



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Board Meeting

Wednesday, May 20, 2020

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Via Zoom

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
Larry Frank, 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	Teresa Plaza, Secretary	X

1 Call to Order	<p>1.1 Pledge of Allegiance</p> <p>Mr. Urioste called the meeting to order at 10:01 AM.</p>	Ms. Stiehl
	<p>1.2 Adjustments to the Agenda</p> <p>a. No adjustments.</p>	Mr. Urioste
	<p>1.3 Approval of the Agenda</p> <p>a. Ms. Jacquez moved to approve the agenda, and Mr. Frank seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the agenda.</p>	
	<p>1.4 Items for Future Agendas</p> <p>a. Mr. Frank said he would like to do some potential LARAEC-connected grant opportunities to work together on, and he would love to do an agenda that digs into what their challenges have been and what their best practices are so LARAEC member districts can learn from each other under COVID.</p>	
	<p>1.5 Approval of the Minutes</p> <p>a. Regular Board Meeting: April 22, 2020</p> <p>i. Mr. Stark moved to approve the minutes, and Ms. Montes seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the minutes.</p>	
2 Public Comment	No public comment at this time.	
3 Yearly Plan Update	<p>3.1 Discussion of process for writing and submitting the plan for school year 20□21</p> <p>a. Mr. Asturias explained that they have an upcoming due date for the next yearly plan, which is on August 15. The LARAEC office would like to propose that the LARAEC office develop a draft plan working with the Point Persons Team to get their input, subsequently present to the executive team for their input and additional ideas, or different direction if need be, to generate a finalized draft to present to the board for approval at the July board meeting. He is confident that they can make that happen.</p>	Mr. Asturias

	<p>b. Ms. Montes asked to clarify if they would be developing that just as the LARAEC office, and Mr. Asturias confirmed they would develop the first draft, present it to the PPT, and get their input on the plan and additional ideas. Then, after they include that input to the draft, then the second draft will be routed to the executive team for them to provide additional comments and direction and input. Once they have input, direction, guidance, and comments from the PPT and executive team, they would call that a final draft that they would submit for approval for the July 15th board meeting. That still gives them 4 full weeks before they submit it to the state.</p>	
<p>4 Budget Report and Updates</p>	<p>4.1 Upcoming CAEP due dates, updates and reminders</p> <p>a. Ms. Ocampo summarized the upcoming CAEP due dates as explained in the board packet.</p> <p>4.2 FY 2021-2022 Consortium Fiscal Administration Declaration (CFAD)</p> <p>a. Ms. Ocampo explained that LARAEC has also submitted a few weeks ago their FY 21-22 CFAD. A copy of that report is included in the board packet on page 24. She then introduced some snapshots from the report. She noted that when they submitted the CFAD, it was based on a budget of about \$134 million from the governor’s January budget. But there have been some changes.</p> <p>4.3 FY 2019-2020 annual plan</p> <p>a. She explained that they had also received a memo from the state after they received LARAEC’s FY 2020 annual plan, and a copy of that memo is included in the board packet. Highlights of the memo:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Ed Code 84900-84920 and state issued guidance remains in effect for the 19-20 program year. ii. Member districts must continue to follow their approved annual AE plans, and this includes paying all adult ed related staff to follow the approved plan. iii. Also, consortia may reduce a member district funding if an approved plan is not being followed (based on EC84914). Criteria are in the Ed Code: if the member no longer wishes to provide services consistent with the adult ed plan, the member cannot provide services that address the needs identified in the AEP, or if the member has been consistently ineffective at addressing those needs. Also, an approved adult ed plan and its related budget can be modified with consortium approval and certification. 	

	<p>4.4 CAEP Allocations – May Revise California adult education budget scenario based on the May Revise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ms. Ocampo explained that last week they received the revised allocations based on the May Revise. When they were putting the board package together, they did not have final numbers so those were just estimates. There were some differences due to rounding. b. The memo released by the state this week will be posted on the website. The state indicated that there was a 12.105 reduction in the CAEP allocation. So when they started in January, the state allocation was 550,897,000, but in the May revise, this was cut by 66,689,000. Current CAEP allocation is now 484,208,000. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. For LARAEC, Ms. Ocampo explained that when they submitted their revise, once they applied the 12.105% reduction, their revised allocation is around 118 million from 134 million. ii. They applied that percentage proportionately to each member district, and the total revised allocation is about 118,02,709. iii. They also compared the figures they gave in the packet, and there’s about a \$6,000 difference due to rounding. The state will conduct a webinar this Friday to walk member districts through the process. The CAEP office will be adjusting the CFAD which entails a budget amendment. So the LARAEC office will be updating the allocations based on this information and then it has to be approved by each member district. c. Mr. Frank thanked the LARAEC office staff for doing the hard work to make this all clear for the board. He added that if you think of it in relationship with last year’s budget, it’s not a 12.105% reduction; it’s actually a 10.2% reduction compared to the 19-20 budget. And of course, there may be additional costs that come from collective bargaining agreements. 	
<p>5 Information/Discussion Items</p>	<p>5.1 Conference funds report of the expenditures and balance from the cancelled March 2020 LARAEC conference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mr. Gorence reminded the board of the outstanding contracts regarding the conference discussed at the last meeting, and the request by the board to aggregate some of the costs so it was clear what money may be freed up from the conference cancellation. He directed them to a mini spreadsheet in the packet, and described the various scenarios depending on when or if they reschedule the conference. He concluded that it would make sense to reschedule the conference to March of 2021. 	<p>Mr. Gorence</p>

