions should have seen an increase enrollment. However, budget cuts severely

limited adult school course offerings. Thus, at a time when consortium members should have seen an increase in enrollment, enrollment halved.

Chapter V: Objective #1 – Services & Programs Currently Provided by CCDC Members

Current Services for Five Program Areas

Of the five program areas the consortium primarily serves 3 of the 5 program categories: adult basic and secondary education, classes for immigrants, and career technical employment. The consortium has explored during the planning process and the Steering Committee continues to explore ways to improve and increase services to adults with disabilities and for apprenticeship programs. This chapter outlines the services and programs currently provided by CCDC members and posits ways to better address the two program categories under-served.

Academic and High School Programs

Delivery of basic education instruction differs between the K-12 and community college consortium members. All K-12 institutions utilize some variation of an independent study/lab mode of delivery. Teachers in an academic lab assign high school course work and provide one-on-one instruction as students need assistance completing assignments. One institution has utilized OdysseyWare, an online credit recovery system, to accelerate credit recovery. Adult Basic Education skills are provided in a similar fashion. Where possible, instructors may offer small group direct instruction around specific Math or English skills, but limited time and resources often mean limited direct instruction. In contrast, both credit and non-credit courses at Citrus College are direct instruction classes in the classroom.

What the Data Reveals

The numbers of students needing to finish their High School Diploma within the geographic footprint of our area is staggering. As our previous demographic data shows, nearly 100,000 adults over 25 in the region have not completed a high school diploma. As Table 1.1A demonstrates, in the 2013-2014 school year, the members of our consortium served a total of 10,949 individuals, who were working towards attainment of Adult Basic Skills and/or High School Diploma programs. That number only represents a little more than 10% of potential students. Citrus College served 9,175 of these students and the four Adult Schools combined to serve 1,774 students. Drilling down into this data is revealing. Of the 9,175 students that Citrus served, 1,828 were in non-credit basic ed classes. That was nearly 50% more than the year before and more than the K-12 adult ed institutions.

One positive trend that members acknowledged is that enrollment improved from 2012-13 to 2013-14. In the 2012-13 school year, consortium members served 9,568 students. In 2012-2013, Citrus College served 7,621 students (6,336 credit and 1,285 non-credit) and the Adult Schools combined to serve 1,947. The trend here shows a growing need for adult basic and secondary education services in our area.

We feel that we are serving much of the region's needs, but the data shows that we still have massive amounts of the regional population that are not high school graduates. We see this as a program where more work and resources are needed. In 2008-2009 our consortium served 17,139 students in Academic and High School programs. We don't believe that the needs of 7,000 students just disappeared between 2008 and 2012. We believe the 7,000 student gap represents the Adult Education students who were unable to be served because of the budget cuts that occurred in 2008 to the regional adult schools. When adult education funding was flexed, programs shrunk to fit the budget that was then allotted. One CCDC goal is to return our services to the level that they were in 2008 and even to grow beyond that to truly meet the needs of our area.

English Language Learners

Our Consortium has a large and diverse contingent of English Language Learners who have been diligently served by our programs. The ESL programs our institutions offer are similar in some ways and very different in others. Not all consortium members have the same programs and not all are accountable to the CASAS testing system for their academic performance and funding. However, these differences were addressed in the planning process.

What the Data Reveals

The data shows that there is very diverse populations of English Language Learners entering into our programs and that CCDC members receive students from a large geographic area. It also reveals that like our Academic programs, we have lost the opportunity to serve many of our stakeholders because of the diminished funding brought on by flexibility and a lack of dedicated funding for these programs ever since 2008.

In the 2012-2013 school year our consortium served 4,803 students and in the 2013-2014 school year our consortium combined to serve 5,353 students in our English as a Second Language and Citizenship programs. This shows a recent growth trend over the last two years as immigrant students are entering society and the work place and are recognizing the need to educate themselves. There is a trend of growth at both the Community College level as well as at each of the four Adult Schools within our consortium. In conversations with our partners (such as Azusa Public Library) who also

serve English Learning students, they all seemed to be experiencing a growing need in this area as well. Though the enrollment has been increasing slightly over the last three years, again we are still serving a significantly lower population than we served in the 2008-2009 school year. In that year the data shows that our consortium served a total of 8,428 students in classes and courses for immigrants. Again, we see the effects of the budget cuts and subsequent flexing that limited the classes offered by the adult schools in this area. All four adult schools in our consortium feel that a large number of ESL learners and immigrants are not being served due to funding constraints. The data certainly would seem to bear this out.

Adults with Disabilities

Our consortium is working hard to serve all learners who come to us regardless of their specific needs. Monrovia has an Adult Transition class that is located on the Adult School campus which allows the opportunity to work with the disabled adult students. This class is not counted in the reported data numbers because it's funding comes from a K-12 source. We do serve these students with the adult education programs even with no funding assistance. By weekly attendance in Monrovia's One-Stop center any of these disabled students can get assistance and job training that is specific to their needs. The One Stop Center supports all consortium members who can refer students who are then provided the opportunity to learn life and personal skills working on real projects that the adult school staff provides for them. This creates an environment for not only learning new skills, but working with others outside their own classroom environment.

Azusa served 178 students in their Adults with Disabilities program in the 2008-2009 school year. After the budget cuts the following year they no longer had the resources to continue the program. Currently Citrus College is the only Consortium member to have served Adults with Disabilities in a designated program in recent years. In 2012-2013 they served 72 adults. However, while the college had minimal dedicated programming for adults with disabilities, the college continues to provide robust ancillary services such as DSPS and a veteran's support center to assist students in their academic and personal goal achievement as well as success in credit and noncredit programs. The number of students served by such programs was not included because of unclear data definitions.

The difficulty in gleaning any useful information from the data stems from the fact that adults with disabilities are often mainstreamed into other program areas. Monrovia's One Stop, which assists adults in job search and development, serves a number of students who had learning or emotional disabilities. Citrus' specific program that served adults with disabilities went from an enrollment of 72 in 2012-13 to 0 in 2013-14 due to losing staffing for the program.

The consortium Steering Committee has strategized how to better provide for learners in this program category. Committee members have explored leveraging existing programs, reviving older programs, and creating new programs based on need. The biggest obstacle to these efforts is funding. Programs cannot be leveraged, revived, or created without knowing that funds to sustain the programs exist.

Career Technical Programs

With the recent economic growth in our state, there are many opportunities for adults to enter the work force with specific education and training. Our Adult Education programs and Citrus College all have a long history of preparing adults in our area for good jobs with solid earning potential.

What the Data Reveals

In the 2012-2013 school year our consortium members served 1,196 students in this area. In 2013-2014 we served 951 students. With the need for health care professionals in our region, our consortium members have focused on healthcare jobs that meet those current demands. We have all seen evidence of the high employability of the programs we offer and we also see the ever present need of employers.

The healthcare sector in the region has provided jobs for students from our institutions. We have many regional healthcare facilities that look to us to fill vacancies. We are able to partner with City of Hope, Santa Teresita, and Arcadia Methodist hospitals as well as many convalescent and care facilities within our footprint. Our CCDC partners are active in recruiting our students and serving in advisory capacities, as we work together to bring qualified employees to the work place.

As with the other programs we offer, Adult Ed numbers are currently much smaller than they were in years past due to budget cuts and flexibility. In the 2008-2009 school year, we served 4,758 students in program area #4. Citrus program area #4 enrollment has held somewhat constant due to stable funding, but K-12 adult programs are struggling to maintain enrollment, as they search for dedicated funding. Additionally, much of the CTE training, even short-term (less than one year) is credit apportionment at Citrus College. Therefore, reported enrollment data for short-term CTE reflects a small fraction of the college's efforts. The programs that existed during this school year were better funded and more robust. The decline in enrollment has been troubling because data indicates the need is still strong for educating adults in short-term CTE programs with high employment potential. The data that the consortium is analyzing comes from EMSI and will be discussed further in Chapter VI.

Apprenticeship Programs

CCDC members were initially very hopeful that program area #5 could be an area to target for growth. This hope was based on the fact that initial definitions for apprenticeships coming down from the AB86 Work Group were going to be broad. Further research into this topic indicates apprenticeships are going to be subject to the California Division of Apprenticeship standards. That severely limited consortium strategies.

Potential areas for developing this program area do exist. Monrovia currently is creating construction pathways in a partnership with the local WIB. The hope is that these pathways will provide apprenticeship opportunities for regional students with the International Brotherhood for Electrical Workers (Local 11) and other construction trade unions. Also, some CCDC members are engaged in the Career Pathways portion of AB86 and grant funding there could be leveraged in a partnership capacity to grow apprenticeship opportunities.

The Steering Committee continues to make expanding apprenticeship opportunities a priority and is exploring a variety of ways to do so.

Overview: What the Data from the Tables Reveals

The data from our tables, members believe, was helpful, but not perfect in giving us a clear picture of what we are and what we offer. We saw immediately that the systems that we used to gather and measure the needed data were different and sometimes incomplete within our consortium. What we did gather represents an honest effort to bring forth a true picture of what has been required. The planning process has brought uniformity to data collection protocols.

The data reveals that as a consortium we are currently serving a large number of students in the region. Our programs in academic areas, ESL and classes organized for Immigrants, and Short Term CTE are still thriving despite K-12 cutbacks in budgets. Though the quantity of offerings has diminished, K-12 members have not diminished program quality. The data shows that Citrus College is a strong viable option to students who seek education in the five program areas and that the adult schools remain strong options as well -- just for a smaller number of potential clients. The data also shows a need to grow programs. Table 2 depicts that enrollment declined by nearly 50% from 2008-09. Considering regional demographic data discussed earlier in this report, members concluded that is not because there has been a 50% decrease in need for services, but is due to severe budget cuts.

Members do not believe that 2008-09 funding should be restored to all members just for the sake of restoring funding. Targeting state resources to truly address the current

needs of community college and K-12 adult education institutions has been approached with care and collaboration.

Chapter VI: Objective #2 – Evaluation of Current Needs for CCDC Members

Needs by Five Program Areas

Despite excellent efforts by CCDC members to provide quality programs for adult learners across the five program areas, unmet consortium needs have challenged all of us in these efforts. Members believe that the planning assisted us in identifying and codifying these unmet needs. In addition, members have been able to compare individual institutional needs and take a regional view when planning how to best fix our issues and serve the stakeholders who rely on us.

