



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Regular Meeting and LARAEC Board Workshop

Friday, August 16, 2019

1:30 PM – 5:30 PM

Burbank Adult School
3811 Allan Ave, Burbank CA 91505

Executive Board Members in		Point Person Team Members		Staff	
Emilio Urioste, Burbank USD	X	Rosalinda Brewington, BUSD	X	Lanzi Asturias, Project Director	X
Veronica Montes, Culver City USD	X	Elvis Carias, CCUSD	X	Michele Stiehl, Advisor	X
Dr. Robert Miller, LACCD	X	Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen, LACCD	X	Justin Gorence, Advisor	X
Joseph Stark, Los Angeles USD	X	Men Le, LAUSD	X	Grace Ocampo, Budget Analyst	X
Alice Jacquez, Montebello USD	X	Philip Tenorio, MUSD	X	Vacant, Secretary	

1 Call to Order	1.1 Pledge of Allegiance	Men Le
	1.2 Approval of the Agenda Ms. Montes wished to express condolences from all of the LARAEC staff and board for the passing of Mr. Tenorio’s son. Mr. Stark moved to approve the agenda, Dr. Miller seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the agenda.	Ms Montes
	1.3 Approval of the Minutes a. Regular Board Meeting, May 2019 I. Mr. Stark moved to approve the minutes, and Dr. Miller seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the minutes.	Mr. Stark
2 Public Comment	There was no public comment.	
3 Annual Plan Update	Mr. Asturias added that all the information in the presentation on the annual plan is in the board packet. He explained that at the last board meeting May 17, the LARAEC office presented a strategy to develop a one-year plan which was approved by the board. The strategy was to list the activities on the 3-year plan that needed to be completed in the 2019-2020 school year. The plan submitted to the state is part of today’s consent agenda, which incorporates those one-year goals. The only challenge is the 1-year plan is organized by State priorities, while the 3-year plan is organized by LARAEC priorities. So they had to develop a crosscheck of the activities listed on the 3-year plan that were due or supposed to be started within the current fiscal year. He then explained how they translated the 3-year strategies into the 1-year plan, and a sample of the tasks and activities that needed to be completed in the 1-year plan, as well as different models for achieving those. He explained that the Point Person Team has banded together to offer suggestions/recommendations for how to do that work. The presentation will summarize those recommended models. Most of the point persons recommend the last model, Model 5 (Revised).	Mr. Asturias

Model 1 involves having a consultant as a facilitator (KH was suggested as the consultant, the same firm which helped LARAEC develop its 3-year plan). It would involve using 6 action planning teams as indicated on the 3- and 1-year plans. They tried to create a rough timeline so the board can appreciate when the plan would be in full implementation. Full implementation would be between February, March, and April. That is when they will be doing full activities instead of partial activities, and the comparatively long time to full implementation is because of the need to bring on board a contractor.

Model 2 involves using a Consultant and Trainee (Train the Trainer). The consultant would be driving the implementation of the activities to be done, and at the same time the consultant would be training either a LARAEC rep or appointees who would in turn take over the implementation process at a later time. Similarly to the previous model, full implementation would be in a later part of the year since they have a contractor to bring on board and some training time to be factored in.

Model 3 is "Implementation Model Workgroups by Strategies", and Mr. Asturias explained that there was not much difference from the previous models. They would be using 3 workgroups based on strategic priorities rather than 6 action planning teams. The timeline on this plan would be based on whether they implement this with plan 1, 2, or 4.

Model 4 would involve the LARAEC Office as facilitator implementing the activities. Because they will not need to hire a contractor, this would probably be the option that would move faster in terms of full implementation.

Dr. Miller said that the plan is a very detailed document, and the document by which they will be judged by. He preferred model 4, but did not know if the LARAEC office had enough "horsepower" to implement it. He suggested that they might need to have two Mr. Asturias's, one that performs all of his current functions, and another that does program oversight and program management. Their consultants are very good and provide a lot, but they are also expensive and they come and go. For something like this, he thinks they need continuity.

Mr. Stark appreciated the staff for putting this together, but wondered if it might be helpful to come back to this issue, since they would not be deciding anything today and it will probably become a little clearer after the discussion during the board workshop later today.

Mr. Asturias continued and explained Model 5, incorporating a consultant and trainee (train the trainer approach), with workgroups by strategy. The difference is, the model is using 4 work groups instead of 6 planning teams, and is similar to Model 3 in that they would be using priorities identified by the 3-year plan.