- b. However, there's a consideration the board may want to take into account: the preparation for the conference starts early in the fall, which would require the office to engage in activities to get the conference up and be ready by March. There are public health concerns due to COVID which would only be alleviated with a treatment or vaccine that would allow large gatherings. So it may be that rescheduling for March 2021 would not be possible, so it may be good for the board to renegotiate the contract with the Sheraton, and maybe extend that until March 2022 so there's no question that a large event could occur.
- c. Mr. Frank asked Mr. Gorence if they have started the conversation at all about pushing it past March 2021; Mr. Gorence said they have not. It's pending the board's direction on how they'd like to handle that. Mr. Frank said he would personally be supportive of that approach, but would like to hear from others.
 - i. Ms. Montes agreed, thinking it is better to be safe than sorry. Her understanding is that the conversation with the Sheraton would be in the event that they still cannot have large gatherings, they would like to negotiate for a later date. Mr. Gorence explained that that would be the strategy in order to ensure that it's possible to extend that and not incur that total cancellation fee of \$48,000.
 - ii. Mr. Stark asked if they see any issues with, if they weren't able to do an in-person conference in March and pushed it back to 2022, do they see any problems with that about carrying over those funds, or will they run into technical snafus with budgeting? Mr. Gorence said the LARAEC office staff can look into it..
- d. Mr. Asturias explained that in essence the emphasis right now is on addressing rescheduling the conference for next year. As the situation progresses, they have to approach the vendors, and the LARAEC staff will be more than happy to do that in the coming months. They feel they have plenty of time to see how the situation pans out; it's likely that large gatherings will not be possible next year, but they feel that it is too early to determine that. However, it is not too early to start conversations with their vendors as they approach March of next year. If large gatherings are not possible, they themselves would not be able to offer the services they usually do, so they'd be open to LARAEC rescheduling for the next year.
- e. Ms. Jacquez acknowledged MUSD is in the same boat; she also personally thinks pushing to next year is smarter, but they will work with the consensus.

- f. Mr. Urioste said that the consensus seemed to be that they would negotiate with primarily the Sheraton that if they cannot hold this conference in March 2021, that LARAEC would not incur any loss in fees, and that LARAEC would then update the date to March 2022.
- i. There was unanimous consensus from the board that that's how they want to approach this issue.
- g. Mr. Urioste asked if the amount freed up by not holding the conference in March is for this fiscal year. Mr. Gorence confirmed it was, and said he believed the LARAEC office should look to the board for direction on what they would like to do with that amount.
- i. Mr. Asturias added that they are open to suggestions; generally speaking, any carry-over from the funding from one year goes to the next year for additional expenditures that may come up as part of the LARAEC office. He pointed out that as they move to additional years that next year the budget of the LARAEC office will also be cut, so some of that may be used to subsidize the additional expenses there may be.
 - ii. That being said, they understand that districts are making sacrifices at this point, so the freed up amount can be dispersed as the board sees fit. He added that as the CAEP office has implemented FIFO, and since the fiscal manager for the LARAEC office is LAUSD and LAUSD expenses are way below the spending limits, we would not incur any penalties for carrying over the funds if that's what the board decides. Mr. Urioste asked if there was a possibility of taking this amount, \$82,562 and redistributing it for 2021 to member districts, and Mr. Asturias said that there was. Mr. Urioste asked if the board would want to do that.
 - iii. Mr. Frank asked if they would then hold back the same amount of money in the LARAEC budget next year, just to be safe; if it would be useful or important to take the amount of money from the 2021 distribution, and if there is a way to hold that in a special pot if it's going to be expended, and if it is. Mr. Urioste asked to confirm that they hold a portion of the budget for each year, and Mr. Asturias confirmed that they do as part of the existing budget of the LARAEC office.
- h. Mr. Urioste asked if they would want to have Ms. Ocampo put together a report for the next meeting where the allocations are adjusted with the addition of this \$82,562.
- i. Mr. Stark asked if it made sense to redistribute this if they know that they're getting their budget cut. And

obviously carryover is important in plugging holes in the budget next year.