We have identified the following needs and listed them as action items (they are discussed at length in the next section):

1. We need to better serve ASE and ABE adult students at enrollment levels that reflect the actual regional needs as indicated by consortium and institutional data.
2. We need to better serve ESL and Immigrant adult students at enrollment levels that reflect the actual regional needs as indicated by consortium and institutional data.
3. We need to maximize high employment CTE program opportunities for students based on quality data for actual employment needs in the region's industries.
4. We need to increase student awareness of careers, education and training that is available to them.
5. We need to better align education and training with employer and market needs.
6. K-12 adult high school programs need to complete the process of altering curriculum and instruction to address Common Core State Standards so that we provide students with strong academic skills for postsecondary education and career-readiness.
7. We need to streamline our programs to allow students to advance more quickly through our systems towards their chosen career or educational path.
8. We need to take a regional approach to allocating consortium resources to address on which campuses the CCDC places programs to insure it is in accordance to regional student needs.

9. We need to better assist students in gaining important career-related and real-world experiences during their educational program.
10. We need to streamline and articulate our programs better, in order to assist postsecondary institutions with impacted programs.
11. We need to improve data collection systems for K-12 members.
12. We need the dedicated resources to allow us to ensure that we can successfully execute all of the aforementioned action items.

Assessment of Needs Unmet

1. Serve ABE and ASE adult students at sufficient enrollment levels that reflect the actual regional needs

Data from Table 2 shows there was a significant decrease in the number of adults served, who needed basic skills and/or a high school diploma. 2008-09 combined enrollment for all consortium members was 17,139 total students served. By 2012-13, that number had decline to 9,568, a massive decrease of 44%. Though enrollment increased in 2013-14 to a consortium total 11,002, that total is still 36% lower than 2008-09 enrollment levels served. Considering that census data demonstrates that nearly 100,000 adults in our region have not completed a high school diploma, there exists a significant gap between the number of students member institutions should be serving and those they actually have had the resources to serve.

2. Serve ESL and Immigrant adult students at sufficient enrollment levels that reflect the actual regional needs

Data from Table 2 shows there was a significant decrease in the number of adults served, who needed English language instruction and classes for immigrants. 2008-09 combined enrollment for all consortium members was 8,428 total students served. By 2012-13, that number had decline to 4,803, a massive decrease of 43%. Though enrollment did increase in 2013-14 to a consortium total 5,353, that total is still 36.5% lower than 2008-09 enrollment levels served. Considering that census data demonstrates that 150,000 adults in our region speak English less than “Very Well” and 250,000 adults hail from foreign soil, there exists a significant gap between the number of students member institutions should be serving and those they actually have had the resources to serve.

3. Maximize high employment CTE program opportunities

CCDC members have made this unmet need the highest priority. The consortium has allocated significant planning funds to purchase EMSI which will provide exhaustive industry and occupational data that has informed and driven consortium discussions. EMSI has allowed Data Analysis Sub-committee users to drill down into the occupational data by industry and members have analyzed education needed for these occupations and regional completers. A large portion of Steering Committee efforts has been the creation of a comprehensive CCDC approach to CTE programs based on EMSI data. These efforts are ongoing and a finalized plan will be used to drive Allocation Committee discussions in the coming months.

4. Increase student awareness of careers, education and training

K-12 adult institutions have lost substantial counseling resources. These resources must be restored to better place students in the meaningful programs and pathways that are being developed in action item #1.

5. Better align education and training with employer and market needs

CCDC members have expressed a desire to utilize common advisory boards and community partnerships, in an effort to gain a better understanding of employer and market needs. For example, members have expressed that the consortium find a less bureaucratic process for coordinating adult education CTE programs with local Workforce Investment Boards. Also, consortium members recognize the need to share industry advisory boards.

6. Transition to Common Core State Standards in adult high school programs

In an effort to provide students with strong academic and problem-solving skills, and better career and postsecondary readiness, adult schools must adapt the Common Core State Standards.

7. Implement ways to accelerate and advance students through our programs

To help students advance more quickly through our systems towards their chosen career or educational path, all member institutions must agree on common accelerated and competency-based approaches to advancement and then implement those approaches.

8. Allocate consortium resources from a regional approach

Consortium resources should be allocated from a regional approach. For example, the K-12 adult institutions in the eastern part of the consortium region do not have

any CTE programs. Claremont serves some residents from Pomona, which has a high level of unemployment and adults over 25 without diplomas. A regional approach to CTE offerings will ensure we best serve the adult learners in our region.

9. Help students gain important real-world experiences during programs

Though program area #5 is narrowly defined through California apprenticeship standards, consortium members must work with regional partners to increase internship, externship and job-shadowing opportunities.

10. Articulate programs to create better transitions

CCDC members need to create a more effective transition between secondary and postsecondary education, which includes aligning exit and entry assessment processes. Members have also discussed the possibility of K-12 institutions assisting the postsecondary institution in providing pre-requisite and lower level courses in impacted programs and a pilot program has been planned between Citrus and Monrovia.

11. Improve K-12 data collection systems

The standard data collection systems, ASAP and TOPS Enterprise, which are sanctioned by CDE have had some limitation in providing accurate and consistent data that reflects the realities of current service to adult learners in K-12 Adult Education programs. Members need these systems to improve their effectiveness, if we are going to continue to rely upon them. Also, K-12 members must do a better job of collecting student data on program outcomes. Institutions need uniform and accurate data in regards to employment and exam pass rates for CTE programs, level completers for ESL classes, and postsecondary enrollment and progress. Outcome data is either poorly collected or not uniform. Members require the resources to meet this unmet need.

12. Dedicated resources to ensure we can successfully meet existing needs and execute all of the aforementioned action items

K-12 institutions must have adequate and designated funding to support existing adult education programs, facilities and equipment. And, if consortium members are going to create educational programs per action item #1, there must be funding to support those programs.

Regional Data Sources

Members are primarily focusing on five industry sectors from the CDE Career Technical Education sectors. Primarily these sectors are being analyzed because members have

some level of existing programs with established pathways in these sectors. The five industry sectors are Health, Science and Medical Technology; Building Trades and Construction; Arts, Media and Entertainment; Education, Child Development and Family Services; and Transportation. Even though varying level of programs exist across these sectors for CCDC members, all programs will be scrutinized through the lens of whether or not the program will serve the needs of regional students by leading to employment.

EMSI provided data by industry and then occupation for the region to drive CTE planning. Members searched and sorted industries by regional competitive growth advantage (the Location Quotient), by the aggregate number of expected job growth (Expected Change), by the percent of job growth (% Change) or other criteria. Once the above industries with good employment opportunities were identified, members drilled down into occupational data. Members sorted the Occupation Table by education requirements, expected number of new jobs and number of students who completed regional certifications. By using Industry and Occupation Tables from EMSI data, members identified programs that could be created or avoided. The Steering Committee has made some hard decisions about existing programs, consolidating some existing CCDC programs, for example. But the data now has the consortium poised to create new effective programs to better prepare adult learners for career-readiness.

Chapter VII: Objective #3 – CCDC Plan to Integrate Existing Programs

After extensive data gathering and analysis, CCDC members intently focused on addressing Regional Plan objectives through strategic planning sessions on systems and pathway integration. Members spent a substantial number of months engaged in efforts to create educational pathways; align placement, curriculum, assessments, and progress indicators; and create transition strategies. Much was achieved by CCDC members, but there is still work to be done. Chapter VII discusses the process of creating an Integration Plan and the particulars of that plan. It also discusses what has been achieved in that plan and what members are still working to address.

Guiding Principles

Reiterating what was addressed at a high level in the Executive Summary, the consortium process to integrate existing programs was driven by three guiding principles shared by all CCDC members:

1. Aversion to Bureaucracy

CCDC members have consistently eschewed bureaucracy in addressing the demands and objectives of AB86. The CCDC AB86 planning process has invariably been streamlined and efficient. That is the approach the CCDC leadership team members use when each administers his or her individual institution. That do-it-yourself, efficient attitude has influenced consortium-wide decision-making processes, especially in approaching Objective #3.

2. Collaborative Efforts

CCDC members have created a professional, but collegial atmosphere at status meetings, leadership meetings, data meetings, consortium– wide professional development and strategic planning sessions, and writing and editing sessions that has fostered tremendous collaboration. All CCDC members, including certificated and classified staff, would definitely say that their voices have been heard in all stages of the planning process.

3. Institutional Autonomy

All member institutions critically recognize how vital it is that the consortium align and connect existing and future adult education programs to postsecondary academic pathways and/or career pathways leading to employment. However, CCDC members have had vigorous discussions about the importance of individual

institutional autonomy. Industry and curricular standards will uniformly drive instruction and pathways. However, the individual approach each member takes to address standards and pathways will be respected within the consortium, as long as institutional data reflects student success.

Phases to Create Consortium-wide Integration Plan

The creation of an Integration Plan was a fluid, grass-roots, bottom-up process. While a newly formed Steering Committee facilitated a number of stakeholder meetings over six months, CCDC faculty and staff drove the process during those meetings. Action Items and new committee structures were created out of those meetings by faculty and staff.

Below are the chronological steps CCDC members took to integrate programs:

1. Form a CCDC Steering Committee to direct and administer program alignment

The first step to creating a comprehensive Integration Plan was to create a Steering Committee. The Steering Committee replaced the CCDC Committee of the Whole and was the committee that oversaw the completion of the Regional Plan. It will also be the committee in charge of implementing the plan. The Steering Committee is comprised of administrators, certificated, and classified staff with representation from each partner. In the spirit of democracy and in an effort to hear all voices, any number of member stakeholders may serve on the Steering Committee, but each member organization still has only one vote.

The CCDC Steering Committee has six primary responsibilities:

- Foster communication between CCDC members, workforce agencies and consortium partners
- Supervise the ongoing alignment of placement, curriculum, and assessment across all programs and the articulation of that alignment
- Work with Faculty Advisory Committees to use newly agreed upon data rubrics and benchmarks to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of all programs
- Administer the process of consolidation and creation of CTE programs by using EMSI, San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership (SGVEP) and Workforce Investment Board (WIB) economic data
- Address gaps between current programs, expanded pathways and identified consortium needs by using relevant data

- Oversee the continued efforts of the CCDC Integration Plans which could include: analyzing the feasibility of potential MOU arrangements and supervising faculty advisory committees

After its formation, the Steering Committee facilitated faculty meetings to address the important work of creating the Integration Plan.

2. Align and integrate K-12 programs

CCDC members believed it was important that the K-12 adult education members analyze all existing protocols and procedures for current programs before intensive interaction with staff from the community college member. K-12 adult education member institutions had to understand current practices, find similarities, and address differences to create a uniform approach to systems and pathway integration. Meeting with community college faculty before K-12 alignment would have been an ineffective use of time for all members. To that end, all faculties from all K-12 member institutions met in consortium-wide strategic planning sessions from September 2014 through January 2015.