Finally, he explained the preferred choice of the PPT, Model 5 (Revised): Consultant and Trainee (Train the Trainer), Workgroups by Strategy. It would

	<p>use the 3 priorities identified in the same plans, and accounts for two ongoing workgroups that are in operation currently, Data and Accountability and the Counseling Collaborative.</p> <p>Mr. Stark noticed that in a couple of cases some groups have their lead “TBD”, but some have an individual already named as a lead. Mr. Asturias clarified that the PPT left in individuals who were leading those groups last year.</p>	
<p>4 Budget Report</p>	<p>Upcoming CAEP and Data and Accountability deadlines and updates:</p> <p>Ms. Ocampo explained the upcoming Data and Accountability fund deadlines. They have submitted their closeout report already to the state, but still need to complete the Practice With Promise report. Ms. Montes asked what that was, and Ms. Ocampo explained that it is basically a report of best practices from consortiums across the state. Mr. Asturias added that there is a template for submitting online, and they would appreciate if districts that received funding submit one or two best practices about what they did with the data and accountability funding provided them, whether it’s new training, new equipment purchase, etc.</p> <p>Ms. Ocampo then summarized the upcoming progress report and estimated program area report deadlines to be submitted in NOVA, as well as the due dates for fiscal year 2020 CAEP fund budgets.</p> <p>4.1 Recertified, Revised CFAD Allocations</p> <p>Ms. Ocampo explained the consortium’s CFAD allocations as of May 2nd when they initially submitted CFADs, and noted that the state had reduced COLA from 3.46 to 3.26, so allocations went down.</p> <p>4.2 D&A Final Budget And Expense Report</p> <p>Ms. Ocampo explained that this was the final and closeout report submitted to the state. LARAEC received 4.6 million covering June 1 2016 to June 30 2019. Each member district has fully spent their respective allocations. Since they are all CBO signed, they were spent based on objectives set in the plan.</p> <p>4.3 FY 2019 CAEP Q3 Progress and Expense Report</p> <p>a. Capital Outlay Summary and Reminders</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. As of Q3, LARAEC has a budget of about 146 million, including carryover from prior year. They have about 58.6 million left as of Q3. The Q3 target is about 45%. She pointed out that some members have not spent within that target, and have their corresponding corrective action displayed on the presentation slide as submitted to the state. II. Ms. Ocampo reiterated the state’s previous response to Capital Outlay requests. The state did not approve them, but said that they could move forward if consortium members agreed to it after submission for review, they are for the sole 	<p>Grace Ocampo</p>

	<p>benefit of the seven adult ed program areas, the minutes from the meeting discussing it were saved, and they posted it in their 18-19 budget and work plan as it connects to the 18-19 annual plan strategies.</p> <p>III. She then went over the listed respective budgets and expenses of capital outlay for each district and whether they've presented and submitted them to the LARAEC board. As of Q3 BUSD, LAUSD, and MUSD have submitted to LARAEC, CCUSD had no expenditures, and LACCD submitted directly to the state.</p> <p>IV. Mr. Stark asked if they knew why LACCD had not submitted their capital outlay expenditures to the LARAEC board, and Mr. Asturias said that they were informed the request would go directly to the state and that the state has approved those requests. Dr. Miller said that he did not have any more information currently, but he could find out more and present it at a later meeting.</p> <p>b. Spending targets</p> <p>I. Previously discussed in item 4.2.</p>	
<p>5 Board Member Reports</p>	<p>5.1 Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP LARAEC Enrollment Count and Procedures Audit Progress Report</p> <p>a. Ms. Ocampo explained that sometime in May LARAEC had received a letter stating that Vavrinek, Trine, Day and Co, who had been contracted with LARAEC to audit their enrollment count and procedures, will be merging with EideBailly CPAs and Business Advisors.</p> <p>i. She explained that the auditors have visited the four unified K12 districts between April and June. They are in the same process with LACCD; selections have been made and provided to the district, and the district is gathering info to provide support.</p> <p>ii. The auditors reviewed enrollment procedures at each site and compared for consistency. They have participated in conference calls with all key personnel from member districts, communicating what items the auditors needed to evaluate.</p> <p>iii. She explained that for the next steps, they need to complete testing at LACCD, prepare their observations for each district's management's review and input, finalize their enrollment agreed-upon procedures report, and present that report to LARAEC.</p> <p>b. Mr. Stark said that they had all agreed at one or more board meetings that there was a sense of urgency to procuring this audit information to respond to questions from the state, and he would like to see a timeline so they know when things will be completed and when things will go back to the board. Mr. Asturias added that this information is crucial so they can meet</p>	<p>Grace Ocampo</p>