- ii. Mr. Asturias added that the funds will not expire. Also, they have a proposal as part of the agenda for an online conference. There's some cost involved with that, and again, as Mr. Stark indicated, this would be part of funds to try to keep the personnel and the activities and the budget as it currently is in the face of cuts coming up next year. That said, they will be happy to have Ms. Ocampo generate the amount that would be redistributed to each member district as part of a one-time redistribution of funds for the 19-20 conference.
- i. Mr. Urioste said he would be in favor of having Ms. Ocampo at LARAEC's June meeting make a presentation that would show what this redistributed amount among the member districts for the 20-21 budget would look like.
 - i. Mr. Frank said that it would be relevant to have a proposed budget for the LARAEC core budget as part of the consideration of whether those dollars get distributed to the campuses or whether they'd stay at the LARAEC office.
 - ii. Mr. Stark agreed, and said it was important to see how the budget decrease will affect the LARAEC office. And if they are moving money around, he just wants to make sure they are all clear what the impact of that potential decision is on operations and LARAEC activities.
- j. Mr. Asturias confirmed that that can be included in a report for June.

5.2 Eide Bailly, LLP LARAEC enrollment count and procedures final audit: CASAS report on reconciliation of data between systems

- a. Mr. Asturias explained the issues that had come up in the Eide Bailly report about conflicting enrollment numbers across different systems. Eide Bailly said they were not able to find out why the various systems did not agree and could not be reconciled. The reports for attendance and enrollment generated at each system did not quite agree with the reports generated by TE. Based on that, the board suggested they invite TE to comment on the discrepancies and see if they can shed some light on this item. They then invited reps from CASAS. They were provided with the data set for LAUSD and asked to reconcile the information from the Eide Bailly report to what they found through their process.
- b. Richard Ackerman introduced himself as the software manager at CASAS for TopsPro Enterprise. He explained

that he received a number of records from program year 17-18, when the audit was conducted, and the auditor did not provide any reference to where the discrepancy occurred. He received 3,824 records for enrollment for all sites and did not find any discrepancy in that sample. He added that there are a couple places where discrepancy can occur in these situations:

- i. Students can have 2 records going on for some time if they incorrectly put in their student ID. It can go weeks without being discovered, and when it's discovered, the two are usually merged.
 - ii. Another can occur if there's been a mistake, but if a person deletes the record in SIS, it might not show up in TopsPro.
- c. Mr. Urioste asked if they're theorizing that the largest issue here is duplicated student accounts. Mr. Ackerman said that they know from their own experience that not a lot of student records need to be merged, it can be between 1%-5% based on the school, and also when deleting records for whatever reason. He reiterated that CASAS never got any specific information from Eide Bailly about what the discrepancies were, merely that discrepancies exist. They didn't give any way to reproduce what they saw, and CASAS was unable to find that discrepancy in the info they were provided.
- d. Ms. Montes asked if Mr. Asturias and the LARAEC office team had ever requested that Eide Bailly provide more detail on their discrepancies. Mr. Asturias said they had requested the data that would support each one of the findings, and connected Eide Bailly representative Brandon Harrison with Mr. Ackerman. The information that Mr. Ackerman was given from Eide Bailly was that they didn't really receive any reports from each one of the districts, they were just told that the reports would not match. Mr. Ackerman added that Mr. Harrison gave him the same report he gave LARAEC, and said he provided everything that he had.
- i. Mr. Urioste said that he was unimpressed with that report, and remembered going through it and saying, "This is it?" So he thinks it behooves them to produce more detailed data so LARAEC can have a knowledgeable discussion. They have gotta be able to provide CASAS TE with specificity.
 - ii. Mr. Stark agreed wholeheartedly, mentioning that the original intent of the audit and report was to provide actionable information and to inform the procedures/protocol they would need to put in place, if any. He does not know how actionable this report is, and they have heard from CASAS now that from

a data standpoint it's going to be impossible to make decisions if they don't have really clear parameters.