3. Create Faculty Advisory Committees for K-12 members

In an effort to create uniformity across K-12 institutions the CCDC created Faculty Advisory Committees (FACs). These FACs have engaged in strategic planning sessions and have reported to the Steering Committee, which will be charged with implementation of those proposals that are feasible. The constitution of each FAC was voluntary and inclusive, but each member was expected to have at least one faculty member serving on the committee in their discipline.

4. Strategic planning sessions between K-12 and Community College stakeholders

Once K-12 members had articulated consistent standards for curriculum and student progress for their institutions, K-12 faculty interacted with community college faculty in a series of strategic planning sessions with great success. Faculty analyzed standards, course materials, assessments, and performance bands (for ESL). Faculty Advisory Committees were then formed with both community college and K-12 faculty members. Members of discipline specific FACs found common ground for integration and transition. Now each FAC is in the process of creating articulation agreements to address pathways, integrations, and transitions.

5. Align existing data bases and create ways for all members to access student data

The problems that arose from the simple task of garnering data of existing programs well indicated to CCDC members the need for uniform data gathering system. However, the idea of creating a brand new consortium data system on a go-forward basis is anathema to CCDC members who avoid inefficiency and unnecessary expense. Thus, the Steering Committee decided that consortium expectations and protocols in data collection will be uniform across the consortium, but how each member achieves those requirements will be up to each individual institution. The Steering Committee has agreed to expand ASAP to all K-12 members using planning funds. Also, K-12 members are still examining the viability of creating an ASAP data supra-system that would allow K-12 members to track students between institutions. This supra system could be programmed to “talk” to Citrus College’s Banner system in data fields that members determine are important. No final decision has been made in this arena. The Data Analysis Sub-committee is the committee responsible for further evaluation of this proposal.

6. Determine feasibility of MOUs between K-12 members and Citrus College

CCDC members have discussed the feasibility of creating Memos of Understanding (MOUs) whereby K-12 adult education institutions could provide Citrus College-approved non-credit courses on the K-12 campuses. These discussions are still in the early stages as the Steering Committee has had more pressing matters just getting existing programs aligned. There are a number of obstacles and problems that would need to be addressed. Chief among the concerns is whether K-12 faculty members would meet the more stringent instructional requirements of Citrus College. Also, differences with pay and benefit structures for faculty between all consortium members could be difficult to negotiate and cause union issues.

However, a working model for overcoming these obstacles exists. Many of the K-12 member school districts have established MOUs with Citrus College to provide summer programs for their district high school students. If creating similar MOUs for adult education could be efficiently and effectively devised, a number of positive outcomes would result. Adult students that enrolled into these programs at the K-12 level would automatically be enrolled into the Citrus College data base and have a Citrus College id. That is the first step in a seamless pathway to a postsecondary institution. The courses being taught would be based on Citrus College course outlines, thus potentially simplifying the transition from non-credit to college credit courses. Citrus College could potentially increase non-credit course offerings without overloading capacity, which would mean more adult students could be served. As data in Chapter III indicates, the consortium is serving 50% less adults than 6 years ago.

In light of the potential positives, the Steering Committee is in the process of devising a feasibility study on creating K-12 MOUs with Citrus College. Early discussions have indicated that part of that feasibility study could be to pilot one program between one K-12 member and Citrus College.

Integration Plans

In creating an Integration Plan, the Steering Committee and faculty believed that each program should be addressed separately. Trying to create a one-size-fits-all approach to integrating would be inefficient. Thus, following are consortium Integration Plans presented by each program area.

Integration Plan for Program #1 – ASE and ABE

In the K-12 member institutions, strategic planning sessions revealed that many similarities existed in adult high school diploma programs. Graduation requirements are fairly identical (except for one member who requires 10 credits more than other institutions). All members deliver instruction through an academic lab setting. All members have large concurrent high school programs that are important to each K-12 district. Though differences exist, no ASE faculty or staff member felt that these differences were serious impediments to creating program uniformity.

During planning sessions, members forged uniformity in terms of standards, curriculum, assessments, and progress indicators. Also, planning sessions led to the formation of ASE/ABE Faculty Advisory Committees. The ASE FAC took ownership of the Integration Plan Action Items and the efforts to complete them. Below is the Integration Plan for ASE/ABE:

ASE / ABE Integration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
Evaluate and implement uniform placement assessments	All CCDC members have agreed that adult learners entering their institution must engage in placement testing: K-12 organizations are using TABE and CASAS and Citrus College is using AccuPlacer	Action Item Completed
Evaluate current curriculum delivery methods used for ASE to determine ways to accelerate credit acquisition	All institutions have purchased a small number of OdysseyWare licenses to help in credit recovery	Action Item Completed
Analyze ASE course outlines, materials and assessments to insure courses are addressing new Common Core State Standards	ASE FAC is in process of analyzing course outlines, curriculum and assessments to determine CCSS alignment	In Progress

ASE / ABE Integration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
Identify ways to accelerate diploma acquisition including: ➤ administer challenge exams	ASE FAC is in process of analyzing benchmark exams and study guides for the exams across all core academic subjects	In Progress
➤ utilizing online credit recovery curriculum	All institutions have purchased a small number of OdysseyWare licenses to help in credit recovery	Action Item Completed
➤ study feasibility of offering elective credits for work programs	CCDC K-12 counselors and ASE FAC is in process of determining feasibility	In Progress
➤ offer new accelerated elective courses	CCDC K-12 counselors and ASE FAC is in process of determining feasibility	In Progress
➤ analyze term lengths to maximize credit acquisition	FACs and Counselors have performed analysis and individual institutions have adjusted terms accordingly	Action Item Completed
Identify ways to incorporate career pathways into diploma courses	CCDC K-12 counselors and ASE FAC is in process of determining where contextualized opportunities and career pathways exist for ASE programs	In Progress
Identify problems affecting students who enroll and do not attend and credit and graduation completion rates and propose solutions to these problems	CCDC K-12 counselors and ASE FAC is in process of analyzing data	In Progress
Coordinate professional development for the program	Steering Committee has started PD and it is ongoing	In Progress
Create, or vigorously participate in, PLCs for the program	Creation of PLCs are in early stages	In Progress
Create uniform graduation requirements	FACs still coming to common ground as this needs board approval from every member institution	In Progress
Determine uniform progress indicators for the consortium	Steering Committee, FACs, and Counselors have created	Action Item Completed
Create uniform approach to ABE curriculum so that it strives to address CAHSEE or GED	FACs have come to preliminary curricular agreements	In Progress

ASE / ABE Integration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
requirements to accelerate student acquisition of diploma or GED		
Create ASE / ABE Articulation Agreements between all member that outline CCDC integration of placement, curriculum, assessments, progress indicators and major outcomes	FACs are currently working on completing Articulation Agreements	In Progress

ASE / ABE Progress Indicators and Major Outcomes

The ASE/ABE FAC has worked in concert with the Steering Committee and CCDC counselors to create the following ASE/ABE progress indicators upon which all members have agreed will measure program effectiveness:

- Attending the first class and earning the first credit
- Credit acquisition per term
- CASAS benchmark progress
- TABE progress
- CAHSEE pass rates
- GED pass rates
- Diplomas earned
- Wage increases after each term (where applicable)

Integration Plan for Program #2 – Classes for Immigrants

Much like the ASE program, the initial planning sessions for the K-12 member institutions revealed that many similarities existed in classes for immigrants. All but one institution used CASAS to monitor student progress, and after initial CCDC planning meetings that one member moved to using online CASAS. That member is now further along technologically than the other members, who will be using online CASAS in 2015-16.

Initial K-12 planning sessions led to the formation of a preliminary ESL Faculty Advisory Committee. Once K-12 member ESL faculty met with Citrus College ESL faculty, the ESL FAC grew to incorporate Citrus faculty. The CCDC ESL FAC created the following Integration Plan:

ESL Integration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
Evaluate and implement uniform placement assessments	ESL FAC with both community college and K-12 faculty members have agreed upon need for placement assessments: K-12 uses CASAS and community college uses	Action Item Completed
Analyze ESL course materials to insure courses are addressing ESL standards	ESL FAC with both community college and K-12 faculty members analyzed and approved course curriculum and materials	Action Item Completed
Determine consortium-wide standards for ESL performance bands	ESL FAC with both community college and K-12 faculty members have articulated how each individual institution's performance bands are measure	Action Item Completed
Determine consortium-wide standards for moving from one performance band to the other	ESL FAC with both community college and K-12 faculty members have articulated how student's progress up each institution's performance bands	Action Item Completed
Identify ways to accelerate ESL student performance from one band to another	ESL FAC members still analyzing strategies to accelerate student progress	In Progress
Identify ways to incorporate contextualized learning for interested students	ESL FAC members still analyzing strategies to incorporate contextualized in professional development	In Progress
Coordinate professional development for the program	Steering Committee facilitating ongoing Professional Development	In Progress
Create, or vigorously participate in, PLCs for the program	Steering Committee facilitating the creation of ESL PLCs with both K-12 and community college faculty involvement	In Progress
Create ESL Articulation Agreements between all member that outline CCDC integration of placement, curriculum, assessments, progress	ESL FAC with both community college and K-12 faculty members working on Articulation Agreements	In Progress

ESL Integration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
indicators and major outcomes		

ESL Progress Indicators and Major Outcomes

The ESL FAC has worked in concert with the Steering Committee to create the following ESL progress indicators upon which all members have agreed will measure program effectiveness:

- CASAS benchmark attainment
- Course completion
- Performance band jumping
- Citizenship test pass rates
- Standardized oral examinations (for accent reduction)
- Wage increases after each course (where applicable)

Integration Plan for Program #4 – Career Tech

Initial planning sessions K-12 CTE faculty, revealed that many similarities exist in CTE programs. That makes sense because certifications, industry standards, and exam prep would demand that CTE programs and course outlines be similar.