	<p>the requirements that LARAEC had indicated to the state would help us complete the items they would do to have LAREC removed from the audit report they are under currently based on the MUSD audit report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Dr. Miller said that LACCD has been in almost constant contact with the auditors' representative Mr. Harrison, and that their auditing process is different because of the way they report enrollment. He asked if the state has been checking on LAREC with where they are in their reports. Mr. Asturias said that the state originally gave LARAEC one year to comply, and they have exceeded that one year and have not finalized. Dr. Miller asked if the state had been asking after LARAEC, and Mr. Asturias confirmed they had not. ii. Dr. Miller asked when they could anticipate the two consulting firms' process being completed, and Mr. Asturias said that part of the work is really depending on finishing the LACCD segment. Dr. Miller said that the ball was in the firm's court. iii. Mr. Asturias said that it had been communicated to LARAEC that the firm was actually waiting on a response from LACCD, and that they have reached out multiple times. <p>c. Dr. Miller asserted that that was not correct, that it was the second time he had been ambushed at this meeting, and that he did not appreciate it. He added that a simple phone call would have enabled him to get information to address these issues. Ms. Montes said that they can reach out to Mr. Harrison, and then she can facilitate communicating with anyone they need to.</p>	
	<p>5.2 Vasquez and Company, LLP Development of Oversight Policies and Procedures Progress Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Marialyn Salvador, introduced herself as a senior manager at Vasquez and Company, and explained that she was there to report on the status of their contract with LARAEC for developing oversight policies and procedures for the AB104 Adult Education Block Grant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. They have started going to districts and interviewing LARAEC personnel to gain an understanding of systems and practices currently performed related to monitoring AB104 programs. They have held in-person meetings with LAUSD, MUSD, and an in-person visit with LACCD, and teleconferences with CCUSD and BUSD. ii. They have documented narratives and procedures, focusing on the districts' procurement and disbursement. Ms. Salvador is waiting for her auditing partner to come back from vacation, then they will draft 	<p>Marialyn Salvador</p>

	<p>a report with findings and recommendations. They may come back and do a walk-through if needed with previous interviewees in case their understanding was not complete at the time, and to make sure they are documenting LARAEC districts' procedures correctly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. The next steps for them are to develop an effective monitoring function and written policies and procedures manual for the administration of AB104, and to present them and the report to the LARAEC board, as well as potentially the boards of individual districts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Ms. Montes asked to confirm whether Ms. Salvador was just waiting for her partner to come back to finish writing districts to make sure they understood their procedures, and Ms. Salvador confirmed that they were, since her partner has necessary experience, input, and suggestions. c. Mr. Urioste asked if districts would be getting a draft of the reports of their procedures, since in particular how BUSD operates as a small K12 school is very different from the large LACCD and the unions. Mr. Asturias clarified that that was an understanding we had going into this process; part of it is interviewing, then coming back with what the firm understands LARAEC's districts' procedures to be, and at that point the districts will have an opportunity to review and approve. Once that is completed, a final report will be presented to the LARAEC board to formally approve. This is affecting each district only to the extent that oversight of certain accounts and transactions are needed to comply with the state requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mr. Urioste clarified that he wanted to know, when they get this report, whether they would be getting a draft that they can review and potentially make some revisions to if needed. His concern is that they are going to be having a final report submitted to LARAEC without having had the opportunity to read the whole thing and to say whether they would like to make changes. Mr. Asturias clarified that those opportunities will be provided, and added that in essence, what Vasquez and Company has been charged to do is write the policies, not to implement them. It's up to the board whether to implement them or not, and whether they will be implemented as is or with changes. 	
	<p>5.3 Student Transitions and Educational Plan (STEP) Program update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mr. Asturias explained that basically, at this point they have stopped activities on the development of software intended to provide electronic ISPs to some member districts based on the fact that there was little participation for the test for the development of the software. So for all intents and purposes, that contract is completed at this point. 	Mr. Asturias
6	MUSD:	Ms. Jacquez