- iii. Ms. Jacquez asked if it was just ASAP CASAS was working with as far as the attendance system, and Mr. Ackerman said that there were roughly 12-15 commercial systems in California, and a lot of schools with home-grown systems, so probably 30 just in CA that they work with. She asked, if a district starts a new system, in their experience do they see discrepancies in the first few years, and Mr. Ackerman said that there can be depending on several factors
- iv. Mr. Urioste suggested going back to Eide Bailly and asking what they uncovered in terms of duplicated student accounts and regarding deleted records.
- e. Mr. Stark reiterated that they need to consider whether what they've produced is going to help LARAEC make any kind of decision moving forward, and he does not know that it is. If they are going to be making tough decisions, if this report isn't closing any gaps in their doubts that they have in their decision process, the report isn't worth the paper it's printed on. Obviously all the districts are already reporting their data to the feds and the state to get funding. Long story short, he would suggest going back to the auditors and sharing some of this feedback and going back to the scope of work, which from what he recalls was to provide LARAEC with actionable feedback. It doesn't sound like to him that they've actually accomplished that.
 - i. Ms. Montes asked if the term of their contract with Eide Bailly was finished, and Mr. Asturias said it was, and that LARAEC has paid them. He added that the report was final, brought to the board for approval. Before that, they had the engagement letter dictating what the auditor was supposed to do. The draft report was submitted to the board for evaluation, and subsequently the final report was submitted to the board, so the contract has elapsed. He would be happy to go back to Eide Bailly to see if they can provide additional detail.
 - ii. Mr. Frank asked Mr. Asturias what the cost of the contract was, and he said it was more than \$24,000. Mr. Frank said since everyone was under-impressed, he is not sure where the value is at this point
- f. Ms. Jacquez added that they are asking Eide Bailley for evidence to support the assertions they made in the report since they are looking to take action now.
 - i. Mr. Urioste added that they could not even provide that data to Mr. Ackerman; Ms. Jacquez pointed out

that they do not have a contract with Mr. Ackerman or his organization.

- g. Mr. Asturias said he will be more than happy to request the information, and he will inform the board at the next meeting what their response was. Ms. Jacquez asked Mr. Asturias to also resend the board members the contract, engagement letter, and final report.

5.3 Vasquez and Company, LLP development of oversight policies and procedures progress report

- a. Ms. Ocampo said that they have contracted with Vasquez and Company to develop policies and procedures to address the audit from the state office. They have requested Vasquez to make updates to the draft; according to them, they are still working on it and the LARAEC office expects to have the draft for input by the end of this week. Mr. Asturias clarified that it would not be presented at the June meeting, since it still needs to be evaluated by the point persons to see how feasible the proposed policies are for each one of the districts involved. Then the draft will go out to the board members for additional input. Once that process has taken place and they have consulted with Vasquez and Company, they will move to the final draft which includes input from the districts and LARAEC office, so that will most likely be in the July or August meeting. He said they will send the document expected at the end of this week to the PPT and copy the board members.

5.4 Virtual conference opportunities, consortium moderated sessions, and Innovation Awards

- a. Ms. Stiehl pointed the board members to a report in their packets which covers three different ideas. They have been having conversations among staff and point persons about what they can provide to the field as a LARAEC office and how they can keep their teachers engaged during this time.
 - i. One of them is the idea of having a virtual conference; over the last several months Ms. Stiehl has attended several virtual conferences which have been great.
 - 1. Some were very complex with all sorts of logins and sign-ins, others were much simpler but clean and professional, so they are looking at, instead of waiting until spring of next year or spring of 2022, doing something sooner so they can address the immediate needs of our teachers.
 - 2. She explained the different formats and structure of the virtual conferences she

attended, with some over several days at nighttime, some over the course of one day.

3. She suggested using some of LARAEC's current presenters since they had lots of people ready to go, and some of their presentations are still very relevant. Then there's a whole host of new people developing new stuff right now. It also opens up having people outside of their consortium to be presenters, and they won't have to pay for plane tickets to fly speakers in, so it's a much lower cost overall. The one she attended had a great way of using Zoom for individual and massive group sessions.
- ii. Ms. Stiehl said that the LARAEC staff and point persons also talked a little bit about the Innovation Awards and how they can incorporate those.
 1. Originally they had a long process of having all 5 districts put people on a committee; they selected winners but those winners haven't gotten to see those awards yet. They also wanted to distribute the winners before next year. For next year's conference, there's going to be a whole bunch of nominations they will want to do that will be brand new.
 2. Another idea that came up was doing it as part of a board meeting, using the June meeting to acknowledge Innovation Awards winners.
 3. They could also do it individually on a Zoom call talking about their project and presenting them with their plaque. Those would be great social media clips, and they can roll them out once a week over 12 weeks to keep people engaged.
 - iii. For the virtual conference, they would need time to get it together, so they may have to do it in August or September. When they get into October, the CAEP summit is still being planned, so they would want to do it before that. For the fiscal impact, if they use the tools they have, maybe adding Zoom webinar function, it'll be a very low cost event, only taking time and energy and plussing up Zoom software.
 - iv. Ms. Stiehl then elaborated on one of the conferences she attended, showing the structure it used with Zoom "rooms" with moderators in each room and showing the speakers and topics. It made it very simple for anybody to join in who can use Zoom. No logins or passwords, and the moderators

made sure to keep it safe and bounce out anyone who was not supposed to be there. It looked very clean and wasn't as technical as some of the others.

- v. Ms. Stiehl then elaborated on a third idea they had about "moderated sessions". Essentially, teachers have immediate needs, and they wanted to create something for them sooner. The idea came up that they could potentially create weekly or bi-weekly sessions that are a focused or moderated conversation.