Initial K-12 planning sessions led to the formation of a preliminary CTE Faculty Advisory Committee. Once K-12 member CTE faculty met with Citrus College CTE faculty, the CTE FAC grew to incorporate Citrus faculty. The CCDC CTE FAC created the following Integration Plan:

CTE Integration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
Evaluate and implement uniform placement assessments	CTE FAC with both community college and K-12 faculty members have agreed upon need for placement assessments and are using the TABE	Action Item Completed

CTE Integration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
Identify ways to accelerate acquisition of CTE certifications	CTE FAC members still analyzing strategies to accelerate student progress; module and course outline analysis still ongoing	In Progress
Identify ways to formulate common advisory boards and reduce duplicative efforts in this arena	Steering Committee and CTE FAC work on this is still occurring	In Progress
Analyze CTE course outlines and course material to insure courses are addressing new industry and examination standards	CTE FAC members completed course analysis and are satisfied with courses addressing industry standards	Action Item Completed
Coordinate professional development for the program	Steering Committee facilitating ongoing Professional Development	In Progress
Create, or vigorously participate in, PLCs for the program	Steering Committee facilitating the creation of CTE PLCs with both K-12 and community college faculty involvement	In Progress
Create CTE Articulation Agreements between all member that outline CCDC integration of placement, curriculum, assessments, progress indicators and major outcomes	CTE FAC with both community college and K-12 faculty members working on Articulation Agreements	In Progress

CTE Progress Indicators and Major Outcomes

The CTE FAC has worked in concert with the Steering Committee to create the following CTE progress indicators upon which all members have agreed will measure program effectiveness:

- Course completions
- Certification exam pass rates
- Externship participation rates
- Employment rates
- Wage increases

Sharing Consortium Data on Progress Indicators

CCDC faculty and support staff across all programs have decided to share data on student progress indicators in a forum yet to be determined. The purpose would be to share best practices for student achievement and progress within specific courses and programs. In addition, if a data supra-system were created (and that is still to be decided), once student consent has been obtained, the consortium database and student information document would inform other stakeholders of student outcomes.

Transition Strategies

The primary strategies for achieving transitions to an integrated approach are spelled out in each program's Integration Plan. One critical component to integration that needs further edification is the role counselors will play in helping adult learners transition to postsecondary and career opportunities. As was noted in Chapter VI, significant gaps currently exist in counseling departments due to budget cuts. Providing more qualified counselors will be critical in providing guidance to institutional learners who wish to transition to college or the workforce.

ASE / ABE Articulation Agreements

The hard work of integration would be demonstrated to the AB86 Workgroup by the existence of Articulation Agreements between all members. Due to the onerous process of creating Articulation Agreements, Faculty Advisory Committees are still working on them and they will be completed hopefully by the end of this school year. The agreements may take longer and since planning funds can now be spent in the 2015-2016 school year, FACs will have the time to make sure the agreements accurately reflect what is best for integration.

Table 3.1

Table 3.1: Implementation Strategies to Create Pathways, Systems Alignment and Articulation among Consortium Participants						
Transition to be Addressed	Strategy/Approach to be Employed	Resources Needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Parties (specific school districts and/or community colleges)	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Evaluate and implement uniform placement assessments for ASE/ABE, ESL, and CTE	Strategic planning sessions with ASE FAC analysis of current practices and agreement with Steering Committee on best practices going forward	Online TABE, CASAS, planning hours	\$20,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC, Steering Committee	Existence of uniform placement assessments	By 3/31/15
Evaluate current curriculum delivery methods used for ASE to determine ways to accelerate credit acquisition with online program	Strategic planning sessions with ASE FAC and Steering Committee analysis of OdysseyWare	OdysseyWare, planning hours	\$30,000 + ongoing maintenance	K-12 members, ASE FAC, Steering Committee	Existence of OdysseyWare on every campus	By 3/31/15
Analyze ASE course outlines, materials and assessments to insure courses are addressing Common Core State Standards	Strategic planning sessions with ASE FAC analysis and report out to Steering Committee	Access to course outlines, texts, materials, assessments, planning hours	\$25,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC, Steering Committee	Existence of FAC-approved curriculum	By 7/31/15
Identify ways to accelerate diploma acquisition including: challenge exams, elective credits for work programs, and accelerated elective courses	ASE FAC to create challenge exams and study guides; counselors and FAC to address codifying elective process	Elective course materials, planning hours	\$15,000 (cost of OdysseyWare addressed above)	K-12 members, ASE FAC, counselors	Existence of challenge exams, new electives, and OdysseyWare	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year

Table 3.1: Implementation Strategies to Create Pathways, Systems Alignment and Articulation among Consortium Participants

Transition to be Addressed	Strategy/Approach to be Employed	Resources Needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Parties (specific school districts and/or community colleges)	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Identify ways to incorporate career pathways into diploma courses	Strategic planning sessions with ASE FAC, counselors and Steering Committee agreement on best practices to incorporate career pathways into ASE program	Research, leverage partnerships, planning hours	\$15,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC, counselors, Steering Committee	Existence of new pathways	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Identify problems affecting students who enroll and do not attend and credit and graduation completion rates and propose solutions to these problems	Counselor and classified staff outreach to and survey of current and former enrollees who never showed up or failed to progress; action plan from this data	Hours for classified staff to call and counselors to coordinate	\$20,000 - \$25,000	K-12 members, counselors, classified staff	Existence of plan to keep learners in program and successful	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Create uniform graduation requirements	Strategic planning sessions with ASE FAC and Steering Committee analysis of graduation requirements and agreement requirements going forward	Planning hours	\$12,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC, individual K-12 member school boards	Existence of uniform graduation requirements	By 7/31/15
Determine uniform progress indicators for the consortium	Strategic planning sessions with ASE FAC and Steering Committee agreement progress indicators	Planning hours	\$12,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC, Steering Committee	Data gathered for progress indicators	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year

Table 3.1: Implementation Strategies to Create Pathways, Systems Alignment and Articulation among Consortium Participants

Transition to be Addressed	Strategy/Approach to be Employed	Resources Needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Parties (specific school districts and/or community colleges)	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Create uniform approach to ABE curriculum so that it strives to address CAHSEE or GED requirements to accelerate student acquisition of diploma or GED	Strategic planning sessions with ASE FAC including Citrus College ABE faculty; agreement on curriculum alignment	Planning hours	\$25,000	K-12 & Citrus College members, ASE FAC	Existence of uniform standards	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Evaluate and implement uniform ESL placement assessments	Strategic planning sessions with ESL FAC analysis of current practices and agreement with Steering Committee on best practices going forward	Planning hours, CASAS	\$18,000	K-12 & Citrus College members, ESL FAC	Existence of uniform placement assessments	By 3/31/15
Analyze ESL course material to insure courses are addressing ESL standards	Strategic planning sessions with ESL FAC analysis and report out to Steering Committee	Access to course outlines, texts, materials, assessments, planning hours	\$18,000	K-12 & Citrus College members, ESL FAC	Existence of uniform standards	By 3/31/15
Determine consortium-wide standards for ESL performance bands	Strategic planning sessions with ESL FAC analysis and report out to Steering Committee	Access to course outlines, texts, materials, assessments, planning hours	\$17,500	K-12 & Citrus College members, ESL FAC	ESL Articulation Agreement	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year

Table 3.1: Implementation Strategies to Create Pathways, Systems Alignment and Articulation among Consortium Participants

Transition to be Addressed	Strategy/Approach to be Employed	Resources Needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Parties (specific school districts and/or community colleges)	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Determine consortium-wide standards for moving from one performance band to the other	Strategic planning sessions with ESL FAC analysis and report out to Steering Committee	Access to course outlines, texts, materials, assessments, planning hours	\$17,500	K-12 & Citrus College members, ESL FAC	ESL Articulation Agreement	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Identify ways to accelerate ESL student performance from one band to another	Strategic planning sessions with ESL FAC analysis and report out to Steering Committee	Professional development and planning hours	\$20,000	K-12 & Citrus College members, ESL FAC	Performance band and progress data	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Identify ways to incorporate contextualized learning for interested students	Strategic planning sessions with ESL FAC, counselors and Steering Committee agreement on best practices to incorporate career pathways into ASE program	Research, leverage partnerships, planning hours	\$25,000	K-12 members, ESL FAC, counselors, Steering Committee	Existence of new learning opportunities	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Identify ways to accelerate acquisition of CTE certifications	Strategic planning sessions with CTE FAC analysis and report out to Steering Committee	Professional development and planning hours, input from advisory boards	\$20,000	K-12 & Citrus College members, CTE FAC	Course completion and student progress data	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Identify ways to formulate common advisory boards and reduce duplicative efforts	Steering Committee to coordinate efforts	Access to advisory boards	n/a	Steering Committee	Existence of common advisory boards	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016

Table 3.1: Implementation Strategies to Create Pathways, Systems Alignment and Articulation among Consortium Participants

Transition to be Addressed	Strategy/Approach to be Employed	Resources Needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Parties (specific school districts and/or community colleges)	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Analyze CTE course outlines and course material to insure courses are addressing new industry and examination standards	Strategic planning sessions with CTE FAC analysis and report out to Steering Committee	Access to course outlines, texts, materials, assessments, planning hours	\$3,000	K-12 & Citrus College members, CTE FAC	Existence of uniform standards	By 3/31/15
Coordinate professional development for all three programs: ASE/ABE, ESL, CTE	Consortium-wide professional development	Experts for PD, PD hours	\$80,000	Steering Committee to coordinate, all faculty to participate	PD agendas, sign-in sheets, and evidence of accelerated and contextualized instruction and programs	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Create and participate in PLCs for all three programs: ASE/ABE, ESL, CTE	Consortium-wide PLC development	PLC coaches, PD hours	\$20,000	Steering Committee to coordinate, all faculty to participate	PLC agendas, sign-in sheets, and evidence of PLCs affect	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Create Articulation Agreements between all member that spell out CCDC integration for all three programs: ASE/ABE, ESL, CTE	Strategic planning sessions with all FACs and Steering Committee coordination of Agreements	FAC and SC members	\$15,000	K-12 & Citrus College members, all FACs (ASE, ESL, CTE), Steering Committee	Articulation Agreements	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year

Chapter VIII: Objective #4 – CCDC Response to Gaps Identified

Program and Service Gaps by Program

Table 4 identifies numerous gaps that were detailed in Chapter VI. Following outlines the gaps for each of those areas.

Academic and High School Programs

In the CCDC region, there are approximately 100,000 adults without a high school diploma. From 2008-09 to 2013-14 there was a 36% decrease in Category 1 services provided to regional adults. This is clearly a gap that needs to be addressed. There was a regional gap before budget cuts, but the gap was certainly exacerbated by the cuts.

English Language Learners

In the CCDC region, there are approximately 150,000 adults with poor English skills, and approximately 250,000 foreign born adults. There was a 37% decrease in Category 2 services from 2008-09 to 2013-14. This is clearly a gap that needs to be addressed. There was a regional gap before budget cuts, but the gap was certainly exacerbated by the cuts.

Adults with Disabilities

The Steering Committee has continued to explore ways to address gaps in serving adults from this program. At the time of publication of the final Regional Plan, additional programs and strategies are still being pursued..