Board Member Reports	<p>a. Ms. Jacquez announced that MUSD recently had a district-wide professional development session with all MUSD staff, in all about 2000+ employees. They went over data, ESL, and technology writing. MUSD also just received a new acting director, and Ms. Jacquez would like to welcome him aboard; he is also the Student Services director, and comes with a wealth of knowledge and experience. August 27 will be another staff professional development day, and August 28 will be the first day of school.</p>	
	<p>LAUSD:</p> <p>a. There was no board member report from Mr. Stark.</p>	Mr. Stark
	<p>BUSD:</p> <p>a. Mr. Urioste announced that BUSD has developed a new website, which gives them tremendous flexibility that they did not have before to add things and new information. It is also much more user-friendly for the end user and for BUSD as an institution. They started back to school on August 17th, and August 23rd will be an all-staff meeting and prof development. On August 24th, they will start self-study meetings for WASC in prep for their visit on April 27th, 2020. They will also have an open house on September 4th at 6 PM.</p>	Mr. Urioste
	<p>LACCD:</p> <p>a. Dr. Miller explained that adult ed continues to be a growth area in LACCD, and adult ed enrollments are up going into the fall semester which commences next Thursday. Thier credit enrollments are down 1-3%. They are also updating all of their colleges' websites, representing a significant investment as they look to take advantage of the social media world. He also summarized the effect of the law AB705 which goes into effect in the fall, which has caused considerable changes in how they approach remedial math and English. Lastly, their guided pathways activity at the state level continues.</p>	Dr. Miller
	<p>CCUSD:</p> <p>a. Ms. Montes announced that CCUSD is also going through a WASC self-study, and they will be sharing a chair with Burbank. Also she will be accepting a position as Director of Student and Valley Support Services, but will still be overseeing adult and alternative ed, so she will still be CCUSD's LARAEC board rep. But she will also introduce the board to Ruth Morris, CCUSD assistant principal, who will be handling all of their day to day logistics.</p>	Ms. Montes
7 Action Items	<p>7.1 LARAEC Board Meetings for School Year 2019-2020 Locations Discussion and approval</p> <p>a. Mr. Asturias explained that the board had decided on meeting dates for this year for LARAEC, but not locations. Ms. Montes, Mr. Urioste, and Dr. Miller came to the agreement that BUSD</p>	

could host the September and May meetings at Burbank Adult School, while LACCD could host the November, January, and March meetings at the Van De Kamp Innovation Center.

- b. Dr. Miller motioned to approve those dates and locations. Ms. Jacquez seconded.
- c. The board voted unanimously to approve the meeting dates and locations for LARAEC board meetings for SY 2019-2020.

7.2 Board President Nomination and Election

- a. Ms. Montes asked if anyone would like to discuss the role of the president or volunteer for the position. Mr. Urioste asked if they had anything on paper regarding the makeup of the board and board positions. Mr. Asturias clarified that they have very little, basically the agreement that was originally done under AB86 that the board was to be made up from a representative appointed by their member districts. They do not have any bylaws to inform the process at this point. About a year ago, the board decided that there needed to be a president.
- b. Ms. Montes suggested to hold off on the issue because of the discussion they will be having in the board workshop. The board agreed to table the issue for now, to potentially revisit it after the board workshop. Dr. Miller clarified that they could have the board workshop and come back to the issue without having to close and reopen the open session, and could table it to the end of the meeting. All board members agreed to table the issue until after the board workshop.
- c. **(Agenda items 8 and 9 were discussed, after which discussion returned to this item)**
- d. Dr. Miller moved that Mr. Urioste be LARAEC board president for the next year. Ms. Montes seconded.
- e. Mr. Urioste asked if they wanted to have the president serve for two years; Dr. Miller thought that it was too much power in the hands of one person for too long, and thinks one year is good. Mr. Urioste suggested having a board member emeritus, given that adult ed is an evolving discipline, they could benefit from that or a similar sitting board member with knowledge and experience. Dr. Miller said that potentially as their board president, Mr. Urioste can agendize this issue, and they can have another discussion about it down the road.
- f. Mr. Urioste said he would like to see someone else get nominated, and nominated Mr. Stark for president.
- g. Dr. Miller said that normally this process is defined in closed doors and agreed beforehand amongst board members. After deciding to have a succession of nominees that would become President after the previous nominee had completed a 1-year term, Mr. Urioste nominated Mr. Stark for first Vice President. Mr. Stark nominated Alice Jacquez as second Vice President. Dr. Miller accepted these amendments to his motion. Mr. Urioste then seconded Dr. Miller's original nomination of him as President.