- 1. They would have someone facilitating it, and people selected for speakers. She added that some schools are doing really amazing things right now; Mr. Gorence was talking about how LA City College had built these lessons for ESL, and how they space them out: Zoom one day, breakout sessions, one lesson on Canvas, so they had built out a whole week of lessons, and it would be great for other people to see how it's done.

- b. Ms. Montes loved the idea of a virtual conference to help people struggling with the uncertainty of life and adapting to a changing world in a timely manner. She thinks it's a great idea, and from that small virtual conference you can build out those opportunities for people to continue to meet and create the structures that build from that. She added that they should present the Innovation Awards at LARAEC's June meeting to provide people something positive right now.

- c. Mr. Stark agreed that a virtual conference would be a great opportunity to really leverage the work a lot of districts are doing, adding that LAUSD developed a future-ready certification for online instruction. Moving forward, crisis or not they are going to be using more blending modes of instruction anyway.

- d. Mr. Frank loved the presentation, and said they were doing versions thereof in LACCD. He likes the innovation awards not getting lost in the shuffle, and the best practicing of people working in the COVID environment. He thinks it's doable, and wouldn't mind a peek of something a little more interactive in June.

- e. Ms. Jacquez liked all of the ideas, and agreed with Ms. Montes about presenting the innovation awards at the June board meeting. She believes in every district everything's pushed back, so their July events in MUSD will probably be in October.

- i. If they are going to still be all virtual until 2021, she suggested making heavy use of Fridays, since those are MUSD's slow days.

- ii. She added that she thinks they need to consider Community Advisory Committees in addition to the existing APTs and do that together with all districts.
- iii. Ms. Jacquez also said that apprenticeships and internships have been very hard to partner on with other people, so they need to consider that as virtual training. Once they execute it, if they don't have a site to place their students and they're not going to get hired, what is the benefit if any to students?
- f. Mr. Urioste emphasized that the conference would have to be relevant to the teachers' needs, and that he liked the moderated sessions. He thinks that would be the best investment, personally, for their teachers. Lastly, he thinks the Innovation Awards could be done very well at their board meeting in June and highlighting the winners and having them there would be fantastic.
- g. Mr. Asturias summarized the asks of the board: number one is the idea of conducting an online conference, and at this point, if they are agreeable to that, they know that it's something to explore, and they will come back to the board with additional ideas. They would want to make the topics relevant to teachers right now, not necessarily the same things they would be discussing at the previous conference. And what that includes teachers' personal needs, how to reduce stress and juggle multiple tasks at home, how to do online instruction and distance learning instruction, and becoming adept on the platforms necessary like Google Docs, Zoom, Teams, etc.
- h. Mr. Stark agreed that the content needed to be relevant and highly engaging; he also asked if they could do a LARAEC future-ready type certification, where if teachers complete these modules, they get a certification they can bring back to their district for salary point credit, etc. In addition, maybe they can get a LARAEC certification that will count.
 - i. Ms. Stiehl said that because LARAEC office staff are housed in LA Unified, and she's been doing the LA future-ready certification with LAUSD, it's pretty amazing, and a lot of things they have been talking about in the PPT meetings regarding resources, etc., is built in nicely to LAUSD's training. And it's set up in small chunks teachers can do 20 minutes at a time. At the endgame, LAUSD employees are going to have 13,000 lessons created by every teacher who's participated. Every lesson she has attended so far has been super engaging, and they do synchronous and asynchronous modules that you walk through that take a deeper dive in each section.
- i. Ms. Montes thinks it's a fabulous idea, though she is not sure she could get HR at this point to say, "If you do it, you'll

get salary points”, but she would definitely do it as professional development opportunities for them.

- i. As far as certification, if they create it as a LARAEC certification and they do that internally, the value that it has, she is just not sure how they can make people take it and it means something.
 - ii. Also, in terms of the different things they are talking about, the Innovation Awards in June are separate from the virtual conference. Ms. MOnTes asked if they could make a decision as a group that they want to make a presentation at the June meeting of the Awards, and then move on to discuss to the conference later.
- j. There was unanimous consensus from the board to present LARAEC’s Innovation Awards at the June meeting.
- k. Mr. Urioste asked if they could have a tighter proposal for a conference at the June meeting with details, which Ms. Stiehl agreed to. The board members agreed as well.
- i. Ms. Montes added that Mr. Asturias had initially asked about parameters so they don’t spin their wheels too much. She thinks personally planning something in the fall in the form of a mini-conference would be the parameters in my mind.
 - ii. Mr. Urioste added that the topics in the moderated sessions are good on page 36, and he thinks they just need to incorporate them into a conference. He realizes that the moderated sessions are separate, but they can be included as topics in a conference.
- l. Ms. Stiehl said that in the PPT meeting, they liked the moderated sessions, and in planning for the fall, they would like to start to move on those as soon as possible, and for the conference they can create a new proposal for the June meeting that’s fleshed out a bit more, and they can work with the PPT to come up with the format, topics, etc.
- m. Mr. Stark suggested, related to Ms. Jacquez and Mr. Frank’s comments, that they get something around apprenticeship or innovative training where they have employers there showcasing some innovation around targeted career tech ed: short term, high impact, and employer driven. He would like to see a strand or two on that if they’re doing an entirely virtual conference..

