

CONSORTIUM PROGRAM QUALITY SELF-ASSESSMENT

The Consortium Program Quality Self-Assessment Tool is designed to provide consortia with a way to begin important conversations about the quality of their collaboration and impact within their communities using a self-directed quality improvement process wherein consortium agencies may work collaboratively to assess their strengths and weakness, and to develop strategies to enhance policies, procedures and practices accordingly.

This tool is appropriate for formative assessment and building teams that will work toward program improvement. This tool is not intended to be used as an external evaluation tool. However, by engaging in honest, open conversations with key stakeholders through meaningful conversations, consortia will be on the path to better manage themselves and serve students more effectively and efficiently. While there are many right ways to use the self-assessment, it is critical that stakeholders have a clear sense of the purpose, process, and intended use of the results before undertaking a large-scale self-assessment process.

This self-assessment tool utilizes and expands upon concepts introduced by Completion by Design's Loss-Momentum Framework and developed under the aegis of the California Adult Education Program Consortium and Member Effectiveness Field Team. Created with input from practitioners and experts in the field of Adult Education, this self-assessment tool was created to help consortia evaluate their effectiveness in the following key areas:

1. Capacity
2. Connection
3. Entry
4. Progress
5. Completion/Transition

On the following pages are a series of prompts that may be used to describe the effectiveness of regional consortia and their members. Within each of the 5 sections, there are various measures and examples of evidence for each indicator of effectiveness. Consortia will be able to pick from a rating of 1-5 (1 being low on effectiveness and 5 being high on effectiveness).

Instructions

Read each of the following items and select the option that best describes your consortium and / or member agency currently. Group discussions of the indicators are encouraged in order to represent far-ranging views of consortia effectiveness. After conducting the self-assessment, interpretations can be made for how effective consortia are in the key areas. If the majority of answers were rated as:

- 1s: There is strong need for improvement and the consortium has an urgent need to address this area.
- 2s: The consortium is making progress in this area but can improve further. This area needs targeted support in order to improve its outcomes.
- 3s: The consortium is doing well in this area but needs additional work to be addressed.
- 4s: The consortium is doing very well in this area and need only a few improvements in order to be exceptional.
- 5s: The consortium is exceptionally proficient in this area, evident in many ways. This area can serve as an example or model for other consortia to follow.

Consortia should strive to have a majority 3s, 4s, or 5s for each indicator to demonstrate overall effectiveness. Assistance and support should be so sought for areas scoring mostly in 1s and 2s.

Quality Indicator #1: Capacity

Key Concept: This section asks questions about the consortium and individual members' ability to support each other and build capacity to deliver high quality adult education to meet community needs.

1.1. Consortium maintains effective collaborative processes for planning, implementation and accountability.

1.1.1.	1 No staff positions are charged with overall consortium management / coordination	2 3 Part-time staff are charged with overall consortium management / coordination	4 5 1 or more staff charged with overall consortium management / coordination
1.1.2.	1 Consortium seldom convenes to discuss progress toward goals	2 3 Consortium occasionally convenes to discuss progress toward goals	4 5 Consortium frequently convenes to discuss progress toward goals
1.1.3.	1 Consortium has few documented processes or procedures for facilitating collaboration and coordination (i.e., shared calendars, bylaws, governance, etc.)	2 3 Consortium has some documented processes and procedures for facilitating collaboration and coordination (i.e., shared calendars, bylaws, governance, etc.)	4 5 Consortium has significant documented processes and procedures for facilitating collaboration and coordination (i.e., shared calendars, bylaws, governance, etc.)