	<p>h. The board voted unanimously to elect Mr. Urioste as LARAEC Board President for a 1-year term, to be succeeded by Mr. Stark for a 1-year term as President, then Ms. Jacquez for a 1-year term as president.</p> <p>(At this point, discussion returned to Agenda Item 9)</p>	
<p>8 Consent Agenda</p>	<p>Consent Items:</p> <p>8.1 RG Pacific P.O. \$18,000 (New Webmaster) 8.2 One-Year Plan</p> <p>Ms. Montes explained that their old webmaster is out of bond, and asked if any board members wanted to pull consent items for discussion. Dr. Miller asked what the process was to go with RG Pacific for the webmaster purchase order. Mr. Asturias clarified that the contractor has been utilized by other schools in LAUSD, and comes highly recommended by individuals who used it before for other schools, and the LARAEC office felt comfortable that this is someone that would perform the duties outlined in PO. They also looked at other providers, and felt for the amount being charged that this would be the most flexible provider for LARAEC.</p> <p>Mr. Urioste asked if they were keeping the same website that they have now, with this company maintaining it, or if they are going to redesign a new website for LARAEC. Mr. Asturias explained that the website is going to be redesigned, and they are not certain as of yet that they will keep the same web account; they are still trying to transact that with the previous webmaster, who owns the domain name, but not the system that operates the website. He said that they will still redesign the website to make it more user-friendly, while negotiating with the previous webmaster for the domain.</p> <p>Mr. Urioste asked if there will be time for the Point Person Team to work with the LAREC office and the new developer to make sure to get eyes on the redesign process and get input, and Mr. Astiruas said that there will always be time for that. Mr. Urioste thought it would be good for the PPT to be involved in the process from the beginning.</p> <p>Dr. Miller moved to approve the consent agenda items 8.1 and 8.2. Mr. Urioste seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the consent agenda.</p>	
<p>9 LARAEC Board Workshop</p>	<p>Governance, Roles, and Responsibilities of the LARAEC Office, Point Persons Team, Action Planning Teams, and Executive Team</p> <p>a. Mr. Asturias introduced the facilitating team from the CAEP office's Technical Assistance Project: Diana Batista, director of TAP, John Fleischman, consultant for TAP, and Veronica Parker, a TAP coordinator. Ms. Batista went around the room, encouraging not only</p>	

the LARAEC executive board but all attending the workshop to introduce themselves, which they did.

- b. Ms. Batista clarified that they do not represent the state Department of Education, but are part of the professional development capacity built in to CAEP. They want to have a dialogue and discussions about the roles and responsibilities of the LARAEC positions mentioned in the annual and 3-year plans. They will not be making recommendations or decisions. She emphasized an atmosphere of open-mindedness and sharing ideas, while being considerate of differing viewpoints, and went over some of the ground rules of the discussion.
- c. Mr. Fleischman introduced himself as a seasoned adult educator with 45 years of experience working in adult ed. He started the Outreach and Technical Assistance Network or OTAN, which is still funded 30 years later. He then gave background on his work with educational consortiums, and working on the AB86 plan.
- d. Mr. Fleishcman then summarized that they wanted to start by going through the existing governance document for LARAEC which was required by the state. He also read the research and investigation commissioned by the LARAEC board about governance, which pointed out to him how fragmented things are throughout the state, and pointed out that the state government compromised in giving funding by taking the concept of local control to a regional level, and giving a degree of flexibility to local agencies.
 - i. Ms. Batista added that some of this work was done during the AB86 period just 5 years ago, and during AB86 they really didn't know if there was a promise of money, and because it was the block grant, they did not know if it was ongoing money. They are seeing now that the state is making a commitment, and now is a perfect time to reflect on what consortiums started with.
- e. Mr. Fleischman summarized that the proposed outcome for the discussion is a rank ordered list of roles and responsibilities for LARAEC office staff, point persons, Action Planning and Executive Teams. Also, time permitting, an initial outline for a Laraec Governance Policy Guide to include a timeline for completion and for updates.
 - i. He then summarized the formation of LARAEC, the creation of the funding distribution system, and the guidelines for operations. He reiterated that the CAEP consortia government report commissioned by LARAEC was fascinating since the state has not provided that kind of research, and since it indicates there is no state-wide standard. There are different models and different sizes, but they boiled down mostly to 2-tiered and 3-tiered structures.
 - ii. He then summarized the variety of board structures around the state, how the consortia are managed, what types of middle management groups they have, and the various types of operations and administrative support.

- f. He then summarized the wide variety of initiatives currently in development statewide at consortiums, including website construction, marketing, and social media. He also summarized the variety of investments in staff development, and the wide variety of funds distribution schemes across consortia.
- g. Mr. Fleischman summarized the CAEP Consortia Governance lessons learned for the state:
 - i. There is a lack of consistency in management.
 - ii. Blending AE and CCD cultures is challenging with rank-and-file. One challenge is funding differences between adult ed K12 schools and CCDs.
 - iii. Data collection seems to be an issue.
 - iv. The lack of full-time staff is tough.
 - v. Also, he has heard nightmare stories from some of the consortia about fund reallocation.
- h. He then listed recommended focus areas for LARAEC:
 - i. Meaningful faculty and student engagement
 - ii. Professional development (establishing PLC's, and a potential super-regional meeting between LA County and Orange County)
 - iii. Transition personnel (Many consortia are moving forward with transition specialists.
 - iv. Articulation
 - v. Scaling best practices (discussion of scaling up the Family Success Initiative).
- i. Dr. Miller suggested that LARAEC is a lot more functional as a consortium than it gives itself credit for, and Mr. Fleischman agreed. He added that he has been to other states with adult ed programs, and it is a huge mix around the country, and he is so proud of what California has done, noting that other states look to them.
- j. Mr. Fleischman then wanted to quickly go through the positions of the LARAEC Office Staff, and asked whether LARAEC staff positions were decided by the central office, or board-approved, and Mr. Asturias confirmed they were board-approved.
- k. Ms. Batista summarized that four office staff positions were outlined for the LARAEC office: Secretary, Fiscal Analyst, Teacher Advisor, and Project Director.
 - i. Mr. Fleischman asked if the positions are funded through LAUSD, if they need to send them to the board to approve any changes, and Mr. Asturias clarified that they do not, unless they wanted to add new positions.
 - ii. Ms. Batista summarized the duties of the LARAEC Secretary as listed in LARAEC documentation, and asked if anyone had any comments on the Secretary position, and anything that should be deleted or omitted. There was not.
 - iii. Mr. Fleischman then asked if there was anything from the listed duties of the Fiscal Analyst that anyone thought needed to be added or deleted, and there was not.