Career Technical Programs

EMSI data has demonstrated to Steering Committee where gaps exist between employment opportunities and CTE programs. Detailed Steering Committee discussions around EMSI data have led to Monrovia closing its CAN program. Final CTE decisions will be implemented by the Allocation Committee based on EMSI data and state directives.

Apprenticeship Programs

The consortium has identified a gap between the need for internships, externships and job-shadowing and the level to which we utilize existing opportunities.

Strategies to Build Capacity

The consortium has realized that they must find funding and resources to grow Category 1 and Category 2 programs. We also understand that we now have a powerful tool to show our regional needs. We plan to use EMSI data to identify industries and

occupations where true employment opportunities exist. We then plan to align program offerings to that data. As we do so, we will want to ensure that our students are knowledgeable and properly placed into the programs that fit their needs. In order to ensure that this happens we plan to increase funding for K-12 member counselors and guidance services. Increased counseling, better post-graduate data collection, better information gathering and connectedness to adult high school graduates, improve articulation amongst K-12 programs and between K-12 and community college programs Agree on uniform data collection platforms and procedures for K-12 members, address problems and issues with ASAP, explore using new data collection system Continue to advocate for substantial dedicated funding for all CCDC members.

We understand the need to have articulation and seamless transition into the work place. To accomplish this we plan to create common industry advisory boards for consortium members, staff development on industry standards, and staff job-shadowing in the industry. We will utilize K-12 district resources and processes to transition curriculum and create common assessments for entrance and advancement in the programs we offer. We will explore possibilities of more seamless transitions between member CTE programs, use EMSI data to identify potential CTE program offerings for K-12 members that wish to expand services Improve partnerships with community businesses, local employers, Work Investment Boards, and other economic partners.

Resources Needed to Implement Capacity Building Strategies

Our regional consortium sees the need for additional teachers, facilities, counselors, curricula, and supplies in order to reach our goals of growing our programs. We also want to ensure that these resources are put to into necessary and relevant programs. EMSI (purchased with AB86 planning funds) will provide us with the proper information to navigate the discussions of maintaining the correct CTE programs and growing in the right areas. Member advisory boards and committees will need to be formed in order to continue to steer our efforts while keeping us in touch with the realities of the industries that we serve.

Methods and Metrics to Track the Successful Implementation of the Plan

As a consortium we realize the need to have solid evidence of our achievement in order to quantify if our efforts have been truly successful. We will seek to see a rise in enrollment rates, and a greater attendance after enrollment in our academic and ESL programs. We will look for larger numbers of students attaining higher levels of credit acquisition, higher CAHSEE pass rates and of course, higher graduation rates from K-12 high school diploma programs. In our CTE programs we will look at employment rates and successful completion of certifications as well as growth of programs that are verified as job growth industries.

Table 4.1

Table 4.1: Implementation Strategies to Address Identified Gaps						
Description of the Gap	Strategies to Address the Gap	Resources needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Parties (Specific school district(s) or college(s))	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
In the CCDC region, there are ≈ 100,000 adults without HS diploma and there was a 36% decrease in Category 1 services from 2008-09 to 2013-14	Find funding and resources to grow Category 1 programs	Teachers, facilities, counselors, curricula, and supplies	≈ 300% increase in funding from current levels	State	Rise in enrollment rates, attendance after enrollment, credit acquisition, CAHSEE pass rates and eventual graduation rates from K-12 high school diploma programs	2015-16 fiscal year forward
In the CCDC region, there are ≈ 150,000 adults with poor English skills, ≈ 250,000 foreign born adults and there was a 37% decrease in Category 2 services from 2008-09 to 2013-14	Find funding and resources to grow Category 2 programs, train instructors in common ESL assessments	Teachers, facilities, counselors, curricula, and supplies	≈ 300% increase in funding from current levels	State AB86 \$ for teacher training	Rise in enrollment rates, attendance after enrollment, language mastery level completion rates, and program completers, CASAS data	2015-16 fiscal year forward
EMSI data will demonstrate where gaps exist between employment opportunities and CTE programs	Use EMSI data to identify industries and occupations where true employment opportunities exist. Then align program offerings to that data	EMSI (purchased with AB86 planning funds)	\$30,000	AB86 Planning \$ All CCDC members and partners utilize tool	EMSI data and tables	On-going throughout 2014-2015 school year

Table 4.1: Implementation Strategies to Address Identified Gaps

Description of the Gap	Strategies to Address the Gap	Resources needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Parties (Specific school district(s) or college(s))	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Gap between student awareness of careers, education and training and actual existing careers and employment possibilities.	Increase funding for K-12 member counselors and guidance services	4 additional consortium counselors/job developers and informational supplies	\$390,000	State	Industry exam pass rates, employment rates from CTE and job development programs, ASE graduation data, wage increase data	2015 – 2016 school year
Gap between industry skills and all adult education programs	Create common industry advisory boards for consortium members, staff development on industry standards, staff job-shadowing in industry	Staff development (some \$ from AB86 planning grant)	\$50,000 annual	AB86 planning \$ to initiate process K-12 districts to continue	Final creation of common advisory board, survey data from staff and industry partners	On-going throughout 2014-2015 school year
Gap between existing curriculum and Common Core State Standards curriculum in adult high school programs	Utilize K-12 district resources and processes to transition curriculum	Faculty Advisory Committees, CCSS-aligned curriculum, staff development	\$40,000	K-12 districts AB86 planning \$	Verify existence of CCSS curriculum	On-going throughout 2014-2015 school year
Gap between time programs take to complete versus the time an accelerated pathway could take to complete	Create common assessments for entrance and advancement, find seamless transitions between CTE programs	Faculty Advisory Committees and member advisory boards and committees	\$10,000	CCDC members AB86 planning \$	See whether accelerated assessments and transitions exist	1 st pass – 12/31/14

Table 4.1: Implementation Strategies to Address Identified Gaps

Description of the Gap	Strategies to Address the Gap	Resources needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Parties (Specific school district(s) or college(s))	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Gaps in a regional approach to program offerings	Use EMSI data to identify potential CTE program offerings for K-12 members that wish to expand services	EMSI (purchased with AB86 planning funds)	\$50,000	All CCDC members and partners	EMSI data	On-going throughout 2014-2015 school year
Gap between need for internships, externships and job-shadow opportunities versus actual participation rates	Improve partnerships with community businesses, local employers, Work Investment Boards, and other economic partners.	Member advisory boards and committees	\$35,000	CCDC members, consortium partners, community stakeholders AB86 planning \$	Data on number of internships, externships, and job-shadows	On-going throughout 2014-2015 school year
Gap between program completers who could transition into postsecondary institutions and employment and those who actually do	Increased counseling, better post-graduate data collection, better information gathering and connectedness to adult high school graduates, improve articulation amongst K-12 programs and between K-12 and community college programs	Teachers for articulation meetings, Counselors/job developers, classified staff, survey instrument, post-grad data collection system	(in addition to counseling costs above) \$50,000 (for extra classified hours)	Increased State funding CCDC K-12 members AB86 \$ for articulation	Post-grad data instruments to measure postsecondary enrollment and employment	On-going throughout 2014-2015 school year 2015-16 school year forward

Table 4.1: Implementation Strategies to Address Identified Gaps

Description of the Gap	Strategies to Address the Gap	Resources needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Parties (Specific school district(s) or college(s))	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Gap between data and it being reliable	Agree on uniform data collection protocols and procedures for K-12 members, address problems and issues with ASAP, explore using new data collection system	CCDC Data Analysis sub-committee	\$50,000	AB86 planning \$	Analyze data to see if it is better aligned and easier to collect	On-going throughout 2014-2015 school year
Gap between funds needed and funds actually allocated to K-12 adult programs	Continue to advocate for substantial dedicated funding for all CCDC members			State		ASAP

Chapter IX: Objective #5 – CCDC Plans to Accelerate Student Progress

During recent years, all CCDC members have applied new approaches in their CTE, ESL and ASE programs to accelerate students to achieve their career and academic goals. For example, superfluous modules in CNA and Medical Assisting courses were eliminated to hasten student completion of the courses. ASE courses have been compressed and reorganized focusing on power standards and online courses with prescriptive elements have allowed students to progress faster. ESL course levels have been combined allowing capable students to master multiple levels during one course.

During the AB86 planning process, CCDC members engaged in efforts to implement significantly many more ways to accelerate student progress toward academic and career goals. Consortium-wide professional development and strategic planning sessions have facilitated K-12 faculty to identify common accelerated strategies. In line with these efforts, the consortium is continuing to identify ways to use contextualized learning and competency-based instructional strategies wherever appropriate. However, due to the extensive work that needed to be completed on integrating programs, not as much time has been available for CCDC stakeholders to implement acceleration strategies. Thus, at the time of the publishing of the Final Regional Plan, the Steering Committee and FACs are still working to develop consortium-wide strategies and metrics to accelerate student outcomes. These strategies are still very much in the planning phase.

Comprehensive Plan to Accelerate Student Achievement of Academic and Career Goals

With that in my mind, following is the CCDC plan to accelerate students to achieve academic and career goals:

1. ASE Faculty Advisory Committees will explore ways to accelerate student progress.

While Citrus College offers credit and non-credit basic education and skills courses, the college does not currently offer an adult high school diploma program and it has indicated that status will not change. The K-12 members will continue to be the consortium institutions that offer an adult high school diploma program. Thus, only K-12 members needed to create an acceleration plan in the high school diploma program.

