



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Special Meeting

Friday, February 15, 2019

9:30 AM – 12:30 PM

Van De Kamp Innovation Center
2930 Fletcher Drive, LA 90065

Executive Board Members in		Point Person Team Members		Staff	
Emilio Urioste, Burbank USD	X	Yanira Chavez, 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	
Alice Jacquez, Montebello USD	X	Philip Tenorio, MUSD	X	Vacant, Secretary	

1 Welcome	<p>Dr. Mullen welcomed everyone and summarized the goals for the planning session, saying today's goal is to identify 3-6 areas to focus on in the next planning cycle. She then turned it over to Gayla Kraetsch Hartsough from KH consulting to facilitate the discussion.</p> <p>Dr. Hartsough introduced herself, saying that KH worked with LARAEC on their first strategic plan in 2014. Two vice presidents of KH will be working with them and the action planning teams, as well as Bob Schilling.</p> <p>Those present went around and introduced themselves, and Dr. Hartsough explained the schedule of discussion for the day.</p>	Gayla Kraetsch Hartsough, Ph.D.
2 Review of:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Planning Objectives and Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Dr. Hartsough explained that the regional plan will focus on 2019-2022, and needs to focus on strategies across all 5 districts. Also, the state is asking for it to be simpler, more user-friendly, and succinct in terms of their templates, successes, and outcomes. b. Planning Schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. She explained that the planning schedule is very aggressive. Why they have to figure out APT placements today is they will be workshopping with them next Friday. In 2014 they ran a series of 4-5 sessions, and now that they are building on the plan of the past, three sessions will be sufficient. ii. On the 4th friday, March 15th, they will have the APT's come and present to the executive committee what they're proposing. Any one of those present can participate in APT's, but you they the body who will be hearing proposals and offering improvement suggestions. At that point, we will make a decision on how they meet with exec committee next, with the goal of having a regional plan ready to submit by June. iii. Ms. Montes asked what the actual due date to the state was, and Dr. Mullen said it was moving, but looks like it will be in April-June. Mr. Asturias added that it has changed several times already. 	

- c. California AEP Planning Framework
 - i. Dr. Hartsough explained the framework from the state and discussed whether each district had done a preplanning assessment, community need, and customers assessment. Mr. Stark said he was not aware of a coordinated LARAEC effort at the moment on that front. Dr. Hartsough asked if the districts could get KH data on their adult ed and accreditation reports. The district representatives agreed that they would be able to get it, but would need specifics as to the data needed. Dr. Hartsough said she would send a reminder email out, and that the three main areas were an overview profile of students, looking at pre-2014 trends, describing their district's community, and what they see as their market industry.
 - ii. She summarized that today will focus on identifying goals and strategies, doing workshops with posters around the room. They will focus on defining what you want the action planning teams to develop in this area.
- d. Consortium Program Quality Self-Assessment (2015-2018)
 - i. Dr. Hartsough summarized that in November they were asked by the state to do a Consortium Program Quality Self-Assessment in 5 areas: Capacity, Connection, Entry, Progress, and Completion/Transition. The idea was to rate how they did in progress on a scale of 1 to 5.
 - ii. Turning to Appendix B, the LARAEC self-assessment, they want confirmation that they all agree with the outcomes of the assessment. One of the things she wants to make sure is that if they turn this into the state, LARAEC is comfortable with being rated a 3 overall, for example, in the 1.1.1 category. Mr. Stark: asked if they were talking individual districts, LARAEC overall, or both. Dr. Hartsough said that personally she thinks they were a little hard on themselves. She thinks in that category they are at a 4 and they can add anecdotal information by district and elaborate in the "Observations" category. The majority voted to raise LARAEC's score to a 4.
 - iii. For 1.1.2., they rated themselves a 5, and there was no disagreement.
 - iv. For 1.1.3, they rated themselves a 5, and there was no disagreement.
 - v. For 1.2.1, they rated themselves a 3. She thinks this is where it's driving it down to individual districts, talking about principals, college staff, deans, directors. Dr. Miller thought they were a 4, and the majority agreed and voted to change it.
 - vi. For 1.2.2, they rated themselves a 3, and there was no disagreement.
 - vii. For 1.2.3, they rated themselves a 5, and there was no disagreement.
 - viii. For 1.3.1, they rated themselves a 3. Mr. Stark suggested it should be a four. Others added that some districts were more of a 3 because it becomes more difficult for smaller districts

who don't have the ideal staff to "support" agency-wide coordination and collaboration. The majority voted to rate larger agencies at a 4 and smaller agencies at a 3, and to note so in "Observations".