5.5 Action Planning Teams: Next steps

- a. Mr. Gorence explained that this is a continuation of some of the info presented at the last board meeting, and directed the board to the report on page 38 of their packet.
 - i. Just to refresh their memory and provide context, they discussed in April that APTs were up and running in November. In the middle of meeting in

Mid-March activities were suspended. This report has more to do with the idea of how they might move forward with APTs given the current fiscal environment: the need to discuss issues surrounding limitations, contractual obligations in regards to PD activities, or considerations of how that might fiscally impact districts for reengaging APT activities.

- ii. They also need to know what their priorities are with continuation and maintenance of instruction, and that might include consideration of what personnel would be able to continue those activities. As the board sees in the report, there are some suggestions for questions the board might want to consider when they're thinking about reengaging action planning teams: what are member district priorities, are the APT members still available to participate, and what might that participation look like moving forward.
- b. Ms. Jacquez said that she loves the APTs, and that they're LARAEC's best-kept secret. She was on the adults with disabilities group, and they were forging through. She thinks they need outside people to be part of it as speakers; for example with Adults with Disabilities, the department of rehab regional center was going to come to speak. For the counselors in the counseling group, if they had counselors from the high school and a rep from the Community Colleges to give feedback, whether it's negative or positive, they need that. With ESL, they have been asked by employers about ESL for their employees. They need to not be isolated and branch out and engage more partnerships.
- c. Mr. Frank added that he has gotten regular reports on the Data and Accountability committee, and he thinks they can continue to meet remotely. He is also a fan of this work.
- d. Mr. Urioste liked the guiding questions for the board; as far as priorities, he wants to make sure they are compliant with their 3-year plan and helping fulfill it. As far as limitations, he is very supportive of their folks that need to be there at the APT meetings, and BUSD does compensate them for their time there. For Burbank, the answer of whether they can participate is yes, and that will be on whatever platform the LARAEC office decides to implement.
- e. Ms. Montes thinks the other thing is, if you look at the different APTs, maybe there's a conversation around what does that look like in terms of now; what are their tasks and how does that fit in with this new mode of instruction. So how can the tasks of the APTs move forward and adjust given the new structure. In terms of other people that Ms. Jacquez mentioned, she does not know how that would

work and does not want APTs to be on hold while scheduling speakers, etc.

- f. Mr. Gorence clarified that a lot of the teams were already meeting virtually, and collaborating on things like Google Docs, so it'll be less heavy lifting for most of the groups to continue doing things that way. He added they can reach out to the groups and co-chairs to see if they feel they have the tools to work in that space. He asked if it would be the board's will to re engage the APTs as soon as possible, and Ms. Montes and Jacquez said yes. There was no dissent.
- g. Mr. Gorence said that they will reach out to the APTs immediately, inform the board what's happening with the information as they get it and how it's shaping up to move forward so the board is familiar with the specifics of the information.

5.6 CalFresh Stakeholders update from May meeting

- a. Ms. Stiehl directed board members to a report in their packet, explaining that Mr. Asturias had asked her to attend a CalFresh stakeholders meeting a little bit ago where they updated what they're doing to serve the community.
 - i. She explained that they're beefing up food banks and providing emergency food for whoever needs that. They're beefing up the application process and have closed physical locations, mostly shifting to online application.
 - ii. Then they have a lot of things they are doing to support people who are already using CalFresh benefits: extending due dates for recertification, and waiving other due dates. They also implemented electronic signatures.
 - iii. She added that what's most interesting is the last part, number 4, which talks about more benefits available, involving schools and what schools can help provide.
 - 1. They're raising the allotments for households currently on CalFresh, and also issued something called Pandemic EBT, where students who get free or reduced lunch at their school, if they're already in the system and have an application for CalFresh, CalWorks, MediCal, they automatically get a Pandemic EBT card, regardless if school is providing free grab and go lunches.
 - 2. These were automatically sent out this week and last week. CalFresh was asking schools for assistance to let people know that if they don't have an application in for any of those benefits, they need to submit an application

for an EBT card. So they were looking to schools for help spreading the word. Also, people who are newly qualified, i.e. people who lost jobs after the school closed, can apply for Pandemic EBT cards.