iv. Ms. Batista moved on to the Teacher Advisor position, and Ms. Montes added that three of the bullet points under the position's responsibilities are repeats, which is just a typo to correct. Mr. Fleischman added that the positions are full-time.

1. Ms. Batista asked if they should add any responsibilities, and Ms. Montes suggested something related to coordinating marketing or website items. Mr. Gorence and Ms. Stiehl added that they also function as point people for the PPT. Ms. Batista suggested creating an updated org chart in the future.

v. Ms. Batista asked if there were any additions or changes for the Project Director, and there were none. Dr. Miller reiterated that he thinks there are too many duties associated with it for one person.

I. Point Persons Team:

i. Ms. Batista asked what the Point Person does as compared to the Project Director and members of the Executive team, and Mr. Fleischman then went over descriptions of the Point Persons Team's responsibilities, and the executive board's.

ii. Ms. Batista asked if the Project Director facilitated every meeting of the PPT, and Dr. Mullen clarified that the agenda is set and sent out by Mr. Asturias, and there are items raised each meeting for the benefit of all districts.

iii. Mr. Urioste asked if the duties outlined so far represented what the PPT does, and Dr. Mullen explained that at one point, the PPT had a more active role of managing and facilitating the annual and regional plan. That has changed over time, and she does not know if that has changed because of LARAEC office staff. She does not think the documented duties are accurate to what the PPT does.

iv. Mr. Fleischman asked what the PPT does, and what their duties are; Mr. Asturias explained that there are a number of themes the LARAEC office had utilized the PPT for, and a lot of history and evolution of their relationship. He thought the question is what they'd like to focus on going forward, and Dr. Mullen added that they should be used to truly move the annual and 3-year plan. Mr. Fleischman asked if they could list that as a duty, to operationalize LARAEC's plan in a local area. Dr. Mullen added that an additional duty would be to address barriers that stop student success.

v. Mr. Tenorio added that they need to clarify the PPT's roles, since most discussions of their roles previously have defaulted to letting the executive team define their role. Dr. Miller said that he would not be opposed to letting the PPT draft their roles.

vi. Mr. Fleischman asked if the point people do not work for LARAEC, and Mr. Asturias clarified that the PPT members are all paid by their home districts.

vii. Mr. Urioste added that aside from their duties at their district, their duties as a point person are attending meetings, participating in those meetings, and that they may be given homework as well, and for that reason many refuse to become members of the point person team.

viii. Ms. Stiehl said she would like more collaboration, and added that the LARAEC staff does not always feel able to participate in PPT discussions. Dr. Mullen said that they think it is critical for the LARAEC staff to participate, and Mr. Carias agreed. Ms. Stiehl clarified that they only call on the five district representatives on the PPT when they are voting, and they do not feel they can be active members of the conversation when they are in the conversation. Ms. Batista summarized that teacher advisors would like to know more about their level of responsibility, they should add marketing/webstie coordination to their roles, and they should be able to participate in Point Person Team meetings.

1. Ms. Stiehl added that when the Teacher Advisors were hired, her thought was it was because the point people have full time jobs and can't do the work for LAREC that they need to do immediately. Mr. Urioste said that he thought historically the pint persons served a tremendous advisory role to the project manager because of the perspective they brought from their districts.

ix. Ms. Batista said that she believes they will have to have a follow-up meeting or two to work through some of these issues, and she summarized the roles of the Point Persons, and that the support the PPT needs will also have to be defined.

m. Mr. Urioste requested to go back to discussing agenda, and said it was his understanding that a board can request to have an agenda item placed on the agenda through the board president, which Ms. Montes confirmed for LARAEC board meetings.