As mentioned in Chapter VII, the means to achieve integration and uniformity in pathways has been achieved through Faculty Advisory Committees by program area. One of the chief responsibilities the ASE Faculty Advisory Committee continues to have is to identify ways that adult students can accelerate completion of the adult high school

diploma program. And much progress has been made. Initial challenge exams and study guides were created. All member institutions have purchased OdysseyWare for credit recovery. Elective offerings have increased. Yet much work needs to be completed. To that end, below is the ASE/ABE Acceleration Plan:

ASE / ABE Acceleration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
Implement quality placement assessments that clearly identify areas where students need skills remediation	ASE FAC strategic planning sessions	Action Item Completed
Offer intensive, direct instruction remediation classes in English and basic math ("skills boot camps") to address skills deficiencies as identified from placement assessments	ASE FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress
Administer standards-based challenge exams so students can earn course credit or partial course credit across all core academic subjects	ASE FAC is in process of creating benchmark challenge exams and study guides across all core academic subjects	In Progress
Provide fair study guides for these challenge exams so students can be successful on them	ASE FAC is in process of creating benchmark challenge exams and study guides across all core academic subjects	In Progress
Offer elective credits for students' current and, perhaps, past work experience (pursuing this strategy could possibly require additional human resources)	ASE FAC and Counselors are finalizing courses and curricular approach	In Progress
Offer new elective courses that would accelerate student attainment of elective credits	ASE FAC and Counselors have agreed on some courses and are finalizing other courses	In Progress
Analyze the feasibility of short-term direct instruction courses for credit	ASE FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress
Search for ways contextualized learning strategies can be used to accelerate credit acquisition	Professional development	Action Item Completed

ASE / ABE Acceleration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
Determine ways online or computer-assisted instruction can be incorporated into courses for student support and/or course acceleration	All institutions have purchased a small number of OdysseyWare licenses to help in credit recovery	Action Item Completed
Analyze course outlines to ensure courses are streamlined: that they are focused on core college and career readiness standards and avoid assignments that are not aligned and time wasters	ASE FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress
Discover ways to align assignments so that they address standards in multiple courses, thus saving students time (e.g. a resume assignment for a labor unit in Economics also fulfills an English IV assignment)	ASE FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress
Brainstorming to find other strategies	ASE FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress

2. ESL Faculty Advisory Committees will explore ways to accelerate student progress

Creating accelerated opportunities for ESL students has been planned through the CCDC ESL Faculty Advisory Committee with representation from both the Citrus College and K-12 members. Below is the ESL Acceleration Plan:

ESL Acceleration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
Offer intensive, direct instruction remediation classes in reading and writing ("skills boot camps")	ESL FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress
Analyze feasibility of offering more intensive courses for those students who wish to advance quicker versus those that do not	ESL FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress
Determine feasibility of creating flexible movement from level to level to allow students who are working faster than the rest of the class to	ESL FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress

ESL Acceleration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
move on to a higher level the moment they are ready		
Analyze course outlines to ensure courses are correctly aligned to core language acquisition standards and avoid assignments that are not aligned and time wasters	ESL FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress
Create lab times during which ESL students can work through online tutorials to accelerate learning outside of class time	ESL FAC coordination with Steering Committee for hours to fund lab hours	In Progress
Search for ways contextualized learning strategies can be used to accelerate language acquisition	Professional development	In Progress
Interact with the CCDC Steering Committee to set-up an annual audit of all ESL pathways to review if there is any way to streamline or hasten student progress	ESL FAC coordination with Steering Committee	In Progress
Create professional development time for staff to look at CASAS data and test results in order to let that information drive the curriculum that is offered (such that instruction can then focus on needed concepts and not those students have already mastered)	ESL FAC coordination with Steering Committee for hours to analyze data	In Progress
Brainstorming to find other strategies	ESL FAC strategic planning sessions	In Progress

3. CTE Faculty Advisory Committees will explore ways to accelerate student progress.

As was previously mentioned, one of the chief responsibilities the CTE Faculty Advisory Committee will have is to identify ways that adult students can accelerate completion of certification programs. To that end, below is the CTE FAC Acceleration Plan:

CTE Acceleration Plan		
Plan Action Item	How Addressed	Status
Evaluate and implement uniform placement assessments	CTE strategic planning sessions and report out to Steering Committee	Action Item Completed
Offering intensive, direct instruction remediation classes in English and basic math (“skills boot camps”) so that students can enter CTE programs better prepared	Steering Committee to perform cost and feasibility study	In Progress
Administering standards-based challenge exams so students can pass out of modules	CTE strategic planning sessions and report out to Steering Committee	In Progress
Have staff apply current industry standards to review of curriculum and class requirements so that they reflect what is truly currently needed in the industry	CTE strategic planning sessions and report out to Steering Committee	Action Item Completed
Allowing students to move ahead through the use of online lab modules that are available after traditional class times	CTE strategic planning sessions and report out to Steering Committee	In Progress
Searching for ways contextualized learning strategies can be used to accelerate progress towards certifications	Steering Committee to provide professional development	In Progress
Creating alignment of programs so students can transfer seamlessly between programs while not losing time or having to repeat work they have already done	CTE strategic planning sessions and report out to Steering Committee	In Progress
Interacting with the CCDC Steering Committee to audit all CTE pathways annually to look for anything that can be done to streamline the pathway and save the student time	CTE strategic planning sessions and report out to Steering Committee	In Progress
Brainstorming to find other strategies	CTE strategic planning sessions	In Progress

The Steering Committee and the FACs in each program area have made some significant progress on this objective, but as the above action plans demonstrate, there is work to be done. Once final strategies are created and implemented, the Steering Committee will use consortium-wide student progress data to monitor the effectiveness of the implemented proposals.

3. Counselors and the CCDC website will make students aware of newly created accelerated options

Once strategies have been implemented, a critical component of accelerating student progress will be making sure students are aware of the opportunities. Counselors will need to be well versed in all options available to students. Consortium-wide training will need to occur for counselors. Also the consortium website will clearly articulate options that exist for students to accelerate progress to reach their goals sooner.

4. Professional development will be presented consortium-wide

Training faculty in a variety of research-based strategies that can accelerate student progress will be another critical factor in achieving this objective. CCDC members will continually hold consortium-wide professional development sessions. One critical strategy that consortium PD will focus on is contextualized learning. This is further discussed in point 6 and in the next Chapter.

5. Professional development will be presented consortium-wide

Each of the Faculty Advisory Committees will be charged with exploring ways to incorporate contextualized learning specific to their program. FACs will reach across their individual programs to identify opportunities for contextualized instruction. For example, recently one of the K-12 member institutions had Pharmacy Tech students perform a health fair for ESL students. Both programs benefited from the project. Identifying larger contextualized learning opportunities and codifying them into consortium-wide programs will be a focus of CCDC FACs. FACs will explore ways to use technology and regional partners such as Workforce Investment Boards to propose possible programs.

The CCDC Steering Committee will determine the feasibility of FAC proposals to accelerate student outcomes, work in concert to implement the proposals across the consortium, and monitor effectiveness of each proposal through data. Counselors will work together across the consortium to make sure that students are aware of accelerated opportunities at each institution. All CCDC members will work together to ensure students finish educational programs in an efficient and speedy manner.

Table 5.1

Table 5.1: Work Plan for Implementing approaches proven to accelerate a student's progress toward his or her academic or career goals						
Description of the Approach	Tasks/Activities Needed to Implement the Approach	Resources needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Member (Specific school district(s) or college(s))	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Offer intensive, direct instruction remediation classes in English and basic math ("skills boot camps") to address skills deficiencies so students in all program areas can enter ASE, ESL or CTE programs better prepared	Steering Committee feasibility and cost analysis	Additional courses and additional teachers	\$25,000 - \$30,000	Steering Committee with ASE FAC input	Existence of additional courses	2015-2016 school year
Administer standards-based challenge exams so ASE students can earn course credit or partial course credit across all core academic subjects and provide fair study guides for those exams	ASE FAC to create challenge exams and study guides	Benchmark and study guides, planning hours	\$25,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC	Existence of challenge exams	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Offer elective credits for ASE students' current and past work experiences	Counselors and FAC to address codifying elective courses from work experience	Elective course materials, planning hours	\$15,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC, counselors	Course schedule with new work-based electives	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year

Table 5.1: Work Plan for Implementing approaches proven to accelerate a student's progress toward his or her academic or career goals

Description of the Approach	Tasks/Activities Needed to Implement the Approach	Resources needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Member (Specific school district(s) or college(s))	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Offer new elective courses that would accelerate ASE student attainment of elective credits	Counselors and FAC to address codifying new elective courses	Elective course materials, planning hours	\$15,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC, counselors	Course schedule with new elective courses	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year
Determine ways online or computer-assisted instruction can be incorporated into courses for student support and/or course acceleration	Strategic planning sessions with ASE FAC and Steering Committee analysis of OdysseyWare	OdysseyWare, planning hours	\$30,000 + ongoing maintenance	K-12 members, ASE FAC, Steering Committee	Existence of OdysseyWare on every campus	By 3/31/15
Discover ways to align ASE assignments so that they address standards in multiple courses, thus saving students time	ASE FAC strategic planning sessions	course outlines, planning hours	\$25,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC,	Course outlines, progress data	2015-2016 school year
Analyze feasibility of offering more intensive ESL courses for those students who wish to advance quicker versus those that do not	ESL FAC strategic planning sessions	course outlines, planning hours	\$25,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC,	Course outlines, progress data	2015-2016 school year

Table 5.1: Work Plan for Implementing approaches proven to accelerate a student's progress toward his or her academic or career goals

Description of the Approach	Tasks/Activities Needed to Implement the Approach	Resources needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Member (Specific school district(s) or college(s))	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Determine feasibility of creating flexible movement in ESL from level to level to allow students who are working faster to move on to a higher level	ESL FAC strategic planning sessions	course outlines, planning hours	\$25,000	K-12 members, ASE FAC,	Progress data	2015-2016 school year
Analyze course outlines to ensure courses are correctly aligned to core language acquisition standards and avoid assignments that are not aligned and time wasters	ESL FAC strategic planning sessions	course outlines, planning hours	\$25,000	K-12 members, ESL FAC,	Course outlines, progress data	3/31/15
Create lab times during which ESL students can work through online tutorials to accelerate learning outside of class	Steering Committee feasibility and cost analysis	Additional courses and additional teachers	\$15,000 - \$20,000	Steering Committee with ESL FAC input	Existence of additional lab time and courses	2015-2016 school year
Create professional development time for staff to look at CASAS data and test results to drive the curriculum and instruction	ESL FAC interaction with Steering Committee to determine feasibility and cost analysis	monthly planning hours	\$51,000	Steering Committee with ESL FAC input	Agendas, minutes, progress data	2015-2016 school year

Table 5.1: Work Plan for Implementing approaches proven to accelerate a student's progress toward his or her academic or career goals

Description of the Approach	Tasks/Activities Needed to Implement the Approach	Resources needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Member (Specific school district(s) or college(s))	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Administering standards-based challenge exams so CTE students can pass out of modules	CTE FAC to create challenge exams and study guides	Benchmark and study guides, planning hours	\$25,000	K-12 & Citrus members, CTE FAC	Existence of challenge exams	2015-2016 school year
Have staff apply current industry standards to review of curriculum and class requirements so that they reflect what is truly currently needed in the industry	Strategic planning sessions with CTE FAC course outline analysis and report out to Steering Committee	Access to course outlines, texts, materials, assessments, planning hours	\$22,000	K-12 & Citrus members, CTE FAC	Agendas, minutes, advisory board information	2015-2016 school year
Allow students to complete courses faster through the use of online lab modules that are available after traditional class times	Strategic planning sessions with CTE FAC	Access to course outlines, texts, materials, assessments, planning hours	\$22,000	K-12 & Citrus members, CTE FAC	Agendas, minutes, advisory board approvals	2015-2016 school year
Creating alignment of programs so students can transfer seamlessly between programs while not losing time or having to repeat work they have already done	Strategic planning sessions with CTE FAC	Access to course outlines, texts, materials, assessments, planning hours	\$22,000	K-12 & Citrus members, CTE FAC	Course outlines showing alignment, progress data	2015-2016 school year