1.2. Consortium agencies have the leadership, management, and accountability processes necessary to meet community need for adult education

1.2.1.	1 Few agency leaders (adult school principals, community college staff with consortium leadership roles (deans, directors, etc.)) have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to meet the goals and objectives of the California Adult Education Program.	2	3 Some agency leaders (adult school principals, community college staff with consortium leadership roles (deans, directors, etc.)) have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to meet the goals and objectives of the California Adult Education Program.	4	5 Mostly all agency leaders (adult school principals, community college staff with consortium leadership roles (deans, directors, etc.)) have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to meet the goals and objectives of the California Adult Education Program.
1.2.2.	1 Resource allocations (e.g., time and funding) for several agency leadership positions (principals, deans, etc.) are not commensurate with community need and program size	2	3 Resource allocations (e.g., time and funding) for some agency leadership positions (principals, deans, etc.) are not commensurate with community need and program size	4	5 Resource allocations (e.g., time and funding) for agency leadership positions (principals, deans, etc.) are commensurate with community need and program size
1.2.3.	1 Few agencies can be said to participate fully in consortium activities	2	3 Some agencies can be said to participate fully in consortium activities	4	5 Mostly all agencies can be said to participate fully in consortium activities

1.3. Consortium agencies have resources that promote adult learning and provide high levels of access to communities of need

1.3.1.	1 Few agencies have staffing models that support agency-wide coordination and collaboration to achieve high levels of student success and AEBG outcomes	2	3 Some agencies have staffing models that support agency-wide coordination and collaboration to achieve high levels of student success and AEBG outcomes	4	5 Mostly all agencies have staffing models that support agency-wide coordination and collaboration to achieve high levels of student success and AEBG outcomes
1.3.2.	1 Few agencies have access to sufficient number of classrooms and other learning spaces appropriate for adult learners	2	3 Some agencies have access to sufficient number of classrooms and other learning spaces appropriate for adult learners	4	5 Most agencies have access to sufficient number of classrooms and other learning spaces appropriate for adult learners

1.4. Professional development provides opportunities for faculty and staff to turn new knowledge into practice

1.4.1.	1 New program staff / member representatives are expected to learn about AEBG policies on their own	2	3 Some program staff / member representatives receive limited training and orientation to the consortium or AEBG policies and guidance	4	5 All new program staff attend local program orientations that includes a thorough review of AEBG policies and guidance
1.4.2.	1 Existing professional development for staff has not been aligned to ensure that the skills of staff meet the consortium's mission and outcome goals.	2	3 Existing professional development for staff is somewhat aligned to ensure that the skills of staff meet the consortium's mission and outcome goals.	4	5 Existing professional development opportunities for staff are clearly aligned to with the consortium's mission and outcome goals.

Quality Indicator #2: Connection

Key Concept: This section asks questions about the consortium members' ability to provide coordinated, proactive engagement to potential students on educational and training options and choices.

2.1. Consortia and members collaboratively engage prospective students from communities of high need to provide services in aligned program areas

2.1.1.	1 Few if any programs develop annual recruitment plan(s) or establish stretch goals for number of students enrolling in program areas	2 3 Some programs develop annual recruitment plan(s) or establish stretch goals for number of students enrolling in program areas	4 5 Mostly all programs develop annual recruitment plan(s) or establish stretch goals for number of students enrolling in program areas
2.1.2.	1 Few programs conduct outreach or early engagement with prospective students to help them understand educational options and services available	2 3 Some programs conduct outreach or early engagement with prospective students to help them understand educational options and services available	4 5 Mostly all programs conduct outreach or early engagement with prospective students to help them understand educational options and services available
2.1.3.	1 Data are not used to inform recruitment	2 3 Some census data, labor market data, and / or assessments of regional and community needs are used to inform recruitment	4 5 Recruitment is consistently informed by census data, labor market data, and / or assessments of regional and community needs