i. Mr. Stark observed that in certain cases, the board says they need staff to look into something or take care of something, and that triggers a meeting. And the question then is, who do they mean by "staff"? Is it just LARAEC staff, including the point people in on that? Moving forward, making a request, it might help to be more specific depending on what the issue is. Ms. Montes clarified that the board had decided at one of their meetings that they would be explicit about whether they would assign items LARAEC staff, since each board member can only task their district's point person with duties, not the entire PPT.

ii. Mr. Asturias said he would like to bring to the table whether these PPT meetings should be brought as open meetings or closed meetings. Because the PPT members are appointed, they may be seen as an extension of their executive

counterparts, and that being the case, they would require an open meeting. Besides that, there's the issue of transparency: if they have open meetings all the time, that's full transparency.

- iii. Dr. Miller added that there are meetings that take place throughout districts and district staff's days which are not governed by the Brown Act, and Mr. Urioste added that he believes transparency occurs with the fact that whatever is discussed in PPT meetings is then agendaized and shared at the regular meeting. Mr. Fleischman thought that seemed to be an equitable way to do it, although Mr. Gorence noted that a number of consortia have agendaized and minuted meetings outside of their executive team throughout the state.
- iv. Dr. Mullen added that during PPT meetings, they are not making decisions, but rather recommendations, and does not think that leads to a Brown Act issue.
- n. Mr. Fleischman invited attendees to rank the items that had been written down by Ms. Batista as potential roles of the PPT, giving them dot stickers to place on the roles they felt were of highest priority.
 - i. Mr. Fleischman then summarized the main priorities decided by the group: managing plan implementation, operationalizing the plan at local sites, and facilitating communication between PP's and the Project Director/LARAEC Office/Exec team. Also, that PP support needs to be defined. LACCD staff needs to communicate support needs to the LARAEC office as well.
- o. Mr. Fleischman then recommended discussing the roles of the Action Planning Teams.
 - i. Ms. Jacquez said that to her, they were clearly like a Professional Learning Community, and each district would designate teachers to attend APTs based on expertise. Mr. Stark added that as the point people are the primary rep for each of the districts, then they have the action planning teams really digging into specific subject areas. They'd be around a particular issue like counseling, ESL, program areas, etc.
 - ii. Ms. Le added that the 3-year plan CAEP strategies include forming an APT for each priority focus area, and said that each APT had a good cross-section of LARAEC members and SMEs, and ranged in size up to 30 participants.
 - iii. Ms. Stiehl added that they looked at how to redefine what existing workgroups were doing to set up new APTs, and they recommended creating ways to get information discussed in the APT meetings out to stakeholders.
 - iv. Ms. Montes said that she sees the APTs as where all the coordination and implementation of the plan happens on the ground, and that their point is to maximize collaboration.
 - v. Ms. Stiehl also clarified for Mr. Fleischman and Ms. Batista the various subject matters APTs were formed around, and the makeup of them. She added that they discussed that there needs to be a balance of representation and buy-in from all the

school sites. To limit LAUSD to 2 people, they would have 9 schools with nobody playing. They were excited in electing chairs and co-chairs once the body was collected together, which was missing from last iteration of SME groups. Mr. Fleischman asked if LARAEC has any oversight or jurisdiction on the groups, and Mr. Asturias clarified that that was purpose fully left ambiguous; roles have organically changed, which led to confusion. He does think there has to be an oversight body for the implementation for accountability purposes. They need to make sure whatever needs to happen is happening. The LARAEC office would be happy to play that role, but they are open to collaborative effort to make sure that plan is implemented.

- vi. Ms. Montes thought there has to be some expectation of oversight, and of capturing documentaiton when they ahve to do reporting. She thinks the 3-year plan will drive what APTs and SMEs do and how long it takes. She does expect that the LARAEC office staff oversees and captures and supports those things.
- vii. The acting director of MUSD asked, regarding proportional representation, how they will equalize that, and prevent there from being one group with more representation. Ms. Stiehl said that they were thinking about that particular issue, and trying to figure out how to balance that. In her experience, the workgroups/APTs were not so much about voting on things or coming to a consensus, but about talking about specific topics and coming away with things to take back to help students in their districts.
- viii. Ms. Batista asked if there were other roles of the APT that haven't come up yet. Mr. Stark added that he does not want their roles to just be limited to implementing the plan, and wants them to be a viable feedback source and make sure that feedback is communicated up the chain.
- ix. Mr. Stark said that he would like the APTs to actually be a PLC, and that LARAEC needs to know when to intervene or provide more support because people's time is really valuable.
- x. Ms. Montes said that she would also like to push equal representation, and wants to ensure all voices are heard, but that there is also equity.
- p. Mr. Fleischman then asked about the roles and responsibilities of the Executive Team.
 - i. Dr. Miller suggested that their responsibilities are to establish policy, approve the budget, and hire and fire their CEO, emphasizing that if the board is not doing what they need to do, changes will be made. Mr. Urioste said that because of their unique makeup, that is not going to happen. He said that they cannot evaluate Mr. Asturias, since he is funded through LAUSD; Mr. Asturias clarified that that does not mean he cannot be evaluated by the LARAEC board.