- ix. For 1.3.2, they rated themselves as a 1. Eventually, it was decided that LAUSD was a 3, LACCD is a 3, CCUSD is a 1, Burbank is a 2, and MUSD is a 2.
- x. For 1.4.1, they rated themselves a 1. The majority voted to change it to a 3.
- xi. For 1.4.2, they rated themselves a 1. The majority voted to change it to a 4, with notation that professional development is a high priority moving forward, and that MUSD stopped professional development, but still has consortium opportunities for it.
- xii. Moving on to Connection, for 2.1.1, they were totally split on this. Some said 1, some said 5. 5 reflected LACCD. Mr. Stark: added that LAUSD would be in the 5 category. Mr. Asturias said that from a consortium perspective, they are at least a 3. The majority were comfortable with the districts being split between a 3 and a 5.
- xiii. For 2.1.2, there was another split between a 1 and a 5. Mr Stark suggested making the same score changes as the previous item with the same notation, and the majority agreed.
- xiv. For 2.1.3, another split between 1 and 5. The majority voted to change to the same split and notation as 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.
- xv. For 2.2, the first 3 items they rated themselves as a 3, and there was no disagreement.
- xvi. For Entry, for 3.1.1, the first two items they rated themselves a 3. The majority voted to move those ratings up to a 4.
- xvii. For 3.1.2 the majority voted to change to the same ratings as 3.1.1.
- xviii. For 3.1.3, they rated themselves a 5. Ms. Montes said that CCUSD should be a 3; it was noted, and the rest were comfortable being rated a 5.
- xix. For 3.2.1, they gave themselves a 3, and there was no disagreement.
- xx. For 3.3.1 they rated themselves in a range from 2-3, and the majority voted to change to a 3-4 rating.
- xxi. For 3.4.1 and 3.4.2, they rated themselves in a range from 2-3, and the majority voted to change that to a rating from 3-4.
- xxii. For Progress, for 4.4.1, they rated themselves a 3, and the majority voted to bump it up to the 3-4 range.
- xxiii. For 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 they rated yourselves a 3, and there was no disagreement.
- xxiv. For 4.3.1, they rated themselves a 3, and the majority voted to change that to a 3-4 range.
- xxv. For Completion/Transition, for 5.1.1, they rated themselves a 1, and the majority voted to change it to a 3.

	<p>xxvi. For 5.1.2, they rated themselves a 3, and there was no disagreement.</p> <p>xxvii. For 5.1.3, they rated themselves a 1, and the majority voted to change to a 3.</p> <p>xxviii. For 5.2.1, they rated themselves a 2-3, and the majority agreed to change it to a 3-4-5 split while explaining that LAUSD and LACCD are doing more in this area.</p> <p>xxix. For 5.3.1, they rated themselves a 1, and the majority voted to change it to a 4-5 split.</p> <p>xxx. For 5.3.2, they rated themselves a 2, and the majority voted to change it to a 4.</p>	
<p>3 Top 3 Priority Setting Exercise</p>	<p>Dr. Hartsough walked the attendees through the Strategy Map for AB86, explaining the mission, indirect beneficiaries, direct beneficiaries, the 5 program areas, and teaching-learning goals outlined by the map. Today they will focus on the yellow bubbles about what they feel they need to do differently as a consortium; then, that will drive funding allocation. At Mr. Stark's suggestion, she agreed to add performance metrics the state has defined for AB104, and Mr. Asturias added that the state has increased the number of program areas to 7.</p> <p>Dr. Hartsough explained the next slide is AB86 Priorities for 2015-2018: Bridges and Pathways, Comprehensive Student Supports, and Common Data, Information and Accountability Systems. Since this is an updated plan, the assessment was very important. They will need to identify the 3-5 areas they need to focus on in the next hour, and figure out a way to scope those areas and come up with leaders of teams to work on those.</p> <p>Dr. Mullen said she would like to see pathway work in the sense of, articulation is one way of doing that, but looking at if a pathway starts in adult school, how does it end in community college. It would be helpful for funding and legislative work.</p> <p>Mr. Stark said he wanted to lean into that and add looking at adult schools to community college and prioritize non-credit to credit pathways, versus non-credit to non-credit. Dr. Mullen said that what they find is the students' education plan and their goal really drives that conversation. Students want education sometimes, and they do not want to pay. So they advise them on options if they do not want to pay, so what drives their placement is their educational goal.</p> <p>Ms. Stiehl said that she would like to see coordinated intentional professional development and collaboration that aims at strategies they listed. They can pick out things everywhere that they're doing that align with these, but she wants to have collaboration and engagement with faculty and administrators in a coordinated way. Ms. Montes added that curriculum instruction and assessment are geared towards helping teachers help students, so that for coordination, she is thinking there should be professional development around that.</p>	