Table 5.1: Work Plan for Implementing approaches proven to accelerate a student's progress toward his or her academic or career goals

Description of the Approach	Tasks/Activities Needed to Implement the Approach	Resources needed	Estimate of the Cost	Responsible Member (Specific school district(s) or college(s))	Methods of Assessment	Timeline
Interacting with the CCDC Steering Committee to audit all CTE pathways annually to look for anything that can be done to streamline the pathway and save the student time	Strategic planning sessions with CTE FAC	Access to course outlines, texts, materials, assessments, planning hours	\$22,000	K-12 & Citrus members, CTE FAC, Steering Committee	Agendas, minutes, advisory board approvals	2015-2016 school year
Search for ways contextualized learning strategies can be used to accelerate credit acquisition, language acquisition and career technical skills	Steering Committee facilitating professional development	Experts and coaches for PD, PD hours for faculty	\$40,000	Steering Committee to coordinate, all faculty to participate	PD agendas, sign-in sheets, and evidence of accelerated and contextualized instruction and programs	By 7/31/15 and ongoing in 2015-2016 school year

Chapter X: Objective #6 – CCDC Plans to Collaborate in Ongoing Professional Development

CCDC members recognize that ongoing professional development is vital to the success of this Regional Plan. However, as was the issue with Objective #5, due to the extensive work that was needed just integrating member programs, not much time has been available for the CCDC Steering Committee to implement professional development. Thus, at the time of the publishing of the Final Regional Plan, the Steering Committee is still working to calendar time for professional development. Professional development will be a priority for the remainder of the school year. Also, the state has just announced that AB86 funds can be utilized next year, so the Steering Committee will schedule professional development into next year.

This is not to say that nothing was done in this objective. CCDC faculty did have introductory professional development and were exposed at a preliminary level to contextualized, accelerated, and competency-based instructional strategies.

Going forward, CCDC professional development will focus on disseminating research-based strategies that are relevant and beneficial to practitioners. CCDC members believe a comprehensive approach to professional development is vitally necessary for successful implementation of successful pathways. To that end, following are the elements of a comprehensive plan:

Comprehensive Plan for Ongoing Professional Development

1. Use K-12 District coaches whenever possible

Using instructional coaches is a research-based, successful model for effective professional development. Some CCDC members have already used instructional coaches to expose adult ed faculty to the Common Core State Standards and contextualized learning. Coaches can be a critical way to leverage individual K-12 district resources across the consortium. For example, if one member was using an instructional coach to provide professional development to its adult ed teachers, other members from the consortium could participate at no additional expense. Professional development meetings with Monrovia coaches will take place consortium-wide at the end of April and more will follow in the 2015-2016 school year.

2. Professional Learning Communities

Program Faculty Advisory Committees will take a leading role in creating Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). CCDC members have defined the scope and structure of program PLCs, but have not started the process of implementing PLCs. Before the end

of the school year, the Steering Committee has scheduled to train FAC members to organize PLCs and facilitate their success. CCDC PLCs will help faculty who have attended workshops share information from the workshop, guide PLC members, and demonstrate how teachers could apply research-based strategies to their specific program area. PLCs will also explore a variety of technological ways to disseminate program information and reach across programs to contextualize learning for accelerated outcomes.

3. Organize consortium-wide training with outside entities

The CCDC Steering Committee will organize and host consortium-wide training with outside professional development agencies. These training sessions will occur next year and will be specific to each program area or general enough to benefit the entire consortium. The Steering Committee has engaged in early discussions with the Outreach and Technological Assistance Network (OTAN), the San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership (SGVEP), and the Workforce Investment Board (WIB), just to name a few.

4. Pay for consortium members to attend outside trainings and workshops

In addition to hosting agencies for professional development, members will be encouraged to attend outside workshops and conferences by having their expenses reimbursed as much as that is economically feasible. Individuals who attend these outside trainings will be expected to work with program PLCs to report out and perform training and professional development consortium-wide.

5. Technological Training

The CCDC Steering Committee will leverage district IT personnel and organize and host consortium-wide technological training sessions. These trainings will be address relevant topics including technology in the classroom, distance learning software, social networking, and learning management systems. Faculty and staff will also be trained on new and emerging instructional technology such as tablets/phones, interactive whiteboards, apps, netbooks, and computers. Given the increased emphasis on technology, it will also be critical that faculty and staff are aware of issues related to technology such as plagiarism, copyrighted materials, and privacy.

6. Cross-program meetings

Program Faculty Advisory Committees will organize quarterly, bi-annual, or annual cross-program meetings where instructors, faculty, staff, and administrators can share instructional strategies or critical information about skills that students need in order to complete academic or career pathways.

7. Counselor trainings

CCDC Counselors will receive professional development to better understand aligned pathways and speak to accelerated opportunities.

Table 6.1 Current Professional Development

Table 6.1 Current Professional Development			
Topic	Professional Development Strategy	Program Area(s) Addressed	Estimated Cost to Implement Consortium-Wide
CCSS Alignment	Individual member districts have been engaged in tremendous professional development to understand how CCSS addresses college readiness and to better understand how to provide instruction for these standards	2	\$24,500
ESL skills building	Some member ESL faculty meet monthly to build faculty skills around intercultural competencies	1	\$29,800
Building soft academic skills	Monrovia coaches working consortium-wide, enhancing soft skills in the context of college readiness	1, 2, 4	\$37,800
Counselors, outside expert training	Helping students navigate transitions	1, 2, 4	\$13,600

Table 6.2 Collaborative Professional Development Plan

Table 6.2 Collaborative Professional Development Plan			
Topic	Collaborative Professional Development Strategy (Activities, Participants, Delivery Mode, Frequency)	Program Area(s) Addressed	Estimated Cost to Implement Consortium-Wide
Contextualized Learning	Overview from Monrovia USD coaches, video of contextualized learning in classroom, team collaboration as to what this looks like in each teacher's classroom Additional PD dates to be set	1, 2, 4	\$42,800
PLCs	Train FAC members on creating and using effective PLCs	1, 2, 4	\$23,600
Accelerated strategies introduction	Overview from Monrovia USD coaches, video of accelerated strategies in classroom, team collaboration as to what this looks like in each teacher's classroom	1, 2, 4	\$42,800
Integration of technology	Establish a community of practice, creating relevance to context and curriculum, and administrative support	1, 2	\$34,800
Soft Employment Skills	Outside employment expert to provide training to CTE teachers	4	\$13,600
Expert PD	TBD	1, 2, 4	TBD

Chapter XI: Objective #7 – CCDC Plans to Leverage Existing Regional Structures

CCDC members have been engaged in substantial efforts to leverage existing regional and community partner structures. Consortium-wide strategic planning sessions have facilitated discussions with local libraries, economic partnerships, workforce boards, and community networks to determine ways to share community resources throughout the consortium. The hope is that each partner will benefit from the opportunity to use resources that had, up until recently, been reserved for only a few of the partners.

Consortium partners have provided a variety of services for the adult learners served by CCDC members. Partners like the Azusa Library, the Glendora Library, and Harvey Mudd College provide extensive tutoring at all academic levels for adult learners from CCDC member institutions. Partners like Kaiser Permanente, Sierra Pharmacy, and Santa Teresita Hospital provide internship and externship opportunities for CCDC CTE students. Cities like Claremont and local YMCA's have provided free class rooms and use of facilities for CCDC member institutions. Each member has worked within the boundaries of their service area to cultivate and foster relationships with CCDC partners to maximize services for member learners.

Comprehensive Plan to Leverage Existing Regional Structures

In an effort to create a comprehensive approach to meeting Objective #7, following is the CCDC plan to leverage existing regional structures:

1. Economic Advisory Partners

In order to create more robust programs for categories #4 and #5, CCDC members have established solid partnerships with a number of regional economic advisory entities. These organizations provide vital economic data and business contacts for member institutions to better provide programs and services for our students. In addition, the Pasadena WIB Board has agreed to operate a One-Stop office within the CCDC at the Monrovia Adult School Campus. This office will serve all members of the consortium assisting students in finding education and employment through schoolwork and training at CCDC sites. Following are the organizations who will partner with the CCDC in this capacity:

- San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
- The Pasadena Workforce Investment Board
- Business, Education, and Community Outreach Network (BEACON)

2. Organizations for Internships / Externships

CCDC members who offer CTE programs maintain collaborative connections to local business partners who provide CCDC students opportunities to gain skill competencies in real-life learning environments. Students gain experiences in internships, clinical practicums, and work studies. Instructors have formed close working relationships and networks which includes representatives from a variety of local business. Through formal affiliation agreements, our Health Care training programs have working partnerships for community learning with the following:

- Kaiser Permanente (Baldwin Park and Fontana)
- Rowland Convalescent Care
- Citrus Valley Health Partners
- Sierra Pharmacy
- Santa Teresita Hospital

Other community partners include Visiting Angels, Walgreens, CVS Pharmacies, Owl Rexall Drugs, and City of Hope.

3. Library Literacy Programs

CCDC library partners provide volunteer tutors to work one-on-one with for adults who are lacking basic reading and literacy skills. This supports K-12 member institutions by serving the neediest of adult learners before they seek our services. CCDC members have been involved in numerous collaborative projects with local libraries, providing small group model English Language development at local community sites. Following are the community libraries serving as CCDC partners:

- Azusa City Library
- Glendora Public Library
- Monrovia Public Library

Dialogue has greatly progressed for stronger collaboration by sharing facilities and reciprocation of referrals.

4. Colleges

Outside of Citrus College, CCDC members have made efforts to leverage other regional colleges as partners. Harvey Mudd College has provided Claremont with extensive tutoring and Mt. Sierra College is a partner with Monrovia in efforts to transition students into postsecondary institutions.

5. Organizations providing space

Some CCDC partners have provided members with use of facilities without charge. The City of Claremont and the YMCA have been excellent partners in this regard.

The CCDC members have different footprints that they serve. Each of these locations has diverse resources and needs. Each member will work within the boundaries of their own service area to cultivate and foster relationships with libraries, community centers and other resources in order to maximize services for each institution's adult learners.