2.2. Consortium agencies demonstrate a “no-wrong door” approach to regional education and training

2.2.1.	1 Few counselors and advisors are knowledgeable of programs and services offered by the consortium	2	3 Some counselors and advisors are knowledgeable of programs and services offered by the consortium	4	5 Mostly all counselors and advisors are knowledgeable of programs and services offered by the consortium
2.2.2.	1 Counselors / advisors are not comfortable referring students to programs or agencies outside of their home campuses	2	3 Counselors / advisors are somewhat comfortable referring students to programs or agencies outside of their home campuses	4	5 Counselors / advisors are comfortable referring students to programs or agencies outside of their home campuses
2.2.3.	1 Few if any agencies have program maps that clearly delineate requirements and aligned career pathway opportunities across members and partners	2	3 Some agencies have program maps that clearly delineate requirements and aligned career pathway opportunities across members and partners	4	5 Most all agencies have program maps that clearly delineate requirements and aligned career pathway opportunities across members and partners
2.2.4.	1 Curricula are seldom organized around common standards for program areas college and career readiness, and instructional practices incorporate the skills and knowledge learners need to transition successfully to postsecondary education, training, and the workforce	2	3 Curricula are somewhat organized around common standards for program areas college and career readiness, and instructional practices incorporate the skills and knowledge learners need to transition successfully to postsecondary education, training, and the workforce	4	5 Curricula are mostly all organized around common standards for program areas college and career readiness, and instructional practices that incorporate the skills and knowledge learners need to transition successfully to postsecondary education, training, and the workforce

Quality Indicator #3: Entry

Key Concept: This section asks questions about the consortium members' ability to have established common intake and assessment procedures and provide career and goal exploration and planning that addresses individual student needs and interests

3.1. Consortia and members orient adult learners in a manner that is culturally responsive and promotes self-efficacy and confidence

3.1.1.	1 Few programs provide mandatory orientation for first-time students	2 3 Some programs provide differentiated orientation for first-time students	4 5 Programs provide mandatory "high-touch" orientation for first-time students designed to help students identify career options and goals aligned to student skills and interests, clarify program and administrative requirements and timelines, and assist with course selection and access to support services, including financial planning / literacy and other wrap-around services
3.1.2.	1 Few to no partnerships exist among community providers	2 3 Some partnerships exist among a few providers in the community to provide counseling, social, and academic supports	4 5 Programs partner with providers in the community to provide case management services to students, including counseling and social and academic supports.
3.1.3.	1 Few students have meaningful access to high-quality counseling services	2 3 Some students in certain programs have access to high-quality counseling services	4 5 Nearly all students have access to high-quality counseling services from initial contact

3.2. Consortia and members use multiple measures to inform placement, education and career planning, classroom instruction, and continuous improvement activities

3.2.1.	1 There is little to no uniformity or consistency among providers regarding assessment, placement, and use of individual learning plans.	2	3 There is some consistency among providers regarding assessment, placement, and use of individual learning plans.	4	5 Providers have adopted common assessments and placement policies, which directly inform students' individual learning plans
---------------	---	---	---	---	--

3.3. Students complete individualized educational plans that reflect an informed understanding of their educational and career options

3.3.1.	1 Few students develop meaningful individual educational plans.	2	3 Some students develop individual educational plans they use to track progress through their programs.	4	5 Individualized educational and support service plans are developed early in the educational experience and updated regularly based on student goals, assessment, and learner outcomes
3.3.2.	1 Career planning occurs at the end of students' programs, if at all.	2	3 Some programs provide integrated career planning that is sometimes captured as part of students' individual educational plans.	4	5 Learning plans are shared across agencies and drive academic and career planning. Career planning is integrated throughout students' educational experience.

3.4. Consortia and members collaborate in the provision of proactive counseling and support services to promote persistence and long-term student success

3.4.1.	1 Few agencies assess or promote the full range of wrap-around supports students need.	2	3 Some programs informally assess student needs and make referrals to partners for services.	4	5 Students are provided the full range of student services to support their ability to successfully complete programs, including financial assistance, housing, access to food / nutrition, child care, books & materials, physical and mental health services.
3.4.2.	1 There is almost no consistent approach to proactively identifying student needs or connecting them to supportive services.	2	3 Dedicated advisors / staff / faculty tend to coordinate academic and non-academic supports to students, though procedures may not be formalized.	4	5 Early alert systems are integrated into programs and prompt action by advisors / staff / faculty who coordinate to provide academic and non-academic support to students

Quality Indicator #4: Progress

Key Concept: This section asks questions about the consortium members' ability to have shared and aligned programs which allow students to accelerate progress via courses that are geared toward academic, career, and community goals.