- ii. Mr. Stark added that if there was a proposal from the executive team members to say that there should be a process to evaluate how an individual is doing vis a vis LARAEC, nothing prevents that, and there are opportunities through various mechanisms to evaluate performance.
- iii. Mr. Flesichman recommended that the board explore coming up with alternates. Mr. Asturias clarified that at one point, he reached out to the state to find out if it legally allowed for the board members to have alternates, and since it's not specifically indicated on AB104, there cannot be alternates. Mr. Fleischman said that he got a different answer from the state. Mr. Stark added that the board has learned to sometimes take what they get from the state with a grain of salt.
- iv. Ms. Batista posed the hypothetical: if they were about to vote on the CFAD and members couldn't attend, would they make sure they get their input prior to the meeting? Ms. Montes confirmed and said that they have had people conference call into meetings before. Mr. Asturias confirmed that he received the previous opinion from the state regarding alternates in verbal and written form.
- v. Dr. Miller thought that they should be able to have alternates. Mr. Urioste clarified that the training the board was given was, if they are calling into a meeting, the member calling in would have to indicate where they would be and the public would have to be invited to attend there. Dr. Miller explained that the way they have gotten around that multiple times when board members are out of town is posting a meeting notice on their hotel room door, notifying that the meeting is going on.
- vi. Ms. Montes asked the board what they thought their roles should be; Mr. Fleischman asked if the entire board provides Mr. Asturias with agenda items, and Ms. Montes clarified that currently she communicates with Mr. Asturias, and other board members can funnel agenda items to him through her.
- vii. Mr. Tenorio asked if issuing directives to the LARAEC staff requires a motion, or some kind of consensus on the board, and Ms. Montes explained that the board said it was her responsibility to work with Mr. Asturias to prioritize such directives.
- viii. Mr. Stark added that their responsibilities should also include ensuring agency performance and accountability related to the consortium plan and executing commitments that are in the plan.
- ix. Mr. Asturias also asked the board to consider an outline of the delegation of responsibility, especially regarding financial matters, and for the board to set a threshold below which LARAEC can spend funds for certain expenses without the need for board approval. Mr. Urioste said that he thought most districts require approval by their board if an expense is over

	<p>\$10,000. Mr. Asturias said that they as a group have not defined what the LARAEC office will follow in that regard. Dr. Miller added that LACCD's threshold is \$92,600, and anything below that does not have to go to bid, but does have to be board-reported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x. Mr. Stark said he was worried about the state ruling inconsistently about the issue, and said that they might need to get more clarity or guidance from the state about it. q. Mr. Urioste said that he thinks they need to indicate what the role of the board president is, and to stipulate a term of office. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Dr. Miller recommended having a board president and two vice presidents, and that way they will have three years of succession in place, and it would rotate every year. ii. Ms. Montes added that the chair has the responsibility of communicating with the project director, and establishing the agenda while working in concert with him or her. They also prioritize the LARAEC office tasks and projects. iii. Dr. Miller suggested that another role might be to work with the project manager to deal with communication issues or issues among the members of LARAEC. He added that the board president would also need to communicate with LARAEC partners. iv. (At this point, the board moved back to agenda item 7.2. Following the vote on agenda item 7.2, discussion returned to this agenda item) r. Mr. Asturias wanted to define, before they move on, whether the one-year term for the board's President was for a whole fiscal year, or one year starting today. Mr. Urioste said that he thought it would have to be for an academic term, and Mr. Stark suggested it should be from July 1 to June 30th of the next year, which the board agreed to. s. Ms. Batista said that they would leave the LARAEC board their notes, and that the next steps are up to LARAEC and their team. t. Mr. Asturias said that the LARAEC staff would summarize the information provided today and present it to the executive team and the PPT. He asked if the board would like the LARAEC office to dabble in creating bylaws for the board based on the info shared during the meeting, and Ms. Montes said it would be great to draft something; Dr. Miller recommended including their colleagues as part of the process. Mr. Asturias also said that they would send the consortia governance report out. 	
<p>10</p>	<p>Announcements Next meeting September 20, 2019 at Burbank Adult School.</p>	
<p>11 Adjournment</p>	<p>Ms. Montes adjourned the meeting at 5:34 PM.</p>	