Table 7.1

Table 7.1 Leverage of Existing Regional Structures from Partners (expand table as necessary)					
Partner Institution Supporting Regional Consortium	Program area to be addressed (1-5)	Tasks/Activities Needed to Implement Support of the Program	Member Counterpart(s) *	Partner Contribution**	Timeline
Foothill Workforce Investment Board	4	Establish One Stop at Monrovia Community Adult School, access reports, meet quarterly or on ad hoc basis as needed	Phillip L. Dunn, Executive Director	\$20,000	Ongoing, 2015-2016 school year
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership	4	Meet quarterly or on ad hoc basis as needed, access reports, expertise and contacts for job fairs	Brad Jensen, Director of Public Policy	\$10,000 (cost of services, reports and data)	Ongoing, 2015-2016 school year
Business Education and Community Outreach Network	4	Meet monthly to discuss needs for externships and job shadowing	Becky Shevlin, City Councilmember	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015-2016 school year
Monrovia Public Library	1, 2	Standing agreement for reciprocation of services	Edward William, Adult Literacy Coord.	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015-2016 school year
Azusa City Library	1, 2	Standing agreement for reciprocation of services	Cathay Reta, Adult Literacy Coord.	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015-2016 school year
Santa Anita YMCA	1, 2	Ad hoc meeting for services and facilities	Karen MacNair, Assoc. Executive Director	Free rental, no \$	Ongoing, 2015-2016 school year

**Table 7.1 Leverage of Existing Regional Structures from Partners
(expand table as necessary)**

Partner Institution Supporting Regional Consortium	Program area to be addressed (1-5)	Tasks/Activities Needed to Implement Support of the Program	Member Counterpart(s) *	Partner Contribution**	Timeline
City of Azusa	4	Standing agreement	Joe Rocha, Mayor	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015- 2016 school year
Azusa Senior Center	1, 2	Standing agreement for reciprocation of services	Lenore Gonzales, Supervisor	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015- 2016 school year
Mt. Sierra College	4	Standing agreement	Tawny Hernandez, Director of Career Services	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015- 2016 school year
California Association of School Counselors	1, 2	Standing agreement	Loretta Whitson, Executive Director	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015- 2016 school year
Glendora Public Library	1, 2	Standing agreement	Janet Stone, Library Director	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015- 2016 school year
Harvey Mudd College	1, 2	Standing agreement	Brian Gray, Asst. Director for Community Engagement	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015- 2016 school year
Rowland Convalescent	4	Formal MOU outlining internship / externship	Anthony Kalomas,	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015-

**Table 7.1 Leverage of Existing Regional Structures from Partners
(expand table as necessary)**

Partner Institution Supporting Regional Consortium	Program area to be addressed (1-5)	Tasks/Activities Needed to Implement Support of the Program	Member Counterpart(s) *	Partner Contribution**	Timeline
Hospital		opportunities for CTE students	Owner		2016 school year
Citrus Valley Health Partners	4	Formal MOU outlining internship / externship opportunities for CTE students	Lourdes Salandanan, Director of Education	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015-2016 school year
Sierra Pharmacy	4	Formal MOU outlining internship / externship opportunities for CTE students	Michael Globerman, President	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015-2016 school year
Santa Teresita Hospital	4	Formal MOU outlining internship / externship opportunities for CTE students	Sister Marie Estelle, Dir. of Staff Development	In services, no \$	Ongoing, 2015-2016 school year

Table 1.1A Consortium Members: Evaluation of Existing Adult Education Programs Offered

Directions: Complete this worksheet by first selecting the name of your region from the drop down menu in B5. Then, beginning in A10, list the data for each consortia member with a separate line for each program area (1-5). Please list separately credit, credit ESL, Credit Basic Skills, Non-Credit and Enhanced Non-credit for community colleges. Cells F7-W7 will auto populate as will columns B, H and P. If additional rows are needed, just begin typing data on the next empty row. Note, this is a data table, you can add more rows by simply entering data on the next line once you have entered information into all of the existing rows.

Region (select your region from drop down):

	FY 12-13 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 12-13 ADA or FTES	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program Total	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 1000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 2000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 3000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 4000's
Total for Consortium Members:	15639	1948.72	10077172	6473769	880514	1881322	235258

Consortium Member Name	Consortia (autofill)	Program Area (select from drop down)	Community College or CDE Adult Ed? (select from drop down)	For Community College Response Only: Credit ESL, Credit Basic Skills, Non-Credit, Enhanced Non-Credit	FY 12-13 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 12-13 ADA (CDE Adult Ed)/ FTES (Community Colleges)	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program Total	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 1000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 2000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 3000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 4000's
Monrovia	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	CDE Adult Education		583	30.93	209475	83181	23952	47646	9026
Monrovia	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigrant	CDE Adult Education		1081	161.01	414259	185960	43297	86129	16316
Monrovia	Citrus	4- Short Term CTE	CDE Adult Education		612	93.06	434388	303238	24873	49478	9373
Claremont	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	CDE Adult Education		724		312041	62305	150320	33416	66000
Claremont	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigrant	CDE Adult Education		961		482606	148875	207585	46146	80000
Azusa	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	CDE Adult Education		595	55.3	370181	189926	56017	63991	12876
Azusa	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigrant	CDE Adult Education		514	137	574966	211719	129397	94440	21692
Azusa	Citrus	4- Short Term CTE	CDE Adult Education		377	85.7	385258	177463	78505	62733	0
Citrus College	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	Community College	Credit Basic Skills	6336	1019	5252714	4084042	13500	1149145	6027
Citrus College	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	Community College	Non-Credit	1285	130	516474	279880	0	36546	1248
Citrus College	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigrant	Community College	Credit ESL	1085	93.1	432456	328483	0	103473	500
Citrus College	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigrant	Community College	Non-Credit	1117	55.8	484950	300275	101704	80631	2340
Citrus College	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigrant	Community College	Enhanced Non-Credit	0	0	0				

FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 5000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 6000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 7000's	FY 13-14 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 13-14 ADA or FTES	Total FY 13-14 Operational Costs for Instructional Programs	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 1000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 2000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 3000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 4000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 5000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 6000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 7000's
488510	5000	112799	17276	2096.46	10711615	6985099	882923	1899122	240161	475258	0	229052

FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 5000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 6000's	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 7000's	FY 13-14 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 13-14 ADA (CDE Adult Ed)/ FTES (Community Colleges)	Total FY 13-14 Operational Costs for Instructional Programs	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 1000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 2000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 3000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 4000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 5000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 6000's	FY 13-14 Operational Cost for Instructional Program 7000's
28952	0	16718	573	25.33	235403	90075	24762	46804	6208	26122	0	41432
52336	0	30221	1254	150.09	537571	244214	55715	105308	11222	46217	0	74895
30065	0	17361	508	104.58	457814	315613	22699	42903	6447	27127	0	43025
0	0	0	571		327000	65000	157000	35000	70000	0	0	0
0	0	0	876		503500	155000	215500	48000	85000	0	0	0
36725	995	9651	630	60.5	267354	88422	47057	62358	17453	38194	0	13870
91343	2465	23910	372	104	579550	224632	108919	90815	26170	94652	0	34362
50079	1540	14938	229	43	378467	175720	65622	59456	247	55954	0	21468
0	0	0	7347	1140	5858214	4664301	43902	1143984	6027	0	0	0
198800	0	0	1828	181	480812	261141	0	31623	1248	186800	0	0
0	0	0	1500	93.3	452362	349277	0	102585	500	0	0	0
0	0	0	1280	111.3	425912	215000	104949	101576	4387	0	0	0
			0	0	0							

Table 1.1B: Total Dollar Amount by Funding Source for Consortium Members

Directions:

Complete this worksheet by first selecting your region in B5 from the drop down menu. This will automatically populate row B. Enter the total dollar amount for each funding source data table, you can add more rows by simply entering data on the next line once you have entered information into all of the existing rows.

Region (select your region from drop down):

Citrus

	Apportionment 12-13	WIA I 12-13	WIA II 12-13	VTEA 12-13/Perkins 12-13	Fees 12-13	State Categorical Basic Skills Initiative (CCC) 12-13	SSSP (CCC) 12-13
Total For Consortia Members:	8532404	86087	176227	0	277165	189275	393479

[illegible]

by consortium member. Note, this is a

[illegible]

Table 1.2: Evaluation of Existing Adult Education Programs Offered by Consortium Partners

Directions

Complete this worksheet by first selecting your region in B5 from the drop down menu. This will automatically populate row B. Next, enter data for each consortium partner listing program areas 1-5 separately. Select the program area from the drop down menu. Note, this is a data table, you can add more rows by simply entering data on the next line once you have entered information into all of the existing rows.

Region (select your region from drop down):

Citrus

	FY 12-13 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 12-13 ADA or FTES (if applicable)	FY 12-13 Operational Cost for Instructional Program	FY 13-14 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 13-14 ADA or FTES (if applicable)	FY 13-14 Operational Costs for Instructional Program
Total for Partners:	0	0	4200	0	0	4200

[illegible]

Table 2: Evaluation of Existing Adult Education Enrollment

Directions

Complete this worksheet by first selecting your region in B5 from the drop down menu. This will automatically populate row B. Next, enter data for each consortium member and partner listing program areas 1-5 separately. Select the program area from the drop down menu. Note, this is a data table, you can add more rows by simply entering data on the next line once you have entered information into all of the existing rows.

Region (select your region from drop down):	Citrus
---	--------

	FY 2008-09 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 2012-13 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 2013-14 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 2015-16 Projected Enrollment (*This information is not required at this time)
Total for Members and Partners:	30865	15639	17306	0

Consortium Member or Partner Name	Region	Program Area (select from drop down menu)	FY 2008-09 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 2012-13 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 2013-14 Unduplicated Enrollment	FY 2015-16 Projected Enrollment (*This information is not required at this time)
Monrovia	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	1005	583	573	
Monrovia	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigran	3000	1081	1254	
Monrovia	Citrus	4- Short Term CTE	3204	612	508	
Claremont	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	1037	724	574	
Claremont	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigran	932	961	877	
Claremont	Citrus	4- Short Term CTE	351	0	0	
	Citrus					
Azusa	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	164	595	630	
Azusa	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigran	2208	514	372	
Azusa	Citrus	3- Adults with Disabilities	178	0	0	
Azusa	Citrus	4- Short Term CTE	1203	377	229	
Glendora	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	95	45	50	
Glendora	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigran	40	45	70	
	Citrus					
Citrus College	Citrus	1-Elementary and Basic Skills	14838	7621	9175	
Citrus College	Citrus	2- Classes and Courses for Immigran	2248	2202	2780	
Citrus College	Citrus	3- Adults with Disabilities	362	72	0	
Citrus College	Citrus	4- Short Term CTE	0	207	214	
Duarte	Citrus					
	Citrus					
	Citrus			0	0	