- b. Mr. Frank asked if Ms. Stiehl had gotten any feedback on the Fresh Success info she provided last month. Mr. Frank added that LACCD is digging in pretty deep on the opportunity: for adult students taking ESL, basic skills, or CTE, and if they are enrolled in CalFresh, about 44% of all expenditures they make on those students are reimbursed back to the system. And it's quite an interesting opportunity that's never been available before, contingent on counties stepping up and partnering on it, which only happened about a month ago.

5.7 Remote CASAS testing and remote COAAP testing

- a. Mr. Gorence explained that OCTE in the latter part of March issued guidelines allowing states to create remote testing guidelines. CASAS issued guidelines for how agencies could continue testing as part of EL Civics. Subsequent to those guidelines being issued, CASAS did field testing of pre and post testing and engaged with agencies to test that and the COAPP test.
 - i. He explained that he is an instructor at LA City College, and his school participated in the testing. CASAS testing is a little more elevated than COAPP, but some of the things they noticed is that there were 5 instructors involved testing high intermediate and low students; this involved 1 on 1 COAPP testing and 1 on 5.
 - ii. The guidelines coming from CASAS prescribe how testing can happen for 1-on-1 and 1-on-5 and how testing security is necessary to do that. After participating, they think equity and access is going to be a big issue.
 - 1. Their student population is dealing with a lot now, including issues accessing their internet, wi-fi, and devices. One of the things they know is it's absolutely essential to get an assessor script created. Also, students are not uniformly using one device; most students access internet with their phone. So with COAPP testing, there was an issue with the formatting of the information on the screen.
 - 2. As the attendees may be aware with COAPPs, there's a writing component and an oral component. The writing component is an

issue because CASAS wants the assessor to be able to interact with the student in a live way.

3. With the written COAPPs, it allows the students with the guidance of CASAS for the assessor to appear on screen, students can write on pencil and paper, then hold it up to the screen when they're finished, so the assessor can take a screenshot. Formatting was critical so assessor can see the assessment and capture them.
 4. For member districts here, the advantage they have: for Canvas and Schoology the students can take the assessments on those systems and still fall within CASAS guidelines. They would allow them to capture those answers so they would be compliant. In terms of city college those were Mr. Gorence's takeaways.
- b. Ms. Jacquez said that MUSD is just exploring the options of remote CASAS testing.
 - c. Mr. Urioste explained that BUSD wants to pursue a pilot with their ESL level 6, intro to ABE class, and see how that goes. He highlighted Mr. Gorence's comment that a good number of students will access the testing and technology via their smartphone. And he has certainly heard that from BUSD's students and other agencies. If that's the case, he asked if CASAS and TE are formatting these tests so they can be viewed so that students can actually work on the tests via their smartphones.
 - i. Mr. Gorence said that he thinks that's an issue; the other issue is one of labor-intensiveness, because typically when schools do pre and post testing, it's in a group environment. And based on CASAS guidelines, it's 1-on-1 or 1-on-5. And for their students, the bar is so high; they'd need to have a computer that's registered and Windows for 1-on-5 assessment. And he thinks that's an issue that has to be addressed, and would be happy to follow up with CASAS to get that info and report back to the board.
 - d. Mr. Urioste said that he thought Jay Wright was participating in this meeting, and he has a lot of respect for him and his knowledge base. Mr. Urioste would like to believe that in August, September, or October, they will be back to where they were, business as usual. But he thinks it is important for them to explore the fact that smartphones and devices are still the way that the majority of people communicate, and it is going to be important for their agencies to format

	<p>assessments in such a way that students can access them via their smartphone. If they lobby on anything, it should be to approach them regarding that.</p> <p>e. Mr. Gorence confirmed that Jay Wright was in the meeting, and Mr. Urioste said that he loved Jay’s last presentation. He asked if there was anything coming up in the future as far as additional webinars?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mr. Wright said that there are actually going to be distance-learning-related webinars tomorrow, including one at 1 PM on basics of distance learning. Then the one at 2 PM is more specific to state-wide and local assessment policy. ii. Mr. Urioste asked if there had been any conversation regarding formatting assessments for students to be able to take them on a smartphone. Mr. Wright acknowledged that Mr. Ackerman might be more detailed on the issue; for now, the pre and post testing requires a computer, and added that Mr. Gorence was a great field evaluator. He explained that they are working on a lot of things to make it an easier process. He confirmed that they are aware of the issue, and that’s why they have been pursuing COAAP because the flexibility with EL Civics is much better. They are looking at a number of different arrangements for doing this because they will be much larger-scale if they have to go into it for next year. <p>f. Mr. Ackerman added that they would love to be able to put the test on the phone, but the issue is the phone screen is just too small. That and security just makes it impossible. The best bet they can see is chromebooks; they know that’s not available to all students, but that seems to be the lowest common denominator of what’s feasible.</p>	
<p>6 Board Member Reports</p>	<p>LAUSD:</p> <p>a. Mr. Stark thanked their stakeholders and their colleagues from CASAS, as well as all their adult ed administrators, classified staff, and teachers during the continuity of learning period we’re in. Everyone’s been working very hard to assist their students across that technological divide. The May revision is scary, no matter how you interpret it. He explained that LAUSD bases their budget on the January budget, so they are taking a huge hit; adult ed is taking a 13 million dollar hit. So they are working with their fiscal staff to see how they can make a few moves to mitigate impact on instruction.</p> <p>They are trying to save summer school, which he thinks they can do, but it won’t be an easy task. On the positive side, they think this period presents a good opportunity to lean into some key workforce training initiatives and</p>	<p>Mr. Stark</p>