4.1. Agencies have aligned and articulated programs

4.1.1.	1 No alignment has occurred	2 3 Some alignment has occurred, and some curricula have been updated based on current learning theory and promising practices	4 5 Curricula are aligned, up-to-date and informed by current learning theory and promising practices with well-articulated instructional goals of reasonable scope and sequence
4.1.2.	1 No alignment / articulation has occurred	2 3 Some programs are monitored for successful alignment and articulation	4 5 Consortia / members actively track performance of aligned programs using established data collection procedures and agreed upon measures of skills attainment

4.2. Agencies offer robust integrated education and training programs

4.2.1.	1 Minimal contextualized ESL is provided at a small number of agencies	2 3 Some concurrent enrollment is available	4 5 Several concurrent enrollment opportunities across a number of disciplines are available
4.2.2.	1 Few to no concurrent enrollment opportunities are available	2 3 Some contextualized ESL or basic skills IET courses are provided	4 5 Basic skills and ESL courses are contextualized to include workforce training and workforce preparation activities

4.3. Agencies provide coordinated, ongoing, consistent student support

4.3.1.	1	2	3	4	5
	There is little to no coordination around student support services		Some agencies have processes for tracking student supports needs and acting on data to ensure student success		Members have shared tools and procedures for collecting counseling, transition, and support services data and provide coordinated referrals to members / partners Student satisfaction surveys show high rates of satisfaction (90% or better) across all agencies

Quality Indicator #5: Completion / Transition

Key Concept: This section asks questions about the consortium members' ability to facilitate timely program completion and successful transition into postsecondary education, training, and / or employment.

5.1. Programs demonstrate effectiveness in transitioning students into postsecondary and / or the workforce

5.1.1.	1 There is little to no coordinated case management or formal support for transition into post-secondary or the workforce	2 3 Some agencies provide case managed transition support, though processes may not be uniform or aligned across agencies	4 5 Members have shared systems and procedures to support transition process (alignment of standards, collocated transition specialists, warm hand-offs, case/referral management and tracking)
5.1.2.	1 Few programs have formal articulation / dual-enrollment policies or agreements	2 3 Some programs have formal articulation / dual-enrollment policies or agreements	4 5 Nearly all programs have formal articulation / dual-enrollment policies or agreement that enable easy transition into postsecondary training.
5.1.3.	1 The consortium does not set performance targets and only rarely looks at student achievement in a coordinated way	2 3 Some programs may set performance targets and / or there are consortium plans to develop processes to do so	5 Nearly all consortium agencies actively collaborate to set and track performance targets and student achievement

5.2. Partnerships with local workforce and community service providers are integrated into programs of study

5.2.1.	1 Programs have few if any formal relationships with regional partners	2 3 There are some formal agreements with regional partners to provide support services in a select number of programs	4 5 Programs actively collaborate with partners to provide service-learning, job-shadowing, mentoring, internships, apprenticeships, and / or other work-based learning opportunities and / or services to students that aid in the development of employability skills
---------------	---	---	--

5.3. Programs conduct continuous improvement planning that is in conjunction with all regional adult education stakeholders

5.3.1.	1 Relatively little formal evaluation of program effectiveness is conducted	2 3 Programs regularly assess their effectiveness supporting student goal achievement using data from AEBG accountability systems and additional local measures of effectiveness (industry recognized credentials, AEBG completion measures (high school credentials)	4 5 Programs regularly assess their effectiveness supporting student goal achievement using data from AEBG accountability systems and additional local measures of effectiveness (industry recognized credentials, AEBG completion measures (high school credentials)
5.3.2.	1 Consortium does not conduct meaningful continuous improvement planning. When it does, community partners, staff, faculty, students, and other stakeholders are rarely involved.	2 3 Community partners, staff, faculty, students, and other stakeholders are sometimes involved in continuous improvement planning and evaluation. Opportunities to participate may be reserved for only some powerful and/or influential agencies or employees.	4 5 Community partners, staff, faculty, students, and other stakeholders are engaged in continuous improvement planning and are involved in evaluating program effectiveness and design