	<p>Attendee Michelle said she would like to speak up for counseling best practices, and have a vision that looks at counseling students through the entire process, as well as evidence-based methods to make sure people know what their pathway is. Attendee Lonnie said that they may need a counseling navigator as well, a resource they can develop.</p> <p>Mr. Asturias said for Data & Accountability it would be important for the consortium to define what efficiency is. He thought it would be better to define that term than wait for the state to define it and have to live up to it. Number 2, they need to define common goals for consortium. Dr. Hartsough suggested regarding efficiency that it might be what are the common management or operating principles on how they are going to work together, and in that could be efficiency.</p> <p>Dr. Mullen said that she likes the concept of consortium goals, but the reality of practice and policy has to be layered into different levels. They can create the culture, but cannot mandate curriculum as administrators.</p> <p>Mr. Stark added that he would like to see specific, measurable objectives so they can assess, perhaps quarterly, to check in on those periodically, rather than more general “goals”.</p> <p>Bob Schilling summarized the major concerns that had been written down from the group, and introduced Charlotte Maure who presented a summarized and consolidated version of the list, shortened to Pathways, Counseling, Professional Development, and Integrated Planning, managing not just as individual districts, but as an entity to say they are doing all these things individually, and how can we integrate so their outcomes are more consistent and successful. And included with that are some of the things like values, efficiency, and how to make sure that all of these actually turn into a governance system that gives them the strength to move forward.</p> <p>Dr. Mullen said that she would not put counseling under Pathways, she would put it under Student Support. Dr. Miller said that Student Support is still very important, and goes beyond counseling to coaches, people who keep students on track. The topic was changed to Student Success Support/Counseling. Dr. Mullen added that “Integrated Planning” and “Pathways” have very specific definitions at the state level, and so “Integrated Planning” was changed to “New Envisioning of LARAEC’s Principles and Operations”.</p>	
<p>4 Formation of Action Planning Teams (APTs) for each Priority</p>	<p>After asking the attendees to vote on which items they would like to form APT’s for, the finalized APT subjects were Professional Development, Pathways, and Student Success Supports. She asked them to divide based on which topic they are most passionate about, and to formulate goals and anticipated/desired outcomes, target population/customer, progress to date, and challenges, taking 10 minutes to discuss in groups.</p> <p>After coming back, Mr. Stark presented for the Pathways group. They talked about this idea that at some point, they want to work in a sub-regional basis</p>	

	<p>for pathways, and this would involve ELAC getting together with Slauson getting together with Montebello about a particular industry or educational need, and require high-level coordination and plenty of time. So a year out, they hope for maybe one or two sub-regional pathways. They also talked about how they are all chasing after the same employer or same advisors independently, where maybe as a region they can bring them in and work with them collectively. They found out Montebello is building a great pathway with ELAC about logistics and forklift training. Dr. Mullen that with these pathways, it's all about workforce economic development.</p> <p>Mr. Asturias presented for the Student Success/Counseling group, saying that they talked about transcripts and providing gainful employment. They have a STEP system pilot coming up pretty soon: Student Transitions Educational Plan. This is the reincarnation of the Individualized Student Plan. They also have the Counseling Collaborative recently accepted as of this school year, and LAUSD navigators helping people transition from training to the workforce, and the Counselor Training Guide. The challenges are, how do they assess student programs? It's something the STEP program should help with. They also want to have consistent, accurate messaging to provide similar answers to their students regardless of where they go. And they want to give offices that can't answer student questions the ability to know where to refer students. For the scope of effort, they are looking at better career planning tools and multiple touch points. Not just having an orientation, then saying "We'll see you at graduation". They want comprehensive orientations and intrusive advising; a lot of times their students do not seek counseling opportunities, so they need to get in front of them. Dr. Miller said he would like to list articulation agreements aligning between adult schools and community colleges. Dr. Hartsough added that in Pathways, they would find them, and in Student Success Support, they would counsel the students about them.</p> <p>Ms. Montes presented for the Professional Development group, and their goal was a coordinated PD plan with timelines, and to make sure it's promoted and attended. It should be aligned with the strategies of their regional plan to make sure their target population in the trenches (teachers, counselors, administrators) are in alignment. The ultimate beneficiary of all of this is the student. Their progress to date is they have had PD delivered, but not always coordinated. Some did the PLC training or FSI. Under Challenges, one is the buy-in to participate, and people feeling the relevance of everything and to apply to as many people as possible, but also not not doing it because it doesn't 100% apply to them. Scheduling is also an obvious challenge, so they want to come up with a schedule to plan better for having staff attending. Budgeting is also a concern, as well as creating metrics for success: how do they have PD that has follow-ups to measure outcomes. They talked about coordinating and sharing trainers, and having some kind of menu so that they can communicate training opportunities.</p>	
<p>5 Next Steps and Wrap Up</p>	<p>Dr. Hartsough wrapped up by saying she has time signed up to talk to everyone, and the LARAEC member districts agreed to send people to the three Friday workgroups in coming weeks, preferably subject experts. Ideally,</p>	

	each district should pick between 9-12 people that will then break into 3 groups to develop the plan. Dr. Mullen said that her dean had asked her since these are very focused, if they could do a survey asking their personnel for input, and Dr. Hartsough agreed. She added that meetings will be from 9 AM to 12 PM on Fridays.	
6 Next Meeting/Adjourn	Meeting was adjourned at 12:58 PM.	