	<p>opportunities, including grant funding. As a quick example, LAUSD is hoping to partner with the county on Project Room Key, bringing some short-term CTE training opportunities to formerly homeless individuals now living in hotel rooms. LAUSD has been very nimble in responding to critical workforce needs.</p>	
	<p>BUSD:</p> <p>a. Mr. Urioste reported that BUSD's summer session is still on, and starts June 1 through July 8, and their teachers have worked very hard getting ready to be able to provide distance learning. And they have been very supportive of their teachers and students to get this ready and to provide a somewhat abbreviated summer session.</p> <p>The second report is that BUSD will have a graduation ceremony, virtual, on June 8th at 6 PM. They have a vendor that their sister school has provided them with, so it's at no cost for BUSD</p> <p>He wants to thank CASAS and TE for their webinars; they've been very helpful to him as an administrator to listen in and get the quality information. Particularly, Jay Wright has led two this summer that he thought were outstanding.</p> <p>As far as the May revision, they will have difficult decisions to make. One difficult decision is they are past their March 15 date, so as far as any personnel matters, they are beyond that. They have contracts still in effect that they need to uphold. So they need to be looking at their enrollments and programs, and no doubt, BUSD will be making some difficult decisions. Hopefully if the economy does perk up and their tax revenue picks up, then their governor will be able to make a revision in the future. And this comes at a time when most adult ed institutions were anticipating a bump up in budget.</p>	<p>Mr. Urioste</p>
	<p>LACCD:</p> <p>a. Mr. Frank reported that LACCD was continuing online all summer, and predicting 80%-90% of classes being online in the fall. The hard to convert classes were about 350 of their 8,000 offerings. We have figured out nursing, amazingly, in terms of clinical hours, and they have had help from the governor to work with the nursing board to figure those out.</p> <p>He also discussed the CARES Act, which provides support to schools, but with terrible conditions: DACA students and others were not eligible for the aid, as were people who were fully online and people who were non-credit. So they have been able to find ways to supplement non-permanent residents. They have been able to figure out the non-credit piece.</p>	<p>Mr. Frank</p>

	<p>The LA County education workgroup is meeting, led by Biola College ,which is pushing very hard to get back open this summer. They're calling what they're pushing "Fast and Safe"; Mr. Frank said that LACCD is a little more circumspect, but the county is trying to be open more July 4th. Some of the numbers are starting to turn in their favor, but they will see how that works out.</p> <p>Finally Mr. Frank said that for folks who haven't seen it yet, there is a grant coming from the DOE called the Education Stabilization Fund. There's 127 million for higher ed for reimagining workforce prep. They are still waiting for workforce development funding that has not come forward, it's stuck in the House and Senate.</p>	
	<p>MUSD:</p> <p>a. Ms. Jacquez reported that MUSD is continuing with all their staff, certificated and classified. One of their themes this week is attentiveness at work, school, and home. She related a story from one of their teachers: her father is a sanitation worker who works for Long Beach, and he noticed a neighbor was not putting out her trash. She's about 90 years old, and the office called and found out she didn't have any more food. So all the sanitation workers put their money together and stocked her kitchen. So this concerted effort of helping others has really come to the forefront. She is very proud of the teachers and certificated staff, and they celebrated them for Teacher's Week.</p>	Ms. Jacquez
	<p>CCUSD:</p> <p>a. Ms. Montes reported that CCUSD is also exploring the options for CASAS testing and placement testing virtually. They've been getting students coming back for online learning after leaving for work, etc. because they have more freedom now, which is good. Graduation is a big deal for people, so they are working out how to do this ceremony virtually to acknowledge the graduates this year. As a member of the CAEIA Board, they met last week; she encouraged everybody to keep contacting their local legislators and letting them know the importance of adult ed and the difference this makes with their students.</p>	Ms Montes
7 Public Comment	There was no public comment.	
8 Action Items	8.1 No Action Items	
9 Announcements	Announcements: Next meeting Wednesday, June 17 at 10:00 AM, to be held over Zoom videoconferencing.	
Adjourn	Mr. Urioste adjourned the meeting at 12:38 